

## TRANSCRIPT

### FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, November 29, 2023, 3 p.m.

Altgeld Hall Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

Northern Illinois University

DeKalb, Illinois

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Akst, Arado, Barrett, Bohanon, Books, Boswell, Brain, Campbell, Corpuz, Creed, Demir, Duffin, English, Finch, Fotovat, Guzman, Hartenhoff, Ito, Johnson, Jong, Kim, Kreitzer, Liberty, Luo, Marsh, McGowan, McKee, Mellon, Montana (for Atkins), Nesterov, Nyunt, Porter, Qin, Rajabi, Rossetti, Salehinia (for Vahabzadeh), Salimi, Scanlon, Sharp, Slotsve, Swedlow, Vahedian, Valentiner, Van Wienen, Wang, Whedbee, Xie

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Atkins, Chomentowski, Graves, Harris, Lampi, Martinez, Naples, Ross, Ruetsche, Sirotkin, Staikidis, Vaezi, Vahabzadeh

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan, Elish-Piper, Falkoff, Fiala, Flynn, Hughes, Middlemist, Perry, Pitney, Saborío, Silva Tovar, Sumner, Swingley

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Cripe, Ferguson, Jaekel

### I. CALL TO ORDER

**B. Creed:** It's 3 p.m. I'm calling the November 29, 2023, Faculty Senate meeting to order.

### II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

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

**P. Erickson:** We do have a quorum. Thank you again for remembering to complete that attendance sheet and leave it at your spot. And thank you, Ferald, for collecting those at the end of the meeting. Thank you also for remembering to go to a microphone if you want to make a comment or ask a question. And it helps us if you tell us your name first. Thanks.

**B. Creed:** I'll also just add if you haven't picked up a clicker, please do, as we'll be using them for a vote later on.

### III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

**B. Creed:** May I have a motion to adopt the agenda for today's meeting?

**T. Arado:** So moved.

**B. Creed:** Therese Arado. And a second? Valentiner, second. Any discussion? All in favor of adopting the agenda, say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** Any opposed? Abstentions?

#### **IV. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 1, 2023, MINUTES**

**B. Creed:** Can I have a motion to approve the minutes from the November 1, 2023, Faculty Senate meeting?

**T. Arado:** So moved.

**B. Creed:** Second? Marsh. Any discussion or questions? Hearing none, all in favor of approving the November 1, 2023, minutes, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** Any opposed? Abstentions? All right, the 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:** Moving on to Item VI, Faculty Senate President's Announcements, I know we have a lot to cover today, so I'm going to try and be brief.

First, I want to mention that the executive vice president and provost search is underway with the position posted widely as part of that process. We would like to receive any nominations from those on campus from your networks for those that may be interested in the position or you deem to be a good fit. If you could please send those nominations to myself or to co-chair Streb. Or, I will send out a nomination link in my follow-up email.

And as you likely saw in the announcements, Criteria 1 and 2 for the HLC Assurance Argument is now available for review. If you could please take the time to review that and add any example to make our case the best that it can be.

I wanted to provide a quick update on the survey that I had asked everybody to go back to their constituent groups and bring back information related to professional development or other information that you may find valuable or your constituents may find valuable prior and at November 1 Faculty Senate meeting. I've gone through those results and I've got a bunch of action

items for me. So, I may stop with the surveys for a little bit so I stop getting more work for myself to do. But there is an overwhelming desire to for more information, training and transparency related to the budget. This includes defining what the structural deficit is, understanding the processes and values behind the decision making, resource allocation, where money is being spent proportionately across the university and so on. I've been in conversation with CFO Middlemist and EVPP Elish-Piper, and they've come to this group, and we're engaged in ongoing conversations. They'll be coming back again to share budget updates in the spring, and I know they're also working to pull together resources to bring more transparency and insights into this process, but I will continue from my seat to continue learning and sharing with this group as we have more information in ensuring that we all – I think the concern or the request is echoed by George and Laurie, both, for building transparency and trust in the budgeting process.

Curricular decisions was also an area that was flagged by multiple groups. I'll be working to see how we can bring together more information about this process to share in this setting. I'll also be pulling this together and I'll share it in the recap, as well, but there was information to learn more about sponsored projects and opportunities for internal supports for research. Those were the main areas related to professional development and for research of tenured faculty, was finding more pots of money, more internal grant competitions and learning more about sponsored projects processes for teaching and librarianship.

There is a number of asks about AI, both in terms of how to use it for teaching, but also how to engage with students using it, both in terms of the stuff that they turn in, as well as how do we prepare our students to better use AI in the careers that they'll be pursuing. And so, that's something that I'm going to start talking with Jason Rhode and Stephanie Richter about, to see if CITL has some insights or has plans in place to support. I know we're exploring using the AI Blackboard tool for course development, but to see if there are other resources that we can share here, they can come and talk to us about or put together resources for us.

And related to service, there are multiple flags for continued and expanded efforts for mentoring, shadowing and training for leadership positions, for folks who are thinking about going into various leadership positions, so I will continue engaging with those who offer those, to make sure that they're available and widely communicated.

And then there was also multiple times faculty reporting a desire to learn more about how to do outreach and community building and building partnerships with external stakeholders. And I know this is a topic that the engagement roundtable, which is co-chaired by EVPP Elish-Piper and VP Cotsones out of Outreach, the chief engagement officer, is taking up at that engagement roundtable. And so, more information will be shared as that becomes available out of the group.

And finally, there's been an ask for more information, something I'll be taking on in the new year, around more information and professional development about what is shared governance, defining it, identifying routes and connection points, defining roles and responsibilities and how it all works together. And I'll be taking that on from the Faculty Senate side of things in the new year.

My final announcement before I move on to item VII, is that I wanted to let folks know about proposals that will be coming before this body in the next calendar year, so in January, related to

making Faculty Senate bylaws governing tenure and promotion more inclusive and in better alignment with our university mission, vision and values. One aspect of this work is related to clinical and research faculty. The Faculty Senate Personnel Committee recently took up the recommendations of a working group on this topic, and they passed a recommendation to amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws to include promotion criteria, guidelines and processes in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, which currently there are no Faculty Senate Bylaws governing the promotion process of clinical and research faculty. So, this will make sure that key and important group of faculty are included in our bylaws.

The Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee will also be considering a proposal to amend Article 8 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws in alignment with the work they've been engaged with over these past two years. And as part of this larger package of work to make the bylaws more inclusive and better aligned with mission, vision and values, will be efforts to include specific language indicating that teaching, scholarship and service that is transdisciplinary, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary or engaged, is valued here at this institution. And so, while this will all come as a package to this body in the new year, if anybody in the meantime would like to learn more about it, has any questions or wants to engage in a conversation with me, please feel free to use my office hours, which I'll share again, or just reach out and we can find a time to talk about all of these efforts being pulled together.

That's a lot from me, but that's the end of my announcements.

## **VII. PROVOST'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**B. Creed:** With that, I'll proceed to item VII, which is the Provost's Announcements, and I'll invite Laurie up.

**L. Elish-Piper:** Thank you, good afternoon. Hopefully, everyone had a good Thanksgiving; we're back for the home stretch here. I have three quick announcements, one of which I've shared before, but it's about book adoptions. We're currently at 67 percent of our spring classes have texts adopted or have been identified as requiring no text. And so I just want to remind folks to take the message back to your colleagues to ensure that we get more of those texts adopted. Because of the holiday, because of the way that a lot of books are now printed on demand, any text adoptions received after December 6 cannot be guaranteed to be available by the start of classes, so we really do want to hit that target date. So, if you can carry that back to your constituents, that would be helpful.

I also have an update regarding general education. I'm going to read it, because it's a little complicated and I want to make sure that I express it correctly. The General Education Committee undertook an extensive two-year evaluation of the Pathways Program, which is an optional completion of selected general education courses in seven areas that fulfill the knowledge domain requirements. The result of that analysis led the committee to conclude that pathways were not an enticing avenue for students, and they were not completing them. At the October 19 meeting, the General Education Committee voted to recommend that the Pathways Program be eliminated effective with the 2024-25 catalog. The Baccalaureate Council considered that recommendation at their November 9 meeting and approved the removal of the pathways. All courses in the pathways will remain as general education courses. Minutes of the General Education Committee and the

Baccalaureate Council are posted online if you'd like to review that to see the discussions and recommendations in more detail. And if anyone has questions, they can reach out to Amanda Ferguson, the faculty chair of the Baccalaureate Council, Rod Caughron, the chair of the General Education Committee or Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Alicia Schatteman.

Also, I want to encourage folks to apply for, or nominate others, for the [RIPS STARS Academy](#). STARS stands for Strategic Transdisciplinary Artistry, Research and Scholarship, and this is a professional development opportunity that focuses on faculty learning more and being better situated to secure external funding. This is offered through the Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships, and if you go to the Office of Research, Development website, you can see more information, but the most important thing probably is the deadline, which is December 6. While the program is targeting early career faculty, all faculty are eligible. So, if you or others in your area are interested, I urge you to apply.

That concludes my announcements.

**B. Creed:** Thank you so much.

## **VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Proposal to amend Guidelines and Principles for Establishment of the Academic Calendar and selected academic calendars and to recommend that General Election Day be designated as an administrative closure day on University Holiday Schedules

**B. Creed:** That brings us to item VIII, which is New Business, a proposal to amend Guidelines and Principles for Establishment of the Academic Calendar and selected academic calendars and to recommend that General Election Day be designated as an administrative closure day on University Holiday Schedules. You can see this on pages 8 through 15 of your packet. I'll read this out loud to everybody.

Clarification of Senate Bill 2123 from the Illinois State Senate staff revealed that the holiday language relative to Illinois General Election Day does not apply to colleges and universities. As a result, this administrative closure day was removed from the NIU University Holiday Schedule and also removed from the Guidelines and Principles for Establishment of the Academic Calendar.

This proposal would accomplish the following:

1. Restore General Election Day as a day of no classes in the Guidelines and Principles for Establishment of the Academic Calendar, item 5, student-faculty vacation periods and holidays.
2. Revise the reference to General Election Day in the already approved 2024-25, 2026-27, 2028-29, 2030-31 and 2032-33 academic calendars from "(university closed)" to "(no classes)."

3. Recommend to those with authority over the University Holiday Schedule to give consideration to making the General Election Day as an administrative closure day in the current and future University Holiday Schedules.

NIU is engaged in many efforts related to voter education, voter registration, and increasing voter participation rates amongst Huskies and in the broader community. While participating in the General Election has been made easier through early voting and absentee voting, the designation of the General Election Day as a no classes day provides faculty and students an opportunity for civic engagement. The no classes day would allow students and faculty, many who are commuters to the DeKalb campus, to vote in their local elections and otherwise participate in the elections. Further, having no classes on the General Election Day would provide the message that NIU values civic engagement, particularly through exercising students' and faculty's right to vote. While the no classes day provides greater opportunity for faculty and students to engage in the election, it does not provide the same opportunity to staff or those students who work on campus. The proposal includes the recommendation for making the General Election Day an administrative closure day, in order to ensure the opportunity extends across campus.

Before discussion, can I have a motion to approve the proposal.

**E. Nesterov:** So moved.

**B. Creed:** And a second. Beth McGowan. Any discussion?

**E. Nesterov:** Evgueni Nesterov, Chemistry. I'm just curious about the text that you have read that refers to item 5 as university holiday and vacation. But then in actual item 5, the text is crossed out and instead it's shown as no classes time. What exactly is supposed to be there?

**B. Creed:** It would be amended to say no class days. As the General Election Day is not a holiday, so we thought to make a more inclusive term there, we would say no class days rather than vacation periods and holidays, because Faculty Senate does not have the authority to create a holiday or a vacation period. So, to be more accurate and precise.

**E. Nesterov:** I mean in that text you have read, actually, the one in the reasoning for this, it actually refers to vacation and holiday instead of no classes.

**B. Creed:** You're correct. I didn't carry it forward into that. It should under the first item, it should be item 5 no class days.

**E. Nesterov:** Okay. But that still means that staff will have to come to work, because that's a different item completely, so we cannot consider that. Basically, the university would be closed on General Election Day, rather than no classes.

**B. Creed:** Faculty Senate does not have that authority to close campus. We can make it a no classes day. And that's why part of the proposal is to make the recommendation to those who do have that authority to make it an administrative closure day.

**E. Nesterov:** Because, typically, if no classes, it's kind of ambiguous because we don't have classes, but we still come to work. Graduate students still come to do research and so on, so it's not the same as having the university closed.

