TRANSCRIPT – FACULTY SENATE

**Wednesday, February 19, 2025, 3 p.m.**

**Altgeld Hall Auditorium**

**Northern Illinois University**

**DeKalb, Illinois**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Alex, Arado, Atkins, Barrett, Bender, Bohanon, Books, Boswell, Brain, Burton, Cain, Campbell, Creed, Duffin, Finch, Fotovat, N. Gonzalez (for Corpuz), Isawi (for Nyunt), Ito, Jong, Korampally (for Demir), Kushimo, Liberty, Libman, McGowan, McKee, Mellon, Mills, Naples, Novak, Palese, Qin, Ross, Sabio, Salimi, Schmidt, Sharp, Sibley, Sirotkin, Slagstad, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stalcup, Thomas, Vahabzadeh, Valentiner, Van Wienen, VanTilburg, Wang, Whedbee, Wilson (for Luo), Woods, Yang

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Akst, Chomentowski, Corpuz, Demir, Hartenhoff, Lampi, Luo, Nyunt, Rajabi, Wheeler

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Boston, Bryan, Elish-Piper, B. Gonzalez, Nolan, Sumner

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Cripe, Garcia, Notebaert, Skuzinski, Strid

**I. Call to Order**

**B. Creed:** Welcome everybody. I’d like to call to order today’s Faculty Senate meeting on Wednesday, Feb. 19. I have 3 p.m.

**II. Verification of Quorum**

**B. Creed:** Pat, can you verify that there’s a quorum?

**P. Erickson:** We do have a quorum.

**III. Adoption of the Agenda**

**B. Creed:** That brings us to adopting today’s agenda. Could I have a motion to adopt the agenda for today’s meeting? Thank you, Felicia. A second? Thank you, Beth. All in favor of adopting the agenda for today’s meeting, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** Opposed? All right, our agenda is adopted.

**IV. Approval of the January 22, 2025, minutes**

**B. Creed:** Next up is the approval of the January 22, 2025, minutes. Those are o n pages 5 through 7. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you. A second? Thank you, Scott. Any discussion, updates or edits? Hearing none, all in favor of approving the January 22, 2025, minutes, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** Opposed? Abstentions? All right, thank you. We’ve got George and then Mark with abstentions. Thank you, so the minutes are approved.

**V. Public Comment**

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

**P. Erickson:** No public comment today?

**VI. Faculty Senate President’s Announcements**

**B. Creed:** While we have a lot of stuff under new business, there are no votes that come with that, so you don’t need a clicker today. The only vote that we have will be a voice vote.

I have two general buckets of announcements. One is somewhat general. The other one is a little bit more specific. First is about ongoing work related to improving a key aspect of NIU and its governance, and that’s the policies and procedures. The second is related to the federal context and agency policy shifts and the survey that I sent out.

Starting with the policies and procedures update, I wanted to just let folks know that I had asked Rules, Governance and Elections Committee to review the Faculty Senate Bylaws to go through to see where procedures would be implicated by our bylaws to help build a rubric or an accounting of what procedures ought to exist. What I will be doing is going through to try to collect the procedures that currently are in existence related to the Faculty Senate policies or bylaws. Once those are collected, I’ll be making those available on the Faculty Senate website, trying to pull out the procedures so that folks know where to go so there’s some continuity between years, between committee composition and things like that. And then identifying where we need procedures to be developed and working with the appropriate committees or bodies or people to develop those procedures so that we have some consistency, some transparency and a place to go to find those procedures, so we’re not reinventing things every year or every time a topic comes up.

Related to that, I’ve been working with our policy librarian, Sarah Garner, to do something similar with the Policy Library, and that will be starting to develop a university procedures space. We’re trying to figure out exactly what that will look like – say, here’s our university policies that are in the NIU Policy Library, and here are the procedures that go along with operationalizing those policies. And so, that will effort that’s rolling out, as well; again, to hopefully elevate the policies, make more accessible the procedures and, ultimately, how those policies are implemented, or the next step of operationalization.

If anybody is interested in that work from a just-have-nothing-to-do-with-your-time-and-want-to-jump-in, please let me know. Or if somebody’s interested in being part of that process because it’s something of interest, do let me know. In thinking through what those repositories for procedures should look like or could look like, or developing and identifying where those procedures currently exist.

