TRANSCRIPT

FACULTY SENATE
Wednesday, April 24, 2024, 3 p.m.
Altgeld Hall Auditorium
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Akst, Arado, Atkins, Barrett, Billingsly (for Guzman), Bohanon, Books, Boswell, Campbell, Chomentowski, Creed, Duffin, English, Finch, Fotovat, Hartenhoff, Hunter (for Kupelian), Jong, Kim, Lampi, Liberty, Libman, Luo, Marsh, McGowan, McKee, Mellon, Mills, Naples, Nesterov, Nyunt, Palese, Qin, Rajabi, Rossetti, Salimi, Sharp, Slotsve, Staikidis, Swedlow, Vahabzadeh, Valentiner, Van Wienen, Wang, Whedbee, Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Brain, Demir, Guzman, Harris, Ito, Johnson, Kreitzer, Kupelian, Larkin, Martinez, Porter, Ross, Ruetsche, Scanlon, Sirotkin,

OTHERS PRESENT: Acardo, Bryan, Elish-Piper, Hughes, Middlemist, Pitney, Saborío, Sumner

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

I.   CALL TO ORDER

B. Creed: I will call to order the meeting of the Faculty Senate for Wednesday, April 24, 2024, at 3:01 p.m. Pat, can you verify that we have a quorum.

II.   VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

P. Erickson: We do have a quorum.

B. Creed: Great, so we do have a quorum,

III.   ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

B. Creed: which brings us to item III, Adoption of the Agenda. Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda for today's meeting.

F. Bohanon: So moved.

B. Creed: And a second from Therese Arado. All in favor of adopting the agenda, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Opposed? All right, agenda is approved.

IV.   APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 27, 2024, MINUTES

B. Creed: Next up is item IV, Approval of the March 27, 2024, Minutes. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes? Valentiner, first. Therese, second again. Any discussion or comments? Hearing none, all in favor of approving the March 27, 2024, minutes, please signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Opposed? Abstain? All right, minutes are approved.

V.   PUBLIC COMMENT

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

P. Erickson: No public comment today.

VI.   FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

B. Creed: I'll start my comments off by saying I'm on the big screen, which is fun. So, that brings us to item VI, Faculty Senate President's Announcements. First, I want to say, welcome to the last Faculty Senate meeting of this academic year. I truly do appreciate the work of those on this body for their work this past year, as a whole, as well as on the committees and councils that represent this body. I think there's been a lot of great progress that we've been able to engage with and oversee. And some of those are very visible, such as the amendments to the promotion and tenure bylaws. And some of it has occurred in the various committees and councils, such as the work of the Baccalaureate Council moving forward with work related to general ed, as well as community engaged course designation. So, I really just want to say thanks to all those members here and on those committees and councils for the work they've done over this past year.

My next announcement is that I'll be sending out a final survey to the faculty senators to get their feedback on what's worked for this and what hasn't worked, and to help set the priorities and agenda for next year. I have some ideas, but that's just my ideas. And I would love to be informed by what members of the Faculty Senate think would be worth our time and worth our efforts in the upcoming year. So, please do look for that and be willing to share your opinions through that or directly with me, either way, happy to incorporate your feedback.

Finally, my last announcement is, as mentioned at our last meeting, we're going to be soliciting committee preferences for the upcoming academic year. Pat will be sharing an email tomorrow. Within it will be brief descriptions of each of the standing committees that we're looking to populate, an overview of the work that those committees will be likely to engage in in the upcoming year, as well as information about the meetings, the dates, if they're already set, the modality and things like that. So, please, if you are serving again next year, please be ready to identify the preferences that you have for the types of effort you'd like to contribute toward.

With that, I just want to say once again, thank you all for the service and thank you all for sharing your time today on this sunny and warming-up afternoon. I appreciate it.

VII. PROVOST'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

B. Creed: With that, I'll turn it over to item VII, which are Provost's Announcements, and I'll invite up Provost Elish-Piper.

L. Elish-Piper: Hi everyone. I have just a couple of quick announcements. One of them is kind of the perpetual announcement about ordering books. There was a deadline of April 1 for fall. A lot of folks have not yet submitted their book orders. You can still do that. So, please go back and encourage your colleagues to do that. And you can do that through the Follett Discover feature in Blackboard for your courses. As we discussed before, that makes it so much easier for students to ensure that they have the books that they need, and those students, who use financial aid to purchase books, have those available to them, and they can start their classes strong.

Also want to first of all say, as we get close to the end of the semester, we're approaching commencement. And we're really looking forward to having strong representation from faculty. Just want to remind you that our graduate commencement ceremony is Friday, May 10. It begins at 4 p.m. If you have not yet registered and you are interested in attending, reach out to Bailey in the Graduate School so that we can get you on the list for that. On Saturday, we have our two undergraduate ceremonies. The first one is at 10 a.m., and that's for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, College of Engineering and Engineering Technology and the College of Visual and Performing Arts, that's at 10 a.m. And then in the afternoon at 2 p.m., the College of Education, College of Business and College of Health and Human Sciences will have their commencement. If you have not registered to attend the undergraduate commencement, reach out to your director of advisement. That would be Margee Myles in the College of Business, Chris Lowe in the College of Ed, Mark Pietrowski in the Engineering and Engineering Technology, Nicole Holland in the College of Health and Human Sciences, Suzanne Hogan in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Donee Spizzirri in the College of Visual and Performing Arts. And those folks can make sure that they get you the relevant information.

Also, if any of you are interested in volunteering at a commencement ceremony, doing things like greeting people or helping to line up people or helping to check people in, you can reach out to Cara Carlson in the President's Office, that's Cara with a C, Carlson with a C. You can drop her a message, as well. We hope to see lots of you at commencement, celebrating our students' earning of their degrees and also honoring all of the great and important work that faculty do to help students be successful and graduate.

And that is the end of my announcements.

B. Creed: We were talking – there was going to be a guest announcement, but they haven't quite made it across campus, so we'll hold off on that if we still want to share it. Oh, never mind, we can throw it right to you as you walk in the door, Carol, or I can give you a second to catch your breath on your way up. As Dr. Sumner walks up, I just want to echo the invite to the graduation and commencements. Similar to our previous ones, there are opportunities for faculty to join and have a welcome when they come as well. Thank you so much.

C. Sumner: Apologies for running. They're doing a celebration of life for Sharon Howard. If you are not familiar with who she was, she was the founding director of the Women's Resource Center here at Northern Illinois University. She passed in the fall. And so, her children and family and friends are all gathered. I need you all to just know the impact you have. There was a woman who traveled from Mali to give remarks, because of the support she'd received from Sharon. She came here with her husband, who was pursuing his degree, and they thought better that she should probably pursue her degree. She came with one of her three children, a five-year old. While she was planning to pursue her master's degree in the spring, her sister in Mali, who was caring for her child, her two other children, who were nine and seven, passed away. And so, she had to return to Mali, and Sharon helped her with money to get back to the United States, helped her find an apartment, a graduate assistant, took her to Jewel grocery store. She liked Aldi, Sharon liked Jewel. Eventually, they found a way to bring her other two children over here. She then graduated with her master's degree, went back to Mali, came back in 2003. And from 2003 to 2011, Sharon gave her resources and support so she could finish her doctorate. All three of her children could go through school and earn their degrees. That's what NIU does. So, I just needed to say that.