**B. Creed:** Correct. And there are other days that are similar where there are no classes. For instance, this past Wednesday, there was no classes, but the university could have still been open.

**S. Marsh:** I'm Sarah Marsh from the Department of Management. I just wanted to express my wholehearted support for this proposal. I surveyed my faculty in my department, and it was nearly unanimous that, as an institution, we need to express our values. And that means taking all the educational opportunities to encourage our students to vote, create opportunities for our faculty and staff to vote, and that while myself, as a faculty member, have made considerable efforts to educate my students about how to vote, how to use all the tools that are available to them to vote, it means a lot more when I can say, "here are all the tools, let's work through these, and the university thinks it's so important that they're closing the university for the day." So, that's all I have to say.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Sarah. Seeing no other movement toward the microphone, we'll move to a vote, and we will use our clickers, and I'll turn to Pat to lead us through that.

**P. Erickson:** Okay, I think the first thing I'll do is go back to this page of voting members so that you can see if you're on that list, or if you're here today for someone who's on that list. That means you're a voting member. And special note, I think we have two new student members in the room today, and you're not on my list, but you are voting members too, so if you see your name there or you're here for someone whose name is on the list, make sure you have a clicker. Quick reminder that you don't have need to turn the clickers on or off; they work automatically when you put your vote in. And in a minute I'll open the poll. And when I do, I'll ask you to click 1 or A for yes, you agree with the motion to approve the proposal. Or click 2 or B for no you don't agree with the proposal. Or 3 or C for abstain. And then you should get a check mark or a smiley face on your clicker to let you know that that vote was counted.

So, give me a second here to open that up for you. Okay, you can go ahead and vote now – 1 for yes, 2 or B for no, 3 or C for abstain. And I don't see any responses coming in, did that not go through? Well, I hate it when it doesn't work. Let's all stop clicking, and I'm going to close that out and we'll try it again. Well, that's never happened before, has it. I'm going to close the whole system and just reboot that; we'll see if that works. Okay, go ahead and click now. No?

**B. Creed:** Is it channel 45?

**P. Erickson:** Channel 45. Yes, and I checked them all this morning, so they should all be on channel 45. We could do a voice vote, or we could pass out paper and do a [written ballot], we could raise hands.

**M. Van Wienen:** I move for a voice vote.

**B. Creed:** Do we have a second for that? Second, Valentin. We'll move to a voice vote, all in favor of passing the proposal as stated in the packet, say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** All opposed? Any abstentions? All right, it has passed.

**P. Erickson:** So, that was the voice vote motion that passed, right?

**F. Bryan:** Yes.

**B. Creed:** Sorry, my fault. This is the actual vote for the proposal, not the vote on the voice vote. All in favor of passing the proposal as written, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** All opposed. Abstentions? All right, both parts are passed now.

## **IX. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

- A. Supreme Court Decision on Affirmative Action and its Impact on NIU  
Bryan Perry, Vice President and General Counsel

**B. Creed:** That will bring us to our next item, Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, item IX., the Supreme Court Decision on affirmative action and its Impact on NIU. We have with us General Counsel and Vice President Bryan Perry. So, if you would please come on up, the floor is yours.

**B. Perry:** Before I get started, I just want to say, Ben, you got a little bit of an insight into my role as parliamentarian for the board. It's not as easy as it looks sometimes, is it? And although I don't usually appear before you, please don't blame me for breaking the clicker.

I see a lot of friendly faces out there that I've gotten to know over the years; but, if I have not met you, please a couple of minutes after the meeting, let's connect so I can put a name to a face and you get to know me.

I'm before you to talk about a pretty landmark case, and that case is the Students for Fair Admissions. We're going to get into that and I'd rather have a conversation. I have slides, and it's going to be a part of your packet. But just to talk about the case a little bit and why it's such a big deal. It's a big deal, first, because it changed the face of race conscious admissions in the United States. For almost 50 years prior to this case, it was pretty well set in law that, if a university wanted to achieve diversity, it was considered a compelling interest, and as long as those means to achieve diversity were narrowly tailored to get to that objective, the court said it was constitutional. And states agreed, and that really was the law of the land.

There have been challenges over the years and on to the Supreme Court, but every time, as long as the means to achieve a diverse class was narrowly tailored to achieve that and compelling interest of diversity was considered by the Supreme Court, there hasn't been a problem, until we get to this case. Students for Fair Admissions versus Harvard and UNC.



There have been a number of cases; some of you may have even heard of them in your studies in *Bakke v California* and *Fisher v Texas* and *Grutter v Bollinger*. These are cases that all led up to *Students for Fair Admissions*. The plaintiffs in this case alleged that the admissions practices at Harvard and UNC violated the Constitution because it unfairly used race as one of the criteria. The schools in the case argued, as every other university prior to this and cases of the Supreme Court, that their use of race is very narrowly tailored to help increase diversity. And up until this point, that had carried the day.

*Students for Fair Admissions* argued no matter how narrowly tailored the means were to achieve diversity, diversity really was not a compelling interest for a university. It violated the Constitution, specifically the equal protection clause of the Constitution and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. And Title VI, in a nutshell, says that if you receive federal funding, you can't discriminate. And so that was the argument. The schools argued like every other university prior to that, compelling interest, narrow means, *Students for Fair Admissions* argued that doesn't matter, you can't ever use race in admissions.

So, the case was argued on Halloween, you can write your own joke, fill in your own commentary with that, itself. But, if you listen to the case, you knew pretty much in 30 minutes what the court was going to do and how they were going to rule. So, after months of deliberations, we finally got an opinion on June 29. I won't forget, because I was at a conference of higher ed lawyers and we broke the Internet, because we were all trying to download this 252-page opinion. And the court did what many thought they would do. They overruled years of precedence and said that race could no longer be used in admissions. The opinion is very clear; the holding was very clear. Affirmative action as we had known it, had grown up on, had worked in, was no longer the law of the land.

The specific holding of the court not only was race no longer considered for admissions purposes, the educational benefits of diversity supported by race conscious admissions is no longer considered a compelling interest. You can't measure diversity, which is kind of interesting. Just as a small footnote, the court says you can't sufficiently measure diversity, but in previous cases, if you said you would measure diversity and when it would be achieved, they considered that a quote and they would strike it down. So, there really wasn't a way to win.