The second topic is about the impacts of the federal context and agency policy shifts, and those impacts here on campus. As folks likely know, the recent executive orders and these shifts have led to a lot of uncertainty in various aspects related to campus. Some of it is funding, both of current work and future work. It has impacts, potentially, on research, scholarship and creative activity, on programming and, generally, on our students, faculty and staff success, wellbeing and quality of time here and supports received here at NIU.

I just want to do some level setting before we go into other stuff, but first I just want folks to know, as I shared in the email and in the survey, I have been in consistent contact in this role as Faculty Senate president/University Council chair, with senior administration and others on campus so that I understand what’s going on and so I can better share that information with faculty senators, with campus, that I can ensure that faculty voice and Faculty Senate voice is represented or heard in those conversations, and to fulfill this role as Faculty Senate president.

As part of that work, currently what I’ve been doing is advocating from my perspective and from the perspective of those who come to me and have shared their opinions, their perspectives, the harms, the worries, the types of information, the way that folks want to be communicated. So, what I have tried to do is be a little more systematic than just those who happen to know me or feel comfortable reaching out to me or feel so impassioned to do so, and be a little bit more broad-based. And that’s what that survey is about, is so that I can serve in this role and I can help campus move together collaboratively, collegially and in a way that retains the commitments that we share as a university.

As of right now, as of about 2:46, those who saw me running up the stairs, I was trying to pull in the most recent response to see if it updates anything that I was going to say. We had 15 folks who had reached out and filled out that survey. I want to share the broad themes that I’m hearing from that survey, as well as from the other conversations. But before I do that, I want to take a step back and set the stage a little bit too; and just make an observation and an ask of everybody here.

First, I want to say that NIU is not alone. Fortunately, and unfortunately, we are not the only institution affected by this. Unfortunately, it means it’s broad spanning impacts and uncertainties that are going on. Fortunately, we are not the only ones trying to figure out how to respond or what needs to be done, and we can leverage broad-scale networks to learn, to coordinate, to figure out what it means for us and for our students and for our staff and for our faculty. This, obviously, extends beyond just institutions of higher education, as well.

Second, I do hope, as a campus, we work collaboratively and collegially to solve or to ensure we navigate the uncertain times we are in, in a way that affirms the type of institution that we believe we are, and what we aspire to be. And one of the key aspects to doing that is through a commitment to shared governance. As I shared last year, for those who were with us last academic year when I started and this year, as well, I really truly do believe shared governance is a cornerstone of a healthy institution. And part of that shared governance is Faculty Senate here on our campus, for us to serve and fulfill our duties as faculty, as staff or student reps on this body. And for us to be able to do that, we need to be able to work collaboratively to learn from one another and be able to find clarity and common ground and common understanding.

And in that vein, I am asking that, if you haven’t yet filled out that survey, or if you prefer not to do it via survey, if you want to reach out to me individually, send an email, whatever, please, I ask of you to share your perspective, but also that of your constituency. I can do this job, and I can do it from – I don’t want to just be myself advocating. I want to make sure that I’m connecting with campus, with the worry points, with the hope-fors, with the opportunities, to advocate for campus. And so, that’s what I’m hoping you can do, is help me learn from your perspective, as well as your constituencies.

Similarly, I hope that you share the summaries back out with your constituent groups. I hope that you are sharing and are a conduit of information, not just to me, but out to your groups, as well. And if there are ways that I can do that better, that I can better advocate for faculty, I can learn more, if I can come and speak to a group or learn from a group or engage in conversation with any group on campus or any individual on campus, I am always happy to do that in this role or just as an individual human. Please do let me know if there are different ways that I can be supportive and learn, and also share information that I have out with campus. Part of what I do with my Faculty Senate summaries is to give you an easy way to go back to your department or your academic unit or your constituency, and share that information, because I think, particularly in these times where there is uncertainty, information, collective understanding, common understanding, is essential to [inaudible] that uncertainty, to putting that uncertainty into its right size of worry.

So, with all that being said, just please share information out to the people you represent, that you were elected to represent. And also, share information back with Faculty Senate, with the committees, with me, with any space that you can. Help make conversations occur and sharing information flow more smoothly on campus. That’s part of our role and our duty as faculty senators and helping campus function in a more healthy and collaborative way.