On to less maybe meaningful work, the IBHE equity plan. As you all may be familiar, the State of Illinois has required that every institution in the state of Illinois complete an equity plan. There are different plans for private institutions and for public. We are well-positioned; and if you are not familiar, my predecessor, Dr. Edghill-Walden worked across the university with many of you all in university leadership to develop an equity plan that predates what the state equity plan requirement is and was actually one of the models that the state has been drawing from for the equity plans that will be produced by all of the other state institutions. We have a deadline of May 31 to submit this equity plan. We have introduced this into the senior roundtable meeting. That team of the vice presidents are then engaging each of their respective individuals. Likewise, the provost has been meeting with her leadership team and the deans to create a framework for how we will respond. There are five particular questions. The first two are really about demographic information, pulling information from resources and data sets that we have. They provided us with a 59-page PowerPoint presentation on data from Northern Illinois University, so, there's no shortage of data. But what we're wanting to focus on – and Tamara Boston, if you are not familiar with her, she's worked on the previous plan when it was a part of the partnership for college completion. She is helping to lead that work. One of the things that we have to demonstrate are programs and initiatives that demonstrate our effort to increase and ensure equitable access to resources and success for students who are marginalized, minoritized, underrepresented, adult learners and re-entry, transfer students and the like. And so, what we will be able to draw on is all the work that we've done. This is a plan that will be required every year, from institutions across the state. We are not looking at a lengthy document. Our HLC Quality Assurance document is also a big part of the framework. The last thing I'll share with you is that some of the instruments we will also be drawing on, something else that NIU has been doing, we've been doing a sexual assault prevention approach to looking at doing a climate study for sexual assault prevention. This year, the state implemented one of those, as well; so, again, NIU is a forerunner, a frontrunner in that work. That will help to inform our work, as well as other surveys and climate studies that have been used previously. We wanted to provide this for you. Tamara is here in case there are any logistical or other questions. We wanted to make sure you were well prepared. Thank you for letting me share, and please let us know if you have any questions.

B. Creed: Thank you for running across campus and, most importantly, thank you for sharing that story of the impacts that we do make and we often don't know that we make. Thank you.

VIII. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

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

Laurie Elish-Piper
Executive Vice President and Provost

John Acardo
Senior Associate Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer

B. Creed: Up next is item VIII, Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. The agenda item we have there is a budget update, which will be presented by CFO Middlemist, EVPP Elish-Piper and Senior Vice President/CHRO John Acardo.

G. Middlemist: Ben, I don't know if you guys can hear me.

B. Creed: We can, George, yes.

G. Middlemist: First, I want to apologize for not being there in person. Sometimes, life just happens, and I've been called away. But know that I'm with you in spirit, and I'm here to answer any questions as we go through the PowerPoint slides. That's a frighteningly big head on the screen, so I'm hoping we get the PowerPoint up.

L. Elish-Piper: We're glad you can join us, George. I think we're waiting to bring up the slides.

G. Middlemist: Very good; yep, perfect. So, we can just jump to the next slide. Just kind of an overview, first I wanted to address the question, and I apologize that I wasn't able to attend in February. But a question was asked in November around the salaries, and so wanted to address that in this presentation, walk through the Board of Trustees recommendations around some pricing and then update you all on kind of where we are on some of the budget work that we've been doing over the last several months. With that, Tony, I think we can go to the next slide.

This kind of sets the context. We've been talking about the expense budget, and the question was asked in the personal services item, which is about 54 percent of the university's budget, how is that distributed in terms of the different employee groups. John Acardo has joined us today, and he'll walk us through the next few slides on how that money is distributed. The one thing I want to point out before John gets into his presentation, for those of you who are like me, that look at numbers, you're going to see that the personnel services budget is $233 million. When John walks you through the numbers, he's going to be updating you on the fiscal year '23 actual expenses. So, these

are the '24 budgeted expenses; what he's sharing with you is going to be the '23 actual expenses, so the dollars are a little different. Tony, I think we can go to the next slide. And John, I don't know if you want to jump in here on these slides. Or, if you are, I'm just going to shut up.

J. Acardo: George, can you hear me?

G. Middlemist: I can hear you.

J. Acardo: Okay, there we go. Again, happy to be here today to talk a little bit about how the salary distribution plays out across our employment categories and also wanted to walk you through some additional slides about how we look at salaries and remain competitive in the marketplace. So, if you want to back up a slide; there we go.

As George indicated, you're going to see differing numbers than what the slide previous to this had only because we're looking at actuals from FY23. I'm just going to share with you, this is our employment categories that we look at in our system. You may see some familiar terms, faculty, obviously, being one that's very familiar. Senior admin, which I want to call out. In that particular group, I segmented the president, VPs, assistant, associate VPs, deans and assistant and associate deans into that category to give you at least some level of representation of what senior leadership, the dollar figure, may look like when we parse out that overall with our salary expenditures.

Below them are SPS, so those are our supportive professional staff. Academic support, civil service, extra help, grads and the last one there is our student employees, as well. On the far right, you can see the percent distribution that we have as we invest in our people. This is the structure that it comprises across the board with all of those individual employment classifications. Next slide.

We wanted to spend a little bit of time just talking about how important people are to our operation, and I can't underscore that enough. As a CHRO, people are what make our business operate and make success for our students. As many of you know, we are student centered. We have student-centered success at the core of our mission, and what you do, as we've just heard from Vice President Sumner, really makes a profound impact and difference. And so, when we look at overall multi-year budgeting strategies, that has to be at the core of our thinking and our processing, keeping people first. And so, I want to stress that as we go through and look at how are we comparing to our peers, how are we comparing to other institutions across the state and the nation, to make sure that we remain competitive in the higher ed marketplace. I know I don't need to go down the rabbit hole and share with you how competitive the higher ed marketplace is. The competition for talent, not only for faculty and staff, is truly immense. And so we want to make sure that we have a market-credible strategy, which we are developing and working more holistically on over the course of the next several months. But I at least wanted to give you an insight into some of the data that we're looking at to evaluate how we compare to others within the marketplace.

So, every year, the institution, for the past several years, has participated in a study through [CUPA](). CUPA is the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources. In my world, the industry standard for where we look at comparisons for salary data for faculty and staff across the nation. There are several thousand institutions that participate in this particular survey over the course of the year. They aggregate this data and then report back to us in different formats what

those salaries look like in a database. And so, for us, we have a little bit of a different classification listing that I'll draw your attention to and walk you through these graphs, just so that you all have the opportunity to know what it means and how we're comparing ourselves to others. But I also want to share with you, IR is the one that actually goes through and provides the data to CUPA on our salary for faculty and staff to ensure accuracy, but also they provide to me the list of our competitive peers. So, in this aggregate summary are our competitive peers, who we view, as an institutions, are competitors and who we can align with whether or not our salaries are competitive.

That first box there is going to share with you what our averages look like across the board to our competitive peers. The administrative group is comprised of more than just that senior admin group, but more of our directors and our more administrative level professionals. Professional staff is truly kind of academic support. Staff is what can be aligned with our civil service. And then I parsed out faculty. So, you see all faculty, then I did by rank professors, associates, assistants and instructors. There, you'll see what the average salary is across the board at NIU in that first column. The second column is when we go out and look at comparisons within our peer group and marketplace. Those are the averages that we see with our competitors. And then, when I look at Compa Ratio – for those that may be unfamiliar with that term, it's just a mathematical computation to tell us how much above or below that average mark we are. So, if we're above, then we're actually paying more than what I would call market. If we're below, then we're below where the market line is. Here, we're noticing that that .87, .92, 1.07, is where we see those averages aligning across the board when we're evaluating and comparing our salaries to our peers.

Below that, I again am drawing out some additional data when I look at the median. So, averages and medians, so that you have that opportunity to view how the kind of cluster and concentration, largest cluster and concentration of salary data, compares to the averages across the board.

And then lastly, I pulled out SRT, so our senior roundtable, so you can look at that as another comparable analysis and see how those are stacking when we look at CUPA data and compare ourselves to peers. If you want to change the slide one more time.