And the court ruled that some groups were disadvantaged by the admission programs. They considered it a zero sum gain. And there was no logical end point of when diversity would be achieved. Again, you can't measure it, don't know when it ends, so the court said we think it's vague enough that we cannot support this any longer and they struck down race conscious admissions.

After the case came out June 29, the Department of Education said they would provide clarifying guidance later this summer on how they interpret the opinion and really why that's important to us is how the Department of Ed would enforce the opinion – how they interpreted the law, the opinion and what we would need to be concerned about as universities. At the end of August, they came out with a Dear Colleague letter, which is not really law, but it kind of is, because they tell you this is

how we see the law, and some advice on things we could do. This was important, because we're all waiting on this, because although the opinion said that race conscious admissions were unconstitutional, there are a lot of things the court didn't say in the opinion, and that created a lot of questions and a lot of vagueness.

One of the things the court said in the opinion, which I think a lot of lawyers were trying to determine: There was language by Chief Justice Roberts saying you can't use race in an objective way and provide a preference in admissions, but students were allowed to talk about race as their lived experiences in the holistic admissions process. So, on one hand you're saying you can't use race, but on the other hand, you're saying you can talk about it; and trying to figure out how broad is that. And there were other areas that remained sort of vague or unclear. And so, the hope was the Department of Ed would come in and clean that up for us.

These are the specific areas that opinion failed to address in the SFA case. Scholarship and financial aid, outreach and recruitment, pipeline and pathways programs, data collection, does it extend to employment, and race neutral strategies. Because although the court said you had to be race neutral, it didn't say what that meant. And you know what happens when you leave stuff to interpretation – everyone interprets it differently. And so, we were looking for guidance around that.

The Dear Colleague letter came out, and these are some of the highlights. There are many things the letter didn't address, but it did clarify some things that we thought, but now we have it in writing, it made our jobs a little bit easier in terms of providing advice.

Some of the outreach and pathway programs, those are still okay, as long as they are open to all. NIU had always been doing this, so for us, the reaction to the decision wasn't as dramatic as some institutions, because we've already been doing things that are in the best interest of our student population and didn't require race to be used in admissions or any of our other programs. So, we were already on the other side of this, but still, we needed to know how far the Department of Ed thought this opinion extended, so we would have a good sense of what the landscape looks like. So, again, pipeline, bridge programs, they didn't see an issue there.

Outreach by race for specific groups. There's nothing wrong with creating a diverse student body if it has the mission of the school. What the clarifying Department of Ed memo said was that, again, you can do targeted outreach, but in the admissions process, that outreach can't lead to a preference based upon race. If you target a particular zip code or high school and partner with them, that's great. But that can't then translate into the admissions process where all the Black or the Latino students get an extra preference because of race and that connection to the school.

One thing that's very important for us and the population of students we serve, data collection was also permissible. So, you're allowed to get student data. Ironically, although you can't use race in admissions, you can still put race on your application. You can still have it on the application process and on the common app. You just can't use it in the process. So, it's a very murky area that you can still have race, because the challenge is that, if you can't prove that something you didn't

do. So, if you have it, there's a good chance you may get a challenge. But if you don't have it, you don't have the data. So, it's sort of this balancing act to figure out where to ask the right questions to get the data you need. By collecting data, the Department of Ed said it's still permissible under the opinion, and I think there's language in the Supreme Court opinion that supports that, as well.

This is the one I think we're waiting on in the next set of cases: affirmative action as it relates to hiring. There's very strong language by some of the justices in the opinion that this case really should be expanded to any instance of affirmative action. So, while the court did not specifically rule beyond admissions, there's enough language that suggests we'll start seeing cases related to affirmative action programs in employment. And, in fact, we're already seeing them. I know of several lawsuits have been filed against law firms and their programs around creating a more diverse class of associates in law firms. So, you begin to see these things. And race conscious scholarships, which I'll get more in detail.

So, this opinion came out in June. Since June 29, I know of at least 12 schools that have gotten complaints filed against them because of that second piece, using race for scholarships. And that is, I think, probably the biggest grey area. Admissions, I think is pretty clear and to be honest, I think if you worked at any other institutions outside of public, for the majority of schools, admissions had already moved to test blind. A lot of schools had moved to a common application, and we all know the demographics. We are fighting for students, so race really wasn't an issue except for more elite schools and really selective admissions schools. So, we weren't impacted there so much.

But the tentacles relating to scholarships, that is where the biggest battle is going to be over the next few years. What is still unclear is what race neutral alternatives are permitted. And neither the Supreme Court, nor the Department of Ed have clearly articulated whether federal financial aid and race conscious scholarships are still permitted. The court did not address that. But the lawsuits are coming, and I think it's naive to suggest that you're not going to see groups attacking race conscious scholarships.

So, the work we're doing at NIU is first trying to get a handle on all the scholarships that we have, because there are so many in each college that I don't think there's been one catalog of all scholarships. So, we're trying to see just how many we have. Out of the scholarships, we're putting them in different buckets. There is a green bucket, which is the easiest – merit-based, need-based – there's no racial component whatsoever. There is the yellow bucket where plenty of criteria other than race, but race may be a small factor. So, we're looking into those to see what is the goal? Because there may be ways to achieve this goal without explicitly addressing race and awarding that scholarship, still retain a diverse pool of applicants and diverse awardees. And then there's a red bucket, which I don't think we have a lot of, knock on wood. Those are the ones where the only component is race. We know those are going to be targeted, and those are the ones that we have to make a decision on how we're going to handle. And the way we're approaching this work is looking at the goal and the objective, because there are so many factors, given our student population, that we can look to outside of race, I don't think there's any financial aid award that we offer where we can't find a way to do it on a race neutral basis.

So, the first activity is just to figure out what we have available and then begin to see what level of work we need to do. I met with the deans this morning, so they're already doing that work. I met with Roundtable, with my colleague Dr. Sumner. This work is ongoing since the case was decided in June, and also the NIU Foundation. I expect to be back before you again, because even since this case, there was one exception that the court made in race-based admissions, and that was for the military academies. Since the filing and the ruling in that case, the SFA group has now sued the military academies to have that exemption removed. So, there's a good chance that in probably two years, as that case makes its way through, the Supreme Court will then clarify all these vague questions that we have, and it may not be in a positive way. We're trying to be proactive now and do the work, one, because we always want to make sure we're on the right side of the law, but also we want to live our values and make sure we're doing what's best for NIU and our students. We don't want to have any instances where we are offering something where we'll need an interruption in that student's life cycle, because we now have to pull an award or restructure something that causes harm to a student. So, we're trying to be as proactive as possible, but the ground is still shifting, we're still trying to figure it out. Again, all of the people who are on the front lines of this work, we have all been talking since June, and I think we have a good handle on a plan of action. Also, I've been in conversation with the IBHE and the Governor's Office. And the State of Illinois is in the same position of leading with values. So far, we've not been tested, but the time may come. I'm not afraid of a lawsuit, but at the same time, I don't want to invite one, because it takes resources away from the work we need to be doing for our students and for our faculty.