So, that’s my soap box piece. I’m going to move on to the themes that I’m learning from campus. What I see is really three general themes. There are a lot of specifics, but this is how I’m hearing them right now. And this is your opportunity to tell me I got it wrong, or to add to them. But the first is a concern about academic freedom. I think that is a – the reason why it’s a core concern is because it’s core to the institution, it’s core to higher ed, it’s core to function of higher ed more broadly.

The second theme is a concern about, a desire for, recommitment to our mission, vision and values, that we will remain consistent and connected to that work, that we won’t shy away from our commitments to our students, to our faculty, to our staff and to our mission, vision and values.

And finally, there’s an ask for clear communication and strong guidance and leadership from campus as folks who are charged with leading us through good times, difficult times and all the times in between.

So, I’m just going to take them one by one real quick from my perspective. Related to academic freedom, I think this is something that I know there’s a commitment to on campus, and I hope you trust me on that. But if not, let me try to verify it a little bit. This is something about a year and a half ago, was a recognition that this is something that we’re committed to on campus. But we maybe could strengthen the process using the policies around academic freedom. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities [Committee] has been working on this for about a year and a half, to try and improve our policies, our bylaws, our procedures to support, to codify, to reify our commitment that is in the atmosphere for academic freedom, to make it stronger by providing more structure and up to date language. This is something faculty led, but it’s not just faculty doing that work. Senior administration has been a willing partner in that. They have sent their own folks to conferences to learn more about it, what their role is in supporting academic freedom related to statements, related to supports of it. And there’s a universal commitment: Just this morning, I had a planning meeting with President Freeman, and, in that meeting and follow-up, she shared an explicit and direct commitment and support of academic freedom and continued support to that. Speaking with Provost Elish-Piper today, as well, there is nothing but genuine commitment to that. There is a commitment on campus to protecting academic freedom. And part of our job, if we are being told that then, is to question it if we think that it’s not being met in action. I don’t think there’s that need to question or challenge, because I haven’t seen it, but I don’t know all things. But I do believe in the commitment to academic freedom.

The second is a commitment to maintain the mission, vision and values. Again, this is something in conversation, both in public forums like University Council, in Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee and in other one-on-one conversations and in public emails that go out to campus and other places there is a continued commitment to the mission, vision and values of our institution that fundamentally nothing changes in that commitment. Again, that’s what is being said; and where or if there are any places where we feel that’s not being followed through, that’s our job as faculty senators, as members of this community, to communicate, to question, to ask, to find out more information, to understand if what we think is a de-commitment to something is truly a de-commitment or if there is a reason or rationale to it. And part of that is working with our departments, working with our colleges, working with those who are making decisions to learn, to educate ourselves and to educate others about what’s happening and the connection points. But again, I believe, this is something I have elevated since the start, that we need to retain these commitments. And it’s been met with nothing besides absolutely, we are affirmed to that.

The third is guidance and leadership from university administration. And I think that a lot of the concerns that I’ve heard often are allayed when I’m able to communicate or share the efforts and activities and engagement that campus leadership has been having. Whether it’s working with other institutions in the state, working with folks downstate in the Governor’s Office, working with organizations that span state boundaries, things like that, it’s been clear to me that that work is going on and people are advocating or are engaged in staying aware of what’s happening. Where I am pushing and asking for more is for ways to show that out to campus. I know in the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee we had conversations about that. We’ve had at University Council, Provost Elish-Piper shared some at the last University Council meeting. But that work is going on, and I think it will help with our worry points knowing more about some of those broad stroke commitments. And I think next week, having the State of the University address, hopefully, in that forum, we’ll have an opportunity to have that commitment even more elevated and concise and coherent than I am right now.

Generally, across all three concerns, I think they are genuine worries and I think they are some of the right worries to have and they’re not worries that are alone, held on our campus and nobody else is feeling these same worry points. I think across the higher ed, folks are concerned about its impact on academic freedom. Across higher ed, it’s: Are we still going to stay committed to mission, vision and values as institutionally defined? Are we being engaged, are we being connected, are we over-reacting, under-reacting, sticking our head in the sand, or doing things that don’t need to be done. I think we’re not alone in that, but what we can do in our shared governance roles as faculty senators is to make sure that we learn what’s happening on campus by asking questions, by learning and then sharing out with our groups and being advocates for campus. And that doesn’t mean just holding the water for me or for somebody else. But it also doesn’t mean just using your own opinion, your own perspective, in these roles. It’s learning, connecting your thoughts, questioning and then sharing out what you know and seeing how we can move together as we are committed to a healthy institution.