Recently, the Chronicle of Higher Education released based on IPEDS data, information as it relates to where ranking may lie for salaries for faculty amongst institutions based on region, state or other different filters or classifications. For this particular slide, I pulled all Illinois four-year public institutions and identified where we fall amongst our peers in the state of Illinois when it comes to faculty salary comparisons. I do want to comment on the first slide again (you can leave this slide up). But the first slide, I know, when we look at faculty, that overall spend was about $90 million. That's inclusive of both our rank faculty, but also our instructor line. We have about 1100 employees that participate in that particular classification. Around 660 are faculty and about 430 are instructors. Instructors account for about 14 percent of that salary line, just so that you're aware in that particular classification. I'll turn it back over to George for the next slide.

G. Middlemist: You've seen this slide before. It breaks out our revenues. And just to remind everybody, the biggest sources of our revenues are students and the state. Actually the next slide, Tony, if we can run to that, illustrates this a little bit better. When we think about where our funding comes from, the circle to the left of the screen, the government, we do get about 23 percent of our revenues from the state. We get it in the form of the state appropriation, and we get it in the form of

the AIM HIGH. You can see the big red circle, and that's the money that comes from students. That's from tuition, fees, room and board, a little bit of sales on campus, parking revenues, retail dining some. And the overlap that's in the middle there, about 13 percent, that's where it's kind of an intersection. We get the money from the government, but it's on behalf of the students. So, things like MAP and Pell, where the government is paying for tuition and fees on behalf of the students. And then those two little circles to the right are things that the community has an impact on us with. A little bit of overlap with our students in terms of events. So, if community members come to football games or go to theater events, park on campus, that generates some revenue. And our students who participate in some of those things also, usually through their fees. And so, that's why you have that little bit of overlap. And then we have some other income that we get, mostly from investment income, some Foundation resources and other things like that. When we think about how we drive revenues, the two biggest sources are the state and then the students. And with that, I think that's a good segue into talking about some of the pricing actions that we took at the Board of Trustees at the February and then March board meetings. Tony, we can go to the next slide.

I think most everybody knows this, but just to remind everyone, at the Board of Trustees meeting in February, the board recommended an average increase in room and board of 5.3 percent. That's average. There are a couple of complexes that were a little less than 5.3 percent; the Neptune North complex doesn't have air conditioning, and I think we recommended 2.8 percent increase in those rates, mainly due to trying to keep up with the cost of running housing. But also a little bit as we see debt payment increasing.

With undergraduate tuition, we recommended to the Board of Trustees, and they approved, an increase of 4.5 percent on the base rate, no increase in differential tuition, and that's for undergraduate tuition. I want to remind everybody that this is only on incoming students, so continuing students won't see that increase in their tuition. I also want to let everybody know that, for the AIM HIGH Huskie Pledge family income ceiling, we're increasing that from $75,00 to $100,000. What that means is that a family whose income was $75,000, we promised that those students would not have any tuition and fee responsibility. So, through MAP, through Pell, through AIM HIGH, through other sources and, ultimately, institutional aid, to make sure that they had no tuition and fee responsibility. We've increased that family threshold from $75,000 to $100,000, meaning that anybody who comes from a family with an income of $100,000 or less will have no tuition or fee responsibility if they come to NIU. So, looking to maintain, in spite of increasing our base tuition rate, making sure that for students it still remains affordable and accessible to those students that we serve. And then also I just want to remind everybody that currently 43 percent of our undergraduate students pay no tuition or fees. This impact is on not as large a population as all incoming students. And then, finally, just to put it into dollars, it results in an increase of $220 per semester or $440 for two semester for a full-time student.

For graduate tuition, we recommended no increases, not because we didn't see the same needs to increase tuition. There is a lot of conversation, a lot of discussion around the graduate programs, tuition waivers and graduate assistantships, and so didn't feel like it was the right time to be increasing tuition if we were going to be coming back in a year with recommendations to change different things. We felt like we should do all of our recommendations at the same time. And so, we're waiting until that work is done.

And then for student fees, we recommended increases to six fees for an overall increase of about 5.1 percent. It was, I want to say, around $57 for a semester in total increases. The main fee that went up was the Holmes Student Center fee. It was $2.45, and that was really to recognize the fact that that is a really well-used space by the students, and we needed to be continuing to keep it up in as good a condition as possible for them. And I think we can run to the next slide.

This slide, we just wanted to share where we sit in fiscal year '24 with tuition and fees, and what we've done historically with tuition and fees over the last several years. You can see that Northern Illinois University sits kind of in the middle with tuition and fees. And I want to point out that part of the fees that are built into this $15,000 number is the mandatory student health insurance. All the universities have that built into their fee. So, it skews it a little bit so that it's not exactly apples for apples comparison, but with all of our fees and tuition, we say that [inaudible] the lower middle part of the tuition and fee structure for fiscal year '24. With the implementation, we'll probably remain right in the middle. We don't know what the other universities have done, so we haven't updated this slide. But you can see, over the last eight years, we've increased our tuition and fees 5.1 percent, which is well below everybody else.

And then if we run over to the next slide, we can show just tuition and what our increase has been over the last eight years. And so, you can see, in tuition for fiscal year '24, we actually sit in the bottom quartile of tuition charges for the different universities. When we put the $448 on top of this $9700 tuition and fee, that will put us just slightly above Chicago State University, but that's assuming that all the universities maintain the same tuition rate, and we know that won't be the case.

And then you can see that, over the last eight years, we've had the second lowest increase, one of the lowest increases over the last eight years, 3.4 percent is how much our how much our tuition has increased since 2016. Tony, I think we can run to the next slide and start doing some budget work.

This is just to remind everybody what our mitigation plan was. It's really two things: increase revenues and reduce expenses. We need to figure out ways to generate new sources of revenue, reallocate resources to grow revenue, increase student recruitment and retention. All of those things will help to increase the revenue flow at this institution. And then in reducing expenses, looking to stop doing things that are non-essential or not priorities and then reallocating some resources to help decrease costs. And we have some examples of some of the work that we've done in the next slide, Tony.

In terms of revenue, we're anticipating increase in tuition and fee base revenues through a combination of retention, reenrollment and pricing strategies. When we do our modeling, we're seeing that we're about $10 million over the beginning fiscal year '24 budget for tuition and fee revenue, tuition and fees. And so, not all of that is from the pricing. A lot of it is actually through retention efforts that we're taking at this institution. And some of the reenrollment strategies that we have like ReUp, which is targeting adult learners [inaudible] stopped out students back into the university. And we saw some pretty good success over the spring semester with the ReUp program. We didn't see a lot of students, but they only had about a month to recruit students. We signed the contract with them at the beginning of November, which meant they had, essentially, November to get students enrolled in school. We saw 27 students come in from that program for the spring

semester. In terms of retention for that program, we're seeing 24 of those students have reenrolled for the summer semester, and I cannot remember how many have reenrolled, so far, for the fall semester. But, that's promising, because the retention numbers are pretty good, and they've now had several months to begin working on recruiting students to start back into the university for the summer and for the fall semesters.

We're also looking at increased housing capacity. We don't know what the looks like in terms of revenues right now; we haven't been able to model that out quite yet. But, housing is certainly very full this past year, and we're looking at it actually growing in terms of demand over the next year. We have expanded partnership with community colleges, and I just talked a little bit about the adult learner opportunities. And again, we're waiting to see what the estimated revenues will be from that, but very hopeful that some of those efforts. We do want to point out that we're anticipating an increase in state funding of about $2 million. We don't know that for sure; the legislature still has to pass the bill, and the governor has to sign it. But all indications are that we will at least get $2 million more in state funding. If you remember, the big circles, the two places that we really can drive revenues are students and then state.

But the little circles, we're actually expecting an increase of nearly $1 million in athletic game guarantees and some new media licensing rights. And the many of the other areas have been working on their own strategies and we're estimating an increase of about $1 million in some additional revenue.

Tony, we can go to the next slide, which is a little about expenses. We are reallocating some expenses. One of the things that we can do is, we haven't leveraged the Foundation resources as well as we could have, in terms of providing aid to our students. And so, we're reallocating some institutional aid expenses to the Foundation, which will save the university about $2.5 million and not impact our students, because they'll still be getting those same scholarships, just from a different funding source.