So, that's where we are now, I just wanted to give you an introduction to it, and always happy to talk further. If you have specific questions or programmatic things that you're looking at and you have questions and wonder if this case will impact it, happy to talk with you any time. I'm available. I'll turn it back to you, if we have Q&A.

**B. Creed:** I'll open it up to see if there are any questions from the floor.

**F. Bohanon:** How does this impact scholarships that are given by private donors that are race-based.

**B. Perry:** We're not dealing with the private, anything outside of NIU.

**F. Bohanon:** Well, I'm talking about that are given through the Foundation that target specific.

**B. Perry:** Right now, we're trying to catalog those. But external funding where we did not set the criteria on, we're not doing anything with those yet, because we don't control those criteria. We're making a note of them in case something changes and that award is no longer offered. There are some that are offered by the state that still use race as a component. We're kind of the pass-through of awarding money to the student. We're noting them in case they change; but because we didn't set the criteria, we're not going to any external funding sources and saying you must change, you must do something else.

**B. McGowan:** I'm wondering about how they decide whether or not your targeted populations are being given preferential treatment. Because it seems to me, if it's outcome-based; for example, if you target a Black high school and you just happen to be accepting good candidates from a Black

high school, and there happen to be more Black students coming from that school than other schools – the outcome based is how we talk about institutional racism. And most of the time, that’s not allowed. You have to have intent. So, I guess I’m wondering what the DOE is thinking in its guidelines. Is it working on intent, or is it working on outcomes? And, boy, if it’s outcomes, that would be interesting.

**B. Perry:** It really is on how you read the language. It is very interesting that, depending on how you see the use of race, I think, holistically, depends on how you read the advice and the guidance. For some who were opposed to using race in any way at all, they look at the Department of Ed guidance as an attempt to work around and saying these are workarounds, but you’re still using race. And they really are illegal. And they are challenging some of the advice from the Department of Ed, because they think it’s just really still not grounded in colorblind admissions. For those who see it more expansive, they say this is fine. But I can tell you in more conservative states and universities, they would still use if you picked a zip code which had more disadvantaged students, high minority populations, they would say, you’re just using this as a pretext to get around race. Although it’s not been struck down and in Illinois – and again, I think the governor is leading with values, right now we’re a blue state; but there are states that will look at that and say, no, this is a pretext for race, and you’re just trying to get around what the law says. So, it really is interesting. It’s very murky. What typically happens in any type of case, the best fact scenarios, the case that gets advanced, hopefully, to get to the court, to get the ruling you want. I think you’ll see a number of challenges throughout the state, and many of them will come from states that already have banned race-based admissions, and they’ll pick examples to try to advance to close the loops that we have open from the previous opinion in SFA.

**B. Creed:** Thank you so much for coming and sharing with us.

**B. Perry:** Thank you.

B. Academic Diversity, Equity and Inclusion: It’s All in the Name  
Carol Sumner, Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer  
Jade Silva Tovar, Assistant Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion  
Joe Flynn, Executive Director Equity and Inclusion

**B. Creed:** Moving on to our next item for faculty consideration, that is the Academic Diversity, Equity and Inclusion: It’s All in the Name. We have three guest speakers with us today; so, please come on up, we’re excited to have you with us today.

**C. Sumner:** We did not purposefully plan to have these presentations back to back, but as coincidence or timing would have it, here we are. I am Dr. Carol Sumner, Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer. My two colleagues with me, one may be a new face to some/many of you here. Another is a familiar face as faculty. We’re going to split our time going through this presentation. I’m aware we have ten minutes, and we are passionate people who can speak ad nauseum, but I’m going to time myself.

Purposefully selecting this title, Academic Diversity, Equity and Inclusion: It's All in the Name, because we are really focused on the institution as an academic enterprise and how we're incorporating diversity, equity and inclusion into the practices across the institution. So, our overview today is looking at DEI in context. It is understanding how we, as an institution, are specifically situation. It's understanding DEI as a part and incorporated into the academic enterprise, advancing the work, talking about the Truth Racial Healing and Reconciliation Center, and then engaging, supporting and serving our communities.

One of the things that's really important for us as practitioners, and given what we just heard, it's no surprise that we're finding that the conversations around diversity, equity and inclusion have been in the highlighted stories and features, because there has been a premise now established that DEI is really about race. I'm going to pull this off, because I'm not one who can stand behind a podium. It's really important to understand that there are a lot of other factors that we have to consider when we're talking about diversity, equity and inclusion. And so, I'm just going to give you a few of them. First gen, rural, low SES, Pell eligible – none of those are race-based. Minoritized, again, doesn't have to be race-based. It can be sexual orientation or gender as minoritized. Underrepresented can be any number of things. Underserved, etc.

So, when we're framing diversity, equity and inclusion, my hope as I have come into this role, is that we're considering the multiple facets of who we are as people, not only about our race, because our race does not always continue to be a factor in some environments. When I'm in my Black community, my race is common, but there can be issues within my community given my gender. So, I want you to think more broadly about it.

I also want you to think about the state of Illinois. Jade and I were talking with one of our former colleagues, and she sent us the new fact sheet from our former institution about the things they can't do. So, we need to understand within the state of Illinois, it is a priority for our governor and leadership within the state that diversity is a value, that equity is a value. It is not compromised. It should not be something that is secondary. And it is a driver for every state organization and entity, including higher education, which is why we have a statewide equity plan. If you're not familiar, Northern Illinois University helped drive that being something as a priority, because we as an institution, under the previous vice president and chief diversity officer, Vernese Edghill-Walden, recognizing that and working with the president and the senior leadership at the institution, equity was a priority. So, we have as a state, an equity plan every institution must submit.