So, I didn’t get off my soap box when I said I did. Now I will. I’ll stop myself. Those are my announcements, so do please, if you haven’t had a chance to submit the survey, please do so on behalf of your constituent group; or reach out to me. I do want to learn and be able to advocate. That ends my announcements.

**VII. Provost’s Announcements**

**B. Creed:** That brings us to provost’s announcements, and I’ll welcome up Provost Elish-Piper.

**L. Elish-Piper:** I’m going to reiterate a lot of the things that Ben said, because I think they’re important to say, and I think it’s also important to know that, in my role, as Ben said, we’re having a lot of conversations, and there’s a lot going on. Over 50 executive orders signed by President Trump since the inauguration on January 20, memos, Dear Colleague letters, social media posts, a lot of things out there right now that directly affect higher education. Things like immigration; things like federal funding for research grants, as well as student support programs; things like the indirect cost recovery rate for NIH grants; things like eliminating federal programs that focus on diversity, equity and inclusion, among others. These executive orders are primarily tied up in temporary restraining orders, injunctions or legal cases right now. And so, I think that’s important to understand that we are truly in a state of waiting to see what happens as they work through the system. And I know that that can be frustrating, but we want to make sure that we’re not over-privileging something like a Dear Colleague Letter or a memo, that doesn’t have legal standing.

There’s a lot of change being thrust upon us, and I know that it can feel overwhelming, and it might even feel like a sense of panic. But we need to make sure that we remain calm, and that NIU leadership is doing everything that we can to remain that sense of calm, to find out what’s going on, to network with others, including our elected officials in Springfield and in Washington, D.C., to leverage our directors of state and federal relations, to lean heavily on our Office of General Counsel here to understand the legality of things. Also, connecting with professional associations like the American Council on Education that just had another webinar yesterday talking about the Dear Colleague Letter and really learning from experts who are focused, as they’re federal relations people, on what they’re hearing and seeing and what it means. In addition to that, connecting with [APLU](https://www.aplu.org/), the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, as well as with other institutions in the state of Illinois, to talk about what’s happening on our campuses.

The most important thing that I want to carry as a message to all of you is, as Ben said, we do remain committed to our vision, mission and values. We do remain committed to academic freedom. And in this time, while it feels like there’s a lot of pressure coming from outside upon us, the most important things that all of us can do is to continue the work – the work we do is important, it matters – and to truly live into our vision, mission and values. That’s what we need to do – to teach and support and mentor our students; to provide those high-quality academic programs and co-curricular experiences for our students; to stay committed to doing our research, our scholarship, our artistry, as usual; to making sure that we are supporting one another and staying focus on that vision, mission and values, because that vision, mission and values isn’t something that belongs to administration, it belongs to all of us. And so, the work that you do every day is the work that we hope you will continue to do during these challenging times, because it does matter.

As we get more information, we will share it, but right now a lot of the information is that no one knows exactly how things will play out, because of all of these legal matters that are working their way through the system. And I know that’s frustrating, but we need to try and remain patient until we get guidance, and we understand what is expected and what will be happening.

President Freeman will be addressing this and more at the State of the University address, as Ben mentioned. It’s going to be on Tuesday in here at 3 o’clock. And she’s also going to talk about highlights from the past year and also updates on university finances. And so, there’s an opportunity to attend in person or to attend virtually, and I encourage you to do that, as well as to encourage your colleagues to attend.

I do have a few announcements. One of them is good news, which, that’s nice, right? The [state of Illinois and the Illinois Student Assistance Commission have partnered with Kaplan](https://go.kaplan.com/illinois) to provide students with free access to test prep materials for graduate admissions exams, licensure exams, credentialing exams and professional development courses, including things like the LSAT, the GRE, the GMAT, the MCAT and many more. A communication went out to students yesterday, and I believe it also went out to faculty. There will be multiple communications, including a story in the Northern Star. This is a wonderful resource for our students to have access to those materials and exams to prepare them either for graduate school or to prepare them to go into their chosen professions. This is paid for by the state of Illinois, so it’s at no cost to NIU. And within 24 hours of announcing this, we had 119 students already signed up for something. So, I thought that was really encouraging. Clearly, students see the value of this. If you didn’t have a chance to see that email, look in your in-box, and you’ll want to make sure that you mention that to your students who might find this valuable and applicable.