And same kind of idea, we're really leaning in to leveraging use of matching AIM HIGH Huskie Pledge funds. So, using more of those funds to drive aid to students, which could results in savings of what we're estimating to be about $1.6 million. And so, with just those few numbers, we're at about $12 or $13 million worth of deficit reduction, we're hoping and anticipating.

In terms of a couple of expense reductions, one of the things that we're in the process of and hope to have the work done by the first of July, is really looking at the cost of IT institution-wide. We have a pretty good idea of what DoIT costs, because we have them in the books, but there is a lot of other IT stuff that happens at the campus. Departments sometimes have their own servers or their own software licenses. And so, what we're really trying to do is get our arms around that and understand. If somebody has multiple software licenses out there, is there a way for us to get one license, reduce the cost and still allow everybody to have access to that license. And same thing for equipment and some of the other stuff that happens in IT. We'll know end of June, I'm hoping, what we think we could generate in terms of savings from those efforts. And then I'm going to turn this next item over to Laurie to talk about the academic efficiencies.

L. Elish-Piper: We talked about this item before. This is where we're talking about reducing the number of low-enrollment courses. We're looking at the number of credit hours required in degrees. Looking at whether all of the specializations in some programs warrant continuation if there's extremely low enrollment. And so, this is a longer-term initiative, and our estimate is, if we are able to fully implement a significant reduction in low-enrollment courses and reduction of curricular complexity, that the financial impact will be about $3.4 million, but that will be over multiple years. And so, that's definitely a multi-year strategy. And so, as the last item says, we're continuing to engage in this work. And, they did take the slide down, but it said something about how the chief financial officer and I are continuing to work with the senior roundtable, the other leaders on campus, to not only implement the strategies that George recapped for you, but also to identify if there are other opportunities either for expense reduction and reallocation or for additional or new revenue generation. So, I think at this point, we will be happy to address any questions that you may have.

G. Slotsve: George Slotsve, Department of Economics. I would just like to know, when can we look at some money being able to upgrade smart classrooms? Especially, the one building I know of is DuSable. The equipment's got to be 10-15 years old. To get the amplifiers to work in some classrooms, you do a drop test. You raise the damn thing an inch, you drop it, then it starts working. It isn't tree-plug; it isn't things like that. The equipment is just very old, isn't working. Earlier, was it this semester or last semester, there was one cabinet that got locked in one of the rooms, you couldn't access the computer. The Provost's Office and IT argued for two weeks over who's going to pay construction to go in there. You can check, ask Celeste, Celeste was involved. You argued two weeks to get the door open. Well, you've got somebody trying to teach that can't even get in there to put a jump drive in. We've got to get the act together here. This is unacceptable and not doing our students any favors. The technology is out of date, falling apart. There might be one projector left in DuSable. You lose a projector, we've lost the room. There are other rooms that we're being told, a room goes down, I wander down the hall, a room isn't being used, it's a provost's room, and we're being told, no, you can't use that, we're not allowing you to put classes in there. You've got to check into this. This is unacceptable.

L. Elish-Piper: Well, I appreciate that. We don't have provost's classrooms, we have university classrooms, I'll clarify that point. So, we don't hold them back. They used to be called provost's classrooms, but they're university classrooms, and they're centrally scheduled, which means that they're available to anyone. Some rooms are partitioned off for certain classes or certain purposes if they're special types of classrooms or they have certain types of technology, and Celeste coordinates the scheduling of those rooms. And so, I just wanted to clarify that language.

G. Slotsve: And I want to clarify that I've had complaints and heard complaints where people have tried to move to another classroom, there have been empty classrooms, and Celeste hasn't allowed them in, and faculty have had to go and say, "the hell with it," and gone in there, because that was the only classroom available where equipment worked.

L. Elish-Piper: Well, I appreciate you sharing that with me, and I'll absolutely follow up on that. From a technology perspective, I'm going to let George chime in for a moment, and then depending on what he shares, I may have some additional information to share. George, do you want to talk a little bit about the technology?

G. Middlemist: Thank you, Laurie. So, we are actually trying to replace those classrooms. I couldn't tell you which classrooms, but IT, DoIT, has been working with Celeste and others in the Provost's Office to see where we can begin to change out some of the equipment. We realize that it's old. And I can't answer to the who-pays-for-what, but I can tell you that Laurie and I are committed to not arguing about who pays for what, but when we have problems, to address it together.

L. Elish-Piper: And then I also wanted to share that, when we're looking at deferred maintenance, one of the things that we have a list of spaces that we're trying to prioritize, that when we do have funding come in; and I will let you know that we have moved classrooms to the top of the list, and specifically, we've moved DuSable up to the top of the list, because we do understand the impact. I've also personally taken the head of the NIU Foundation over there to show the spaces and talk about fundraising opportunities that donors can invest in, really uplifting those classroom spaces, not just the technology, but also the physical spaces. So, it's definitely on my radar, and again, I appreciate you bringing the issue up that you had in trying to reschedule classes. I will definitely look into that and personally follow up with you.

W. Luo: I'm Wei Luo from Earth, Atmosphere and Environment. You mentioned the adult learners, and we have some certificate programs, but I was recently told that the certificate programs are not stand-alone programs. So, how would you address that to make a stand-alone so we can attract more adult learners?

L. Elish-Piper: The certificate has to be attached to a degree is what you're saying? Yes. Is that undergrad level that you're talking about, or graduate? Undergraduate, yes. That issue has recently come out in the Baccalaureate Council, and I know that they're looking into it to see what we can do to address that. I don't have the specifics of exactly where they are in that process, but I know that is an issue that has been raised, specifically as we're looking to serve adult learners who might be interested in earning just a certificate and not a degree. So, it's definitely on the radar, but I don't have more additional details to share at this time. But I'll follow up with Alicia [Schatteman].

J. Akst: Hi, Jason Akst, Department of Communication. Really, really simple question: Where can I get a copy of the presentation you just went through?

B. Creed: We'll share it out afterward in the summary email.

E. Nesterov: Evgueni Nesterov of Chemistry. Thank you for a very good lecture and presentation. There were a lot of details that does kind of answer a lot of questions, and I really appreciate the effort to particularly reduce wasteful spending, because I think that often we can see that often in many instances. My question is a simple question. The faculty salary issue showed, are they nine-month salary or do they include the summer salary, which faculty could pay themselves extra?

J. Acardo: That's a great question. It's based on your base salary, so it would not include anything that would be above and beyond what the base is.

E. Nesterov: Okay, because it looks a little high. I know the salary level in chemistry department. To me, it looked like, I don't know where these numbers are coming from, because they kind of look higher than what we usually see. The second question: Does this budget [inaudible] include this 50 percent over have charged on grant funding, or it doesn't include that – the budget figures which you showed?

G. Middlemist: The budget figures don't actually show what we call the 44 funds – grants. They would show some of the miscellaneous revenue would be from those overhead charges that grants pay in terms of ICR or indirect cost recovery, so that's that 50 percent.

E. Nesterov: So, those numbers don't include them, but I think generally it should be based upon what I know from how much funds, grant funds university receives. That should be, this 50 percent of that, I mean [inaudible] roughly 43 percent of total. That should be a pretty substantial number, and I'm wondering where that goes, because it's not just like $1 million, it's many millions, really.

G. Middlemist: Sure, it goes to many areas. I don't have the breakout in front of me, but it goes to support the PI's, I think. It goes to support the RIPS. And then some of it actually comes to the finance office in terms of that 43 percent, or 49-ish percent. And not all grants pay that, right? Some grants see the full indirect cost recovery, and some grants see very minimal indirect cost recovery. A lot of times, it's up to the granting agency. But you are right, it's not hundreds of thousands of dollars, it is millions of dollars.