DeKalb and Chicago – we live in a rural community in the shadow of one of the largest cities in the United States. What are the binaries? And then what are the multiple facets that bring to this campus a very different and unique experience that other institutions that may be situation in a rural environment or in a near-rural environment don't have the benefit of a large sprawling urban environment.

And then lastly, looking at shared equity leadership. This is not an institutional practice that is new. It is several years in the making. So, when we talk about diversity, it's about who's represented and how we go about doing this. You all heard me – some of you heard me – a few weeks ago in another Faculty Senate meeting when I was talking about the difference between asset base and deficit base. When we talked previously about diversity, it was, "Oh, you are so fortunate to be

here. You have hair. We understand how challenging that is to have to get up and comb it every day, because you've overcome that challenge." And I'm being facetious and yet real. "Oh, you just, god, you're so lucky to be here." That's not the way we're practicing now.

The way we're looking at it is an asset. You have done something remarkable to be here, given all of the other factors that society structures, practices, policies have done or have been put in place to keep you from being here. How did you overcome those? And then how do we help the next person? That's asset-based. We're also looking at the power of the person, but the problem are the policies and the procedures, so we don't problematize the people. Servingness, Jade's going to get to. And R2 institution does not compromise care for students. And we have a lot of individuals that struggle with the institution being an R2. It is not a compromise on our care for students. It does prioritize and recognize the value of research and scholarship. And the last is the intersectional approach for engaging everyone.

I'm going to hand this over to your new colleague, Jade Silva Tovar, who's going to talk about our HSI designation.

**J. Silva Tovar:** I'm the middle baton, so I'll hurry up. As part of our HSI designation, part of the work is really understanding and adapting to who we are as an institution and this emerging institution, but as we seek out the actual designation, both as a Hispanic Serving Institution and an R2 institution. What does this mean in terms of our servingness brainwork. As we think about servingness, how are we intentionally serving not only our Hispanic Latinx students, but our minoritized, marginalized students, our first generation, Pell eligible, world communities, because those are all factors as we look at the HSI designation of the intentional things that we can do. And so working alongside our faculty. What is our academic coursework, pathways, curriculums, look like for our students, where they see themselves represented in your courses? What does that mean for our access? Our persistence? What are those barriers that we may unintentionally have at the institution that make it harder for students to persist to graduation? What are the career outcomes? How are we connecting with the community, with industry, in very intentional ways as we even think about partnering with industry? How are we then creating an environment of servingness and intentional embeddedness in that throughout the academic co-curricular experience, so that when students go into their career environments, they're also having that same experience? That's a part of this work.

It's also looking at how are we working with students to have a civic engagement, global experiences that speak to their needs but also the needs of the communities that they're going to be working in. And it's also looking at leadership development. And so, really reframing what does an intentional leadership development mean for our students that may speak multiple languages and embedding their families as part of that process. How are we not only being as servingness to our students, but their families? And families really with students with families and the families of those students. And so, how are we creating those environments here at NIU.

**C. Sumner:** We have those. I'm just going to kind of move through quickly. SEM 2.0 – if you haven't seen the emails, if you're not a part of it, please do. There are six work groups. We are working purposefully to address some of the concerns: faculty success, student success, one of the drivers. The other is the ILEA Equity Plan. That is the state plan that I was talking about. Every institution is required to do one. We will be working on ours here.

**J. Silva Tovar:** Across NIU is this Truth, Racial Healing and Transformation Center. So, those of you who may have attended the Real Talk Conference back in October, thank you. We hope to be able to do that every year. And then looking at other things throughout the year that we might be able to do in expanding that work. Are we engaging our middle school students, our high school students, especially locally, in that process?

And then, we've launched our GIVE Circles, which are opportunities to Grow in Inclusive Vulnerability and Empathy. This Friday, there is a session for faculty and staff. This is really an opportunity to learn through listening as well as empathy in varied experiences for individuals participating in those. We hope, if you haven't signed up to attend, feel free to do that. But in the spring, we'll be launching additional sessions and some more will be coming regarding the Truth, Racial Healing and Transformation Center work.

**J. Flynn:** Hi everybody. Our FACCE initiative, Faculty Academy on Cultural Competence and Equity, we've been meeting regularly, once a month. You do have to register, because there is a cap on how many people that we are allowing into the sessions. And that's just to make sure that we have high quality sessions where there is a lot of engagement, a lot of discussion and the ability to connect and collaborate with others.

We actually have our next session on December 8, and it's going to be interesting, because it's about teaching with a growth mindset and alternative or equitable assessment practices. And I think this is important, because I'm coming to find that we often think about equity-based practices through the lens of what am I teaching, what topics or concepts am I teaching. We call that content integration, and that's only really part of what these practices are about. What I and other colleagues of mine like Simón Weffer, of course, and Eric Junco, respectively, we've been talking a lot about trying to shift this conversation away from just about equity practice and think about best practice. What are the best practices, based on research that we know of in education, that is empowering and supportive and helpful of not only minority students or minoritized students, but also white students, as well? So, we think that these sessions are helpful in promoting those kinds of practices.

**C. Sumner:** And one of the things I do want to share, because we're at time, is that Dr. Flynn, as a part of the kind of overarching work that we are looking to do, not within the cultural centers, but across ADEI, as we're exploring what diversity, equity and inclusion looks like under social justice. So, I want you to imagine social justice as not just race. It can be sustainability. It can be environmental. It can be any number of other practices that have not previously been explored. We're doing the same thing with prevention education and outreach. What does prevention mean? It's not just sexual violence prevention; there are other avenues. So, as faculty, I would ask you to explore some of the maybe preconceived or established notions you have around the things that we're doing. And if you see something or want to explore a topic, please let us know. We're interested in really trying to represent the work, not just of what's happening across the nation, but



specifically, what are our needs here at NIU. And we sincerely appreciate your time. We are grateful for all the things that we have moving forward, but we look forward to doing more things in the future. Any questions?

**B. Creed:** As folks come up, I just want to make sure to say welcome to Jade. I had the opportunity to meet you today at Joe's talk over lunch today, so it was just a great opportunity to meet you, and glad to have you here on campus.

**C. Sumner:** Wow, I'm not Bryan, so I don't have questions. Well, we're here, and if you ever have any questions, have any needs, we see ourselves as senior educators, always trying to be a resource. Thank you for your time and attention.