I’m also bringing a message that the [Baccalaureate Council](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/bc.shtml) and the [Graduate Council](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/gc.shtml) will be seeking new members for next academic year. The Baccalaureate Council establishes general policies for undergraduate programs and reviews and approves curricular proposals from the faculty. The Baccalaureate Council will continue to meet virtually during the next academic year, because I know that might be a consideration for some folks. If you’re interested in serving, look for emails. Those will be coming out from your college offices soon. And if you’re not interested or available to serve, think about encouraging colleagues in your areas to raise their hands and become members of that group.

Next Faculty Senate, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Alicia Schatteman will come and share a few things with you all. She’s going to be giving updates on career services and some new initiatives that are being implemented there to support our students and their career success. And then also some updates related to the [Student Athlete Academic Support Services](https://niuhuskies.com/sports/2024/7/17/saass-about.aspx), commonly known as SAASS. She’ll also be bringing the new bookstore manager to talk about some of the new initiatives that will be offered through the bookstore.

And then, last but not least, the Student Engagement Fund, which is administered through the Office of Student Engagement and Experiential Learning, usually referred to as OSEEL, is accepting applications through February 28 to support undergraduate student researchers, including things like project supplies and travel to do that research, for the upcoming academic year. The maximum of those awards is $3800 per year, so it’s really a great way to support undergraduate student research. If you’re interested, go to the [OSEEL website](https://www.niu.edu/engaged-learning/). There’s [a link](https://www.niu.edu/engaged-learning/funding/undergrad-research-funding.shtml) and an application that you can fill out online.

That concludes my announcements for this afternoon.

**B. Creed**: Thank you.

**VIII. Items for Faculty Senate Consideration**

A. Instructional Faculty: Teaching Professor/Professor of Practice

 Bárbara González, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

**B. Creed:** Next we have a presentation from Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Bárbara González on instructional faculty.

**B. González:** Hello, good afternoon, happy to be here. I have some important information and an ask of the Faculty Senate. As you very well know, instructional faculty at the university consists mostly of instructors. Instructors are temporary in nature. They have to get contracts every single year renewed, and we believe that this is not the best way to do instructional faculty.

So, we are thinking about what would be teaching professors or professors of practice. They will be non-tenure track faculty, so the same as our instructors, but they would have potentially longer contracts and be part of the university community in the sense that they would have some service component on top of their teaching component.

So, there are two things to this. The first thing is that the terms and conditions of their employment will have to be negotiated with the UPI union, which is the union that covers instructional faculty right now. And so, I cannot tell you the details of what that would look like, because it does have to be negotiated. So, I can’t tell you how long the appointments would be or how much service would these faculty do. All those things are unknown at this point, because they would have to be negotiated.

However, there’s a big role that shared governance will have to play in this; and what I’m here to ask you to start working on, which is the promotional criteria and the evaluation of these new type of faculty members. These instructional faculty the teaching professors – and I’m going to call them teaching professors, but professor of practice will also be a name that we could use. It depends on the discipline, one is the common one and not the other, they are the same. There will be an assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor and teaching professor. So, then you need promotional criteria. This is similar to the work that you did for clinical faculty, that you just finished a little bit ago.

**B. Creed:** About a year ago is when it was formalized.

**B. González:** Right. Similar to that work where the Faculty Senate came up with all those different things for clinical faculty, we would need the same thing for the teaching faculty. And then the evaluation also. How are these faculty going to be evaluated in their departments. I cannot tell you how it will happen; you have to tell me. Those two things are things we will need you to work on, because that’s part of what shared governance is meant to do.

I will take any questions and I will answer them as I can.

**G. Slotsve:** Hi, George Slotsve, Department of Economics. You said these positions are non-tenured?

**B. González:** Non-tenured, right.

**G. Slotsve:** Essentially, if I read between the lines, you’re going to replace tenured faculty with non-tenured faculty.

**B. González:** Absolutely not.

**G. Slotsve:** This is what it sounds like to me, is that you’re now looking at