E. Nesterov: Yeah, it's a big number.

G. Middlemist: And that number is baked into the miscellaneous pie. If we were to go back to the slides – Tony, you don't have to go back to the slides – but the first slide that has the revenue broken out by pie, there's a miscellaneous thing; and indirect cost recoveries is in there. The grant revenues and the grant expenses are not in that, because they're kind of a one-for-one thing. So, for every dollar of grant you spend, you get a dollar of revenue. But you're correct on the indirect cost recoveries.

E. Nesterov: Okay, thank you.

G. Middlemist: You're welcome.

V. Naples: Virginia Naples from biology. In your presentation, you mentioned in passing the dreaded D-word, deficit. And starting last year, we had heard a lot of information about previous estimates of the deficit were $8-$12 million. And then in the beginning of last fall, the dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, in his address about the state of the college, mentioned that it was all of a sudden being calculated at between $32 and $42 million. And my question is: Why the big differential? And my other question is: How much of that – whatever number it is – has actually been moneys already spent or is aspirational that are things that we would like to do, such as pay for deferred maintenance issues and things of that sort?

G. Middlemist: Sure. So, the $32 million comes from the work that we've done in the budget office projecting out our revenues and expenses. The big drivers have actually been personnel, because we've been seeing increments, we've been seeing things that we should have been doing. A little bit of it's deferred maintenance; a little bit of it's capital. But the biggest drivers have been: 1) refilling lines, and then 2) some of the increments. In terms of from $8 to $12 million, to $32 million, I can't answer that exactly, because I don't know where the $8 to $12 million came from. When the budget was passed before I came to the university a little over a year ago, the deficit was around $17 million. It grew to the $32 million as we began to look at all the things that we were doing. And so, that's why we're in this massive effort of trying to increase revenues, but also decrease our expenses where we can, or at least modify the expenses as best we can.

L. Elish-Piper: Can I just jump in and add that one of the things that the budget planning work group suggested or recommended that we do is include everything. And so, previously, that deficit didn't include some of the institutional aid for scholarships that was not tied to a particular revenue source. And so, that's another one of the changes that happened, and the $32 million represents the institutional aid that we provide to students that was not directly correlated with a specific revenue source. I just wanted to share that.

G. Middlemist: Laurie, that's great. That also includes capital expenses, because hadn't also been included in that deficit.

V. Naples: Well, thank you, that's very interesting, because what we were told for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences was that the deficit had remained approximately steady between $8 and $12 million. And I was just wondering what was included in that. And it sounds like what you are doing now is you have changed your philosophy. Instead of talking about a basket full of apples, you're now adding oranges and rutabagas and other sorts of legumes and maybe a few potatoes. So, thank you.

S. Sharp: Shane Sharp, sociology. Some of my colleagues seem to be concerned that the notion of reducing curricular complexity is basically a euphemism for gutting departments, getting rid of departments, combining departments. Just because we're in a public forum, I'd like for you to address those concerns that my colleagues have.

L. Elish-Piper: Absolutely. When we're talking about reducing curricular complexity and increasing academic efficiencies, we run a lot of courses that have a very small number of students in them. And sometimes those courses are clustered in particular specializations. Sometimes we offer competing courses. For example, we might offer a research course that is unique to a department, but the same type of research course is offered in multiple other departments, all of which have low enrollment. We've also created situations where sometimes there are prerequisites that students need to take, and that the enrollment in those courses is low, and the question becomes: Is that prerequisite really essential for that degree program and for students to be successful? So, really, what we've been looking at thus far this year is the low-enrollment courses. When we started this process in July when I came into my role, we had 37 percent of our courses combined grad-undergrad that were below the enrollment caps. And those low-enrollment numbers are so that we can ensure we're using our resources wisely. We want to make sure that we remain able to offer high-quality academic programs, that we're able to ensure that students can take the

classes they need to be successful and continue in the programs and graduate. And so, we reduced the number of low-enrollment classes from 37 percent to 25 percent. So, we made some good progress. But, we still are offering a lot of low-enrollment course, which means that we are not necessarily using our faculty and our instructors and our other instructional employees in the most meaningful and impactful ways. So, that's the one thing we've been doing, thus far.

We started to look at curricular complexity, because we're noting, for example, you might have a strong degree program. Let's say you have an undergraduate degree program that has 100 students in it. Let's say that you have four specializations. Let's say three of those specializations have a robust number of students, and one specialization has three students in it. We're talking about: Is there demand for that specialization with three students in it? Can we teach those students out, and then either combine the most important courses from that specialization into one of the others? Can we phase that specialization out? That's really what we're looking at in terms of reducing curricular complexity – is not creating a situation where we're offering things that 1) there's not the demand for, and 2) it then really taxes our resources.

As we go through this process, it also can include things like, generally, with an undergraduate degree, we want to have 120 credits. But we have some, for accreditation or licensure requirements, that might need more than that. But we have a number of them that do it simply because that's what they've done in the past, but it makes it difficult to be able to offer those classes and to be able to have sufficient enrollment in those classes. So, when we look at curricular complexity, it's everything from the number of credit hours, the prerequisites, the specializations. We recently realized, for example, that we have a minor that has specializations within it. And so, in trying to be so fine-brained on what we're offering to students, we've created a situation that sometimes is not sustainable. So, that's what we're really engaging in doing.

As we go through that process, our intention is not elimination of programs and departments, but as we go through this process, I suspect the data will indicate what we should be doing. Should we be phasing some things out? Should we be updating some things? Should we be, as I said, strengthening that degree program that has four or five specializations by reducing the number down to respond to where the student demand is. And so, that's really the process that we're going to be going through and looking at curricular complexity, because we want to ensure that our academic programs remain strong. We want to make sure that our students can get the classes that they need to progress and graduate from their programs in a meaningful timespan. And we want to make sure that that quality remains there. So, that's really the exercise that we need to go through, is to make sure that we're not doing things that are making it harder for ourselves, or doing things that are making it more difficult for us to be able to do them within the budget situation that we find ourselves.

K. Staikidis: Kryssi Staikidis, School of Art and Design. I'm the chair of the art and design education program, which is licensure. It's undergrad, and then we have master's and doctoral. I guess, when I hear the language looking over – right? – I think a lot of this goes on at the top level, let's say, like the provost or administrative. And I'm just wondering – or requesting – that there might be an opportunity to have dialog with some of the division heads or some of the people who are sort of on the ground in these programs. Because, I know, for example, for our doctoral program, we've built this program over 20 years, and if you look across the nation, our numbers are

aligned with the number of graduates, the number of. But I don't know that we've had a conversation or been approached to really hold a dialog with the people making the decisions. Even too, with our master's, undergrad for licensure, or what happens if one semester something has less enrollment, but the next semester it has a high enrollment. And maybe like, I'm concerned that our long-term vision is getting sort of undermined by our short-term vision. So, those are some of the questions I'm being asked.

L. Elish-Piper: Yes, absolutely. The reason that we haven't convened faculty, for example, is because at the administrative level – I've officially been in the role since April 1 – and having these conversations with deans, mostly with chairs, with department chairs, we had a conversation yesterday, to talk about what could this look like. How do we engage faculty? Obviously, we have curriculum committees that can do some of the work. But much of the work really has to happen at the program level, looking and seeing where you can be more efficient, looking and seeing where the demand is. Maybe there's something innovative that, actually, we need to create a new specialization to replace one that is no longer relevant or of interest or in demand. And so, those processes, absolutely do need to happen at the local level. And what we hope to do is be able to provide some structure, some questions, so that programs can sit and really think about, what can they do to move their program forward, to ensure that we're offering the things that students want, to make sure that, if there are new opportunities or new trends that are forthcoming, that we have an opportunity to really lean into and try to build some of that work. So, there is not a plan to make any decisions at the senior level of what we're going to do specifically, because the knowledge about the programs, the knowledge about the curriculum, the knowledge about the field, resides with the faculty in the programs. And so, what we need to do is be able to provide some structure, some questions, some data to help programs have an opportunity to really look at and see what makes sense for them, not only now, but in the future as they move forward. So, thank you for that.