**B. Creed:** Thank you so much.

## **X. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES**

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

**B. Creed:** moving to the reports from councils, boards and standing committees, our first report will be from the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE. I think I saw Linda. Do you have a report?

**L. Saborío:** Good afternoon. My report's not near as interesting as what we just heard. On November 17, our meeting was hosted by Northeastern Illinois University. We had a brief welcome by their provost who boasted NEIU as one of the most diverse campuses where students can graduate with the least amount of debt.

Following the provost's welcoming remarks, was a presentation by Jennifer Foster as ICCB, Illinois Community College Board. And she highlighted the ICCB's focus on college prep and transferability. As one example, Jennifer talked about the need to provide greater access to dual credit by expanding it to underserved and underrepresented students, particularly in rural and low-income areas, where students may have limited access. She also discussed competency-based instruction and a new workforce equity initiative, which includes short-term certificates and accelerated time to completion around high-demand areas – interesting talk.

Jennifer Delaney, who is our IBHE faculty rep, announced that she is stepping down, because she will be accepting a position at UC-Berkeley starting in January. Illinois or California, which one would you choose, Ben? She suggested that we continue to ask for more visibility with the IBHE, that we ask the board to respond not only to undergraduates, but also graduates in research, and that we push forward with ideas on faculty recruitment, retention and diversity.

We then had a mid-morning presentation about NEIU's [University Without Walls Stateville](#) program. After a gap of 25 years, the University Without Walls program was brought back to Stateville Correctional Center in 2017. It's a non-traditional degree program in partnership with Chicago's Prison + Neighborhood Arts/Education Project. And the program graduated seven students in their first cohort; and in 2020, they welcomed five inmates into their second cohort. So, congratulations to them.

My college affordability and student debt working group – that afternoon we drafted a summary of our work over the past few semesters. The summary includes information on the Nevada Promise Scholarship and the Tennessee Promise Scholarship, as well as statistics on middle class student debt. If you would like to see the full summary, please let me know.

And that concludes my report. Any questions? I don't usually get questions, it's all right.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Linda.

- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report  
Felicia Bohanon, Natasha Johnson, Ben Creed  
Larissa Garcia (Katy Jaekel fall 2023 alternate), Karen Whedbee, Brad Cripe

**B. Creed:** Next up is the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees report. The Board of Trustees met on November 9 to engage with a variety of topics through their three main committees. I want to highlight a few items from the meeting, but once again, I encourage you to review the BOT reports ahead of those Board of Trustee meeting dates. There is often a lot of great information that's shared of which I can only share a little bit today.

First of all, there's a new trustee, Leland Strom, who has joined the Board of Trustees. He was welcomed. The Finance, Audit, Compliance, Facilities and Operations Committee heard a series of reports related to NIU's finances. They also heard recommendations and approved the state budget request, the IBHE capital budget request and a number of upgrade, repairs or replacement requests from across campus, as well as a few other expenditures.

The Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee received updates on academic program reviews. And they also heard a presentation from Drs. Melissa Lenczewski and Christine Mooney about their transdisciplinary and multi-institutional work to develop BASICS, which stands for Business and Sciences Integrated Curriculum for Sustainability. [This PowerPoint is available online on the Board of Trustees website](#). I personally found it extremely compelling and really interesting work, if you'd like to take a look at their presentation. It shared the process for how they developed transdisciplinary curriculum, the time intensiveness, the resource intensiveness of it. And then they highlighted the effect of this curriculum on student learning and then what they learned, as faculty members, from multiple institutions about faculty motivation to do transdisciplinary work, as well as the barriers facing engaging in transdisciplinary work. The Board of Trustees was extremely engaged with the presentation and stated the desire to support and elevate this type of work. It's great to hear the Board of Trustees being so engaged in that type of innovative development of transdisciplinary curriculum, and they expressed their willingness to support and elevate that type of work.

The Research, Innovation, Legal and Legislative Affairs Committee received reports from VP for RIPS Yvonne Harris and AVP Dara Little. In those reports, there is recognition of Dara Little for her work at the university and across her professional communities; also highlighting a couple of faculty members, including Dr. Skuzinski's work with the Illinois Innovation Network and Dr. Tao Lee's work in new membership at Argonne National Research Center.

Senior leadership also presented on some of the themes that NIU took to IBHE's conversation during the annual big picture meeting where NIU and the IBHE were able to engage in a conversation focused on showing how NIU's efforts are aligned with the growth strategies that the IBHE has for the state. And they also shared legislative priorities, and I wanted to just flag that one of the legislative priorities echoes what was shared at our last Faculty Senate meeting by Brendon Swedlow about regulatory reform. And so that was nice to hear that sort of through point connection that there's a lot of different aspects of legislation that are being advocated for reform by our institution, including flexibility for some of the scholarship dollars that our students receive through MAP and AIM HIGH.

Once again, I encourage folks to read the minutes or attend parts of those meetings. They truly are informative of what's going on at our university and across the state. And that concludes that report.

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

**B. Creed:** Next up, we do not have a report from the Baccalaureate Council.

- D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – report

**B. Creed:** Which brings us to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, which is me again, sorry. The Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee met on November 6. They were charged with reviewing NIU's current policies and comparing those with best practices. And also reviewing current trainings related to two topics. The first was sexual misconduct, and the second was academic freedom. This group will be providing recommendations to me about what priorities we should have, what sort of policies may be needed or refined within the university, and to help inform conversations that I'm engaged with across campus. And those will be made to me in the spring semester and then shared with this body at the same time. And that concludes the report from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

- E. Social Justice Committee – no report

**B. Creed:** We have no reports from Social Justice Committee,

- F. FS-UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – no report  
Emily McKee, FS/RGE Liaison/Spokesperson

**B. Creed:** Or the FS-UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee.

- G. Student Government Association – report  
Olivia Newman, SGA President  
Cole Hensley, Speaker of the Senate

**B. Creed:** For the Student Government Association, we have a report and I'd like to welcome Christopher English to the microphone.

**C. English:** Hello. I just wanted to tell you all what's happening with SGA, the Student Government Association. We're hosting the State of the Student Government Association for the fall semester December 5 at 3:30 in the Carl Sandburg Auditorium in the Holmes Student Center. So, that gives a much more in depth update of what we've been doing over the semester and the progress we've made.