E. McKee: Emily McKee from anthropology. One thing I would like us to pay attention to as we move forward, and I'm not always seeing necessarily from my position, newly assistant chair, and so involved in sort of the scheduling, is an appreciation for the interdisciplinary work that gets done and when classes are required by multiple different departments and when faculty serve in multiple different departments, as well as when we have joint 400-, 500-level classes, and the caps are different. So, I would appreciate more dialog on that going forward.

L. Elish-Piper: That's a really good point. Also, from the student side, makes it difficult. Sometimes students need to take a required course in their major. They need to take a prerequisite course or another required course in a different department or program, and everything is scheduled at times that conflict. So, we really do need to do a much better job at thinking about the scheduling, obviously, from the faculty perspective, but also from the student perspective. And we have some tools now that we didn't have five or ten years ago that can help us do a better job of mapping that out. Also, with the centralized room scheduling, we have the ability to figure out where we can put things that can meet at certain times and have to have capacity for certain numbers of students or certain kinds of technology. So, that's absolutely important. I don't know if any of you serve on the – I think it's called the learning space shared leadership group – but that group has put forth a list of recommendations about scheduling, the kinds of questions to ask, the ways to think about that scheduling, some general best practices for scheduling, some of the key considerations or

challenges with scheduling. And so, that's something that, I think that group, we can kind of amplify some of the work that they've done thus far to identify some of those suggestions for scheduling.

E. McKee: Thanks, and also just to clarify, it's not just about scheduling, but as we're thinking about what counts as duplication and sort of thinking about the course complexity and the curricular complexity as well.

L. Elish-Piper: Excellent, thank you for that.

B. Creed: And last question from Chris.

C. English: Chris English, Student Government Association. The question I have is how is student demand being factored in? You talked a lot about that, but then you go on to talk about conversations themes. All those are great; however, in my conversations and my own experience as a student talking with students, is some of the reasons that they don't go to those classes is because: a) they need a whole list of prerequisites, which you touched on a little bit; but b) they aren't informed of those certificates until they're juniors, seniors, end of senior year. So, I think some of that lack of demand is because lack of knowledge, not a lack of interest. I think if you truly want to hear student demand, shouldn't stop by talking with faculty. There's great advice out there, and they do know the course better, but if you're looking for student demand and you're putting it all on student demand, I have not received any kind of survey or any asking of, "hey, student, what is your opinion?" But if you continue to say student demand, student demand, student demand, please ask the students when you're also saying that.

L. Elish-Piper: Thank you, I do appreciate that, as well. One of the things that we've been doing this year that you may have heard about is that we've been really working with our academic advisors, providing some professional development for them, providing some resources for them, creating an academic advising council to bring them together. And certainly that idea about certificates, that idea about gathering, information on what students are looking for, what students might not be able to receive or be able to coordinate into their schedules, is certainly something we can collect from those structures with the academic advisors, who are deployed across all of our degree programs and can provide that information at the program or the department level. And so, that's certainly one mechanism. We now have tools that we didn't have before, so things like Navigate where we can send messages out to students and so on. That's an interesting point. I appreciate that. I'll take that back and share that with my vice provost for academic affairs. She and I have started a student advisory group. We started it this spring. We met with student representatives from each college and from some other large groups on campus. We had somebody from Honors; we had someone from CHANCE, trying to get a representation – that particular group is undergraduate students – to talk to them about some of the pros and cons, some of the challenges, some of their recommendations. So, I think that we're going to not only continue that group, but I think that, as we work with that group, we can use them as a vehicle for helping us. We also have – we're supposed to have someone from the Student Government [Association], who is assigned to work with the Provost's office. And we've inquired a couple times, and we don't have that person. So, I think, in the future, if we can make sure that that appointment or that position is definitely

designated early in the academic year, I think that would be another great resource to build that really strong connection with student government as a vehicle for them connecting to other students, as well. But thank you.

B. Creed: Thank you so much for coming and answering the questions. And just something I would want to call out too, to a comment at the beginning that was made, is the IBHE faculty salary database that I've been playing in. If folks want to dig further into the data as far as trends in faculty salaries compared to administrator salaries, those are all in there, and you can cut them by similar categories here. If you don't know where to find those, let me know, I can send you those databases; otherwise, they're on IBHE's website, so you can look at the course, the base salary, plus additional compensation for faculty and for administration. So, just a resource to engage with.

B. Swedlow: Brendon Swedlow, political science. Thank you for providing the information that was requested. I just wanted to ask a question. I didn't see anywhere covered (maybe it was), but I'm looking at some analysis that the union had done. I'm not a union rep, but this was shared with me, and I'm not at liberty to share all of it quite yet. But, basically, there was an external analysis that the union commissioned going into negotiations with the university; and it covers 2006 to 2016. I think it would be really good if we had via the Faculty Senate basically commission some further analysis by an external person to evaluate situation. One thing I'm looking at here that I didn't see covered was amounts of increase in sort of benefits expenditures from something like 12 percent in 2006, they become almost 30 percent of the budget at that period, that ten-year period; whereas, faculty and administration has actually declined as a percentage of the budget. So, that's just one kind of window, but that seems very significant, wonder what the update on those trends would be [inaudible]. There's like, there's over 50 pages of PowerPoint here that really goes in depth on stuff that we haven't seen yet, and I think that level of granularity could be really helpful to evaluate and help us participate in these conversations that people are trying to have.

B. Creed: Thank you, Brendon. Maybe that's something we can take up in the next academic year and pull together a working group to dig into that work with George and his team, and John and his team to think how that might look for our campus.

IX.   UNFINISHED BUSINESS

B. Creed: All right, that brings us to Unfinished Business, item IX. We have the proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, and before we do that, we want to make sure that we have at least two-thirds of the Faculty Senate present. So, I'll turn it over to Pat to walk us through that verification process.

P. Erickson: And while we're getting ready to do that (thank you, Tony), first let's make sure that everyone knows if they're a voting member. If you see your name on the list or if you're here today for someone who is on that list, you are a voting member and you need to have a clicker; they're on the table by the door. There's no need to turn the clickers on or off, they activate automatically. For today's proposal – let me go to the next slide – Article 17.3 of our bylaws say that 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 the last part of that statement first. Let's make sure that we have two-thirds of voting members present. We have 60 members

currently seated, so that means we need two-thirds or 40 voting members in the room. And I'm going to ask you to just vote 1 or A on your clicker, press the 1 or A button on your clicker now. And we want to see that number get to at least 40. We need four more, three more, two more. You should see a check mark or a smiley face on your clicker to tell you that your vote went through, and I see we do have 40 now. Okay, so nobody leave the room.

> 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. Creed: Just over the hurdle. All right, so that brings us to the proposed amendment, item A, proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws related to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the operating procedures of the Faculty Senate and the duties and responsibilities of the Faculty Senate. Could I have a motion to approve the amendment to the bylaws. First, **Marsh**; second, **Valentiner**.

All right, so now discussion. In order to kick off discussion, I'll remind folks that we had the first reading two meetings ago, and, ultimately, the goal of these amendments is to enable the Faculty Senate to operate outside of the academic year, as well as to codify a standing precedent that the Faculty Senate oversees the academic year. Other public universities have these types of bylaws, which enable their Faculty Senate bodies to convene and make decisions outside of the academic year through the designation to standing committees of the full body to act on its behalf. NIU's University Council has this mechanism, and this proposal brings to Faculty Senate the ability to conduct its business outside the academic year when urgent matters arise. You'll note language has been added based on conversation here to clarify that the Faculty Senate retains their right to review and reconsider any decisions taken by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on behalf of the Faculty Senate through this delegation. And as a reminder, no changes to bylaws can be done in this matter, because you need a first and a second reading, and as we just talked about, you need two-thirds of the Faculty Senate members to be present to vote on that, so this would never lead to those types of changes.

Article 3.1 designates the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to serve as that body that is able to work over the summer and ensure continuity. And then Faculty Senate Bylaws 6.5 is updated to talk about when Faculty Senate Steering Committee is authorized to act.

And then the final piece is the academic calendar piece. Article 7.3 is created as part of the responsibilities to codify what has been precedence, which is the academic calendar is under the purview of the Faculty Senate.

With that, I'll open it up for any comments or conversation. Seeing nobody moving toward

C. Campbell: Cynthia Campbell, College of Education, Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment. My question relates to the 6.5.1 operating outside of the academic year. My question is: What might be considered matters requiring immediate action? And has anything like this occurred in the past? And if yes, what was it and how was it handled?

B. Creed: A good example of something that has happened in the past is changes to the academic calendar have occurred when the July 4 holiday fell on, I believe it was, either a Thursday or a Tuesday. And it was decided to have a university closure day, but there needed to also be an update to the academic calendar. And so that was a decision that was not handled through the Faculty Senate, through standard procedures. It was one that was just decided upon without input of faculty and things like that. Obviously, that's one that is a fairly low-stakes, unlikely to have any sort of push-back or blow-back on that type of decision, but there wasn't the effort to convene or get Faculty Senate perspective on something like that. So, there are occasional things that arise like that, that would require, in the principle of shared governance, a body to come together that owns that authority to make a recommendation or make a decision on that.

I am not sure, I don't have the institutional memory to know all the things that have happened in the past outside of the academic year, but other options are things that may occur – I'm trying to think of an example off the top of my head for this – but I know when we talked about this – I don't know if other members of the Steering Committee can help me out and remember, but there were some that rose where there may be need for a direct response. I guess, if we want to go into a place if we ever felt that something happening came out where we needed faculty to have an immediate stance or perspective that is reflective of something that's happening at the university level, whether it's an opportunity to hold administration up to scrutiny over the summer, to not have to wait to make a statement on behalf of Faculty Senate or on behalf of the faculty through that way. I don't know if that's satisfactory. I don't know if there are other examples that folks remembered from the Steering Committee.

C. Campbell: Thank you. And I'm sort of thinking of some of those low-stakes decisions versus high-stakes decisions. I notice that 6.5.4 says that Faculty Senate retains the right to reconsider the action taken outside of the academic year, and I'm just wondering if we should think about some of those things that might be flagged as high-stakes that would need to be a decision made immediately that may not be able to be, for lack of a better word, overturned or changed if the Faculty Senate disagreed.

B. Creed: I'm not sure what the question is there.

C. Campbell: The last point, 6.5.4 says that the Faculty Senate at the first meeting will be informed about any decisions that were made outside of the academic year, and the Faculty Senate retains the right to reconsider those actions. And I'm wondering if we've thought through, if something's considered high-stakes that needs to be acted on immediately outside the academic year, but then when brought back to Faculty Senate, if Faculty Senate thought, oh I don't know about that, what if it couldn't be changed?

B. Creed: It sounds like the question is, would the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, as the body designee, can it be trusted to act in the best interest of the body outside of the – it's a matter of, can this body act as a delegated authority body.

C. Campbell: Or maybe even if that was something that needed to be acted on immediately.

B. Creed: I think the idea is that, if there is something that rises to that level, at least now there is a way to convene faculty rather than no response, which is a type of response. Now, there is a way for Faculty Senate to be notified of this. And that's stated in here: This notification of all faculty senators to come to an Open Meetings Act implicated body to share their perspective and share their feedback in that moment, at that time, to then be considered and engaged with. So, I think that this gives a mechanism. It should be seen as giving a mechanism for voice and for access and for decision-making or perspective. So, I see – yes, that would be my response.

C. Campbell: Thank you.

B. Creed: Seeing no other discussion, I will call the matter to a vote. I'll turn it over to Pat to lead us through the voting.

P. Erickson: Okay, the poll is open, and you can click 1 or A for yes, you agree with the motion to approve the proposal. You can click on 2 or B for no, you don't agree with the motion to approve. Or, you can click 3/C to abstain. If you abstain, it's the same thing as saying, I am present, but I am choosing not to vote. So, that will have no implication or impact on the calculation of the votes.

Anybody need more time? Okay. And that passes.

> Yes – 38 votes
> No – 3 votes
> Abstain – 0 votes

B. Creed: Yep, that clearly passes.

> 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

B. Creed: That brings us to item B, which is a proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 3.5, the Social Justice Committee. We'll have a first and second, and then a discussion. So, can I have a first to approve this amendment? **McKee** and **Arado**, first and second.

For discussion, I would like to open it up by reading the box and then some commentaries. The first change is focused on representation on the Social Justice Committee to ensure the committee includes sufficient representation from all the constituencies and alleviating some unfair burdens placed on particular faculty senators. And this comes into alignment with other bodies of the Faculty Senate.

The second change is to clarify language in 3.5.2.1, so it's aligned with how actions take place within shared governance. And then to add a specific item, 3.5.2.6 clarifying the five-year reviews are summative and not penultimate. Some of these changes here were due to the feedback received after the first reading. You'll see the text that's highlighted in yellow, that is what's changed from the first reading to the second reading here. So, the first change was to add language to the Faculty Senate to state clearly that Faculty Senate remains the final policy making body for the Faculty Senate business. This language retains the ability of the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee to engage in conversations during those meetings, to make recommendations during those meetings, to other shared governance groups and to administration, as well as to create strategic plans from the perspective of the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee's work. The Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee does not set the agenda for this body, does not create action plans for this body, but it can make recommendations to this body that this body can then vote upon and agree to. And the second change was to move the duty to evaluate progress to a stand-alone item in order to bring more clarity to that first item, as well as to the last. So, again, the idea here is to bring clarity around that the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee is a committee that operates and has work to do, but also works within shared governance, not just this body, but also with UC and with senior administration and other places across campus. And this is bringing into alignment with other committees. So, with that, I open it up to discussion.

C. Campbell: Well, this is related to the striking of the language that – oh, I'm sorry, Cynthia Campbell, Educational Technology, Resesrch and Assessment. This is related to 3.5.2.1, the striking of "with approval of Faculty Senate" and the concern about that revision may undermine oversight of the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee by the full Faculty Senate and potentially empower the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee to operate in dependently of such oversight. So, I just wanted to clarify what "operating within appropriate shared governance procedure" means within this context, and whether doing so includes the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee getting approval of Faculty Senate.

B. Creed: The first part is Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee is subject to the Open Meetings Act, so all action that goes on within that body is open to the public to attend the meetings, to review the minutes, to review the agendas, to be in the room during the conversation. So, there's that sort of oversight ability that is baked into being OMA compliant.

There's nothing that the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee can do to change bylaws or other things that are directly Faculty Senate owned like that. So, I guess a question I would have back is: What is it that the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee could do that would strike into that oversight component, the same way that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee can operate in things that are within its purview, the same way the Baccalaureate Council can operate and the Grad Council can operate and the Steering Committee can operate without direct approval for all actions taken. That's the same sort of delegated authority that's given to this body. And nothing in here is intended to strike that sort of process. So, any sort of substantive policy recommendations, Faculty Senate would have that change to bylaws. But this allows for the reality that during those meetings, there will be conversations. Folks will come to that group to ask for their recommendation rather than having to be like, wait a month for a recommendation to come back for approval from this. That the standard operating procedure for committees is that body can

make a recommendation, can create plans for that body to operate. On anything that would implicate the broader group or other bodies of the Faculty Senate, would come to this body to be voted upon and known about.