To that point, we've approved and recognized over 30 new student organizations who have come to us seeking that recognition. So, there are now more than 30 student organizations who have been recognized on campus.

We are currently in the process of voting on adding code training as a requirement for student organization leadership, having at least two members go to code training.

We are also working on making sure our HR policy is being properly implemented so it can properly benefit the most students.

And finally, during the week of finals, we will be handing out goodie bags to destress and kind of help with all of that finals stuff, as well as try to get feedback from students during that week.

**B. Creed:** Thank you so much, Christopher, and we appreciate you being here to share that, and I look forward to continued conversations with SGA.

- H. Operating Staff Council – no report  
Natasha Johnson, President

**B. Creed:** Up next is Operating Staff Council. There is no report.

- I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – report  
Felicia Bohanon, President

**B. Creed:** Supportive Professional Staff Council, Felicia.

**F. Bohanon:** We're really focused on increasing engagement with SPS staff, and so we have a number of upcoming activities. On the fourth at 3 p.m., we have a trivia event at Fatty's, and we're inviting faculty, as well as everyone else on campus. So, it's an SPS activity and that starts at 3 o'clock. Cathy Doederlein is our game host, so we'd like to encourage you to come out and participate.

We also are looking at having a professional development session on December 14, and the focus of that is on SPS sabbaticals, and we're sending out information to all SPS staff concerning that. It will take place at 11:30.

We also have begun to accept applications for the SPS scholarship and, as previously mentioned, that is for either a child or grandchild of an SPS employee, but also someone who is mentored by an SPS employee.

And then lastly, we have begun to accept applications for our SPS Professional Staff Award. The deadline for that is February 16. At this point, the committee is accepting names, so you do not have an extensive process in terms of applying or nominating someone. If you send us their name, along with one or two sentences, that's all we're asking for at this time. And that information is on the SPS website. Thank you.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Felicia.

J. University Benefits Committee – report  
Cynthia Campbell, FS Liaison

**B. Creed:** Our next report is the University Benefits Committee, Cynthia Campbell.

**C. Campbell:** Thank you. The University Benefits Committee met on November 2. I'm brand new to the committee, it was my first meeting. I found it very interesting, and I learned a lot. So, I'm just going to announce some of the things that we talked about during that meeting. If you have any questions, I might not know the details, because I'm brand new, but here goes.

One of the benefits was for staff. There is an add-pay for degree completion. There's also been a change of the direct deposit. Now it's okay if you want your direct deposit to go to more than one account. Now how you set that up, I don't know, but that's a change, and it was found to be beneficial to some. There's open enrollment – you probably received information about this – with Prudential as a supplement on top of the SURS benefit. You have to have two years of service to be able to be eligible for that and see the HR website for details. In January of 2024, the 403(b) changes. It's going up \$500 per contribution. That announcement is going out at the end of the year.

The Paid Leave for All Act is going into effect January of 2024. This provides all Illinois employees with 40 hours of paid time in a 12-month period. This is in addition to sick and vacation time and can be used for any reason; however, it cannot be cashed out and it cannot be carried forward. So, after the 12-month time, that 40 hours, if not used, goes away. But it will come back for the next round.

Also the parental care time or the leave for a child is approximately five weeks, 187.5 hours. This is something I didn't know that's coming up. The sick bank benefit choice registration opens up in October for temporary instructors and May for everyone else. You have to contribute to be a bank member, and members can access the bank up to 45 days. So, my understanding is that, if some catastrophe happens and you don't have enough sick time, if you're a member of the sick bank, you can withdraw sick time from those that others have contributed.

Going forward, we're going to continue to discuss how to balance the juxtaposition between benefits and the university deficit. We're going to continue to examine benefits of each group. And we're getting ready to benchmark the bereavement benefits compared to other universities in the MAC Conference.

Thank you.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Cynthia. Looks like we have a comment.

**J. Boswell:** Just real quick. I'm the chair of the University Benefits Committee, and I just wanted to clarify the staff pay for degree completion. That was just brought up to John Acardo about the status of it. It was something that was brought up in the past. So, there's nothing yet.

**B. Creed:** Thank you for that clarification, I'm sure John will appreciate that.

**C. Campbell:** And like I said, I might not know the whole story, because it was my first meeting, so thank you, John.

**B. Creed:** All right, thank you. And that concludes the reports for today.

## **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. [Fall 2023 Commencement](#)  
Graduate Commencement – Saturday, Dec. 16, 2023  
Undergraduate Commencement – Sunday, Dec. 17, 2023

**B. Creed:** Which brings us to item XI, which is Information Items. A through O are various minutes and the Policy Library. So, if you're looking for the Baccalaureate Council minutes related to the gen ed decision on pathways, there's a quick link for it. You'll see item P is our upcoming schedule. Our next meeting won't be until the next calendar year, January 24. So, if I don't see you between now and then, I wish you great holidays and great break.

Item Q is the fall commencement. Just a reminder of the two dates, Saturday and Sunday, Dec. 16 and 17. There was a recent request for volunteers for commencement. If you're not already planning to go or serve in some way, please do consider volunteering or also just lending your body in support to those who have completed their time with us at NIU and their degree and honor that moment for them.

And before we move to adjournment, is there another comment?

**B. Swedlow:** Thank you, Brendon Swedlow, Political Science. I just wanted to follow up on your comments at the beginning about the budget and transparency and the previous budget presentation. We had a discussion in our department and I came back with a question to if we could get information on the – I think it was 54 percent of the current budget goes to personnel. And if we could get that broken down by types of personnel and just see where that's going, not only this year, but also the trend in that over some period of time so we can see meaningfully what the trends have been and where that 54 percent – more than half of our budget is going to personnel – what the trends in that are, that would be great. It is something my department was interested in and also other people I've talked to. And I can make that a little more pointed in that people I've talked to, there's an impression that administrative salaries are a larger part of the budget over time, that there's a growth happening there within an overall shrinking budget. And we'd just like to see if that's the case or not and have a discussion about that, if possible.

**B. Creed:** Thank you for that. That's something I can talk with George and others about. We're planning to have him come back in the spring; maybe that something he can share in that setting or through a conversation that we can facilitate to pull that information together and see what sort of data we can have to share. Thank you for the comment.

**B. Swedlow:** Thank you.

## **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

**B. Creed:** That brings us to item XII, which is Adjournment. Do I have a motion to adjourn? David. Second? Second. All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** All right, thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.