C. Campbell: Thank you.

B. Creed: Seeing no other comments or discussion, I'll call this to a vote. Pat, can you lead us through that one more time.

P. Erickson: Once again, if you click 1 or A, that's yes, you agree with the motion to amend the bylaws. Two or B is no, you do not agree. Three or C is abstain, which means you are present but choosing not to vote. Clicking 3 will have no impact on the total vote calculation. Anybody want more time? Okay, and that passes.

> Yes – 36 votes
> No – 1 vote
> Abstain – 1 vote

B. Creed: All right, that passes, as well. Thank you.

X.   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 closes up Unfinished Business and brings us to item X, Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. First up is the FS-UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, and I'll turn it over to Emily McKee to lead us through that.

1.   Election of 2024-25 President of Faculty Senate/Chair of University Council Per FS Bylaws, Article 2

a.   Ben Creed

E. McKee: We have a couple of items related to elections. Our first item is to elect the Faculty Senate president for the 2024-25 academic year, and our one nominee is Ben Creed. Ben's letter of acceptance of nomination was emailed to everybody last week, and it's also in the packet. I don't know, are you going to put it up on the screen, as well? Okay, it will be going up on the screen, as well. For the voting process, we're going to use the clickers again. One or A is going to be yes. Two or B is going to be no. And C is abstain. I'll ask Pat to take over.

P. Erickson: And we can see everyone is clicking in, so that's great. This needs a simple majority. Anybody else? And that passes, congratulations!

> Yes – 38 votes
> No – 0 votes
> Abstain – 1 vote

B. Creed: Thank you. I won't say anything besides let's continue the meeting forward. Thank you.

> 2. Approve faculty candidates running unopposed to serve on various university-wide committees – walk-in

E. McKee: The next item of business is to elect faculty members who are running unopposed to serve on various university-wide committees. You can find that list of faculty candidates in your packet. Can I start with having – I think it's going up on the screen, I don't know – Can I start with having a motion and a second to approve that list? [**D. Valentiner** moved, **B. McGowan** seconded]. You got them both, great, thank you. Any discussion? Seeing nobody going to the mic, can we have a vote? All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

E. McKee: Any opposed? Abstentions? Okay, so the motion passes.

> 3. Election of faculty candidates running opposed to serve on various university-wide committees. Following the meeting, a Qualtrics ballot will be distributed to the tenured/tenure track faculty, clinical faculty and instructor members of Faculty Senate.

E. McKee: Our next item of business is to elect faculty members who are running unopposed to serve on various university-wide committees. To complete this process, Pat is going to be distributing a Qualtrics ballot by email after today's meeting, so you can check your email for that.

> 4. Faculty Senate Personnel Committee 2024-25 – Election of representatives for terms to begin in fall 2024. Those elected to serve on the FSPC must be tenured faculty members of Faculty Senate. Following the meeting, a Qualtrics ballot will be distributed to the tenured/tenure track faculty members of Faculty Senate.

E. McKee: The final item is to elect tenured faculty members to serve on the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee for terms to begin in fall 2024. To complete this process, as well, Pat will be distributing a Qualtrics ballot by email after today's meeting. Please note that only the College of Business, the College of Education and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences need to hold FSPC elections at this time, so only faculty representing those bodies are going to receive the Qualtrics ballot.

That completes the business. Thanks.

B. Creed: Thank you so much.

      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: Next up is the FAC to the IBHE report, and Linda Saborío will be giving us the report.

L. Saborío: Good afternoon. The FAC met on April 19 at Waubonsee Community College, my first time on their campus, and I thought it was a lovely campus. The WCC president gave us a very informative presentation in which he outlined some new initiatives being implemented on their campus. A few examples: To one of his priorities, which is the student experience, the hiring of a VP of talent and culture and chief diversity officer – it's a very long title, isn't it; the creation of more holistic support for students; and adding supplementary services to provide support for mental health.

We then had a report by our FAC legislative liaison, and he reported on the Dual Credit Quality Act and the Mental Health Bill for Students. The proposed amendments to the Dual Credit Quality Act appear to address some of the issues that our working group raised, specifically in terms of ensuring the rigor of dual credit courses. And I encourage you to take a look at that, the wording in the legislation there. The Mental Health Bill, he said, will most likely move forward in the fall, and I think that's for students, right.

We also met with representatives from – this is a lovely acronym – ILACADA, the Illinois Academic Advising Association. And they shared with us many ideas related to advising undergraduate students, such as the imposter syndrome, issues with early college credit and student placement, and letting students define their own success.

In my higher education funding working group, we met with our own Simón Weffer-Elizondo from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to discuss the funding formula. A question was raised about accountability and whether a faculty member would be invited to serve on the implementation team for the funding formula. We also discussed the potential timeline for the formula to pass through the legislative procedure and some potential concerns regarding the implementation process. For example, will oversight of this fall on the IBHE.

Then for our public caucus meeting, we discussed the charming relationship between shared governance and OMA regulations. We were asked to provide any updates to our institutions on our institution's DEI plans. Most replied that their DEI plans are being finalized. They have until May 31, so it makes sense.

Next month, we'll be down in Springfield for our annual meetings with legislators on the Higher Education Appropriations Committees, among others. And then our monthly FAC meeting will take place at the Illinois Association of School Boards on May 17.

That concludes my report. Thank you.

B. Creed: And I just want to say thank you so much. That will be Linda's last report as the FAC, so thank you, Linda, for your service in that capacity.

       C.   University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
              Felicia Bohanon, Natasha Johnson, Ben Creed
              Larissa Garcia, Karen Whedbee, Brad Cripe

B. Creed: There is no report from the UAC to the BOT.

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

B. Creed: No report from the Baccalaureate Council,

       E.   Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – no report

B. Creed: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities,

       F.   Social Justice Committee – no report

B. Creed: Or Social Justice Committee.

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

B. Creed: Chris, do we have an SGA report?

C. English: Hello. Recent SGA actions finished up, and we have a whole list of new people in various positions. For the new speaker of the senate, Manny Corpuz was elected in. For the new president, Ja'kobe Jones was elected. For vice president, James Innis. For student trustee, Aidan O'Brien. For student treasurer, Ethan Pesavento. A total of 24 senators have been voted in to represent their constituencies. So, that's all of the elections.

This year, using student fees, we've spent over $58,000 to various different student organizations, specifically 86 different student organizations.

B. Creed: Thank you, Chris.

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

B. Creed: Do we have a report from Operating Staff Council? I didn't see Natasha or Mandy, so I don't think so.

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

B. Creed: Do we have a report from SPS? Thanks.

F. Bohanon: Not from SPS, but I wanted to just say thank you to those that attended and participated. The Presidential Commission on Race and Ethnicity – we had our awards luncheon, and Deacon Davis program. One of the honorees was Fred Barnhart. And then also our afternoon panel focused on Black faculty, particularly Black women faculty and concerns; and Janice Hamlet participated on that panel. We'll be posting both of those presentations on our website. So, just want to say thank you to those individuals that came out to support and that attended. Thank you.

B. Creed: Thank you, Felicia.

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](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
O.   [Minutes](#), Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE
P.   Annual Report – Carrie Kortegast, Faculty Personnel Advisor – Pages 17-18
Q.   Annual Report – Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President – Pages 19-21
R.   2024-25 FS schedule: Sep 4, Oct 2, Oct 30, Nov 20, Jan 22, Feb 19, Mar 26, Apr 23
S.   [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: Up next are informational items. A through O are the standing ones. You'll find the annual report from Carrie Kortegast, our faculty personnel advisor, on pages 17 to 18. My annual report as Faculty Senate president is on pages 19 to 21. As a reminder, this is the last Faculty Senate meeting for the academic year. Our last announcement is just a reiteration of the spring commencement that's upcoming.

XII.   ADJOURNMENT

B. Creed: With that, can I have a motion for adjournment. **Mills**, first. **Marsh**, second. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

B. Creed: Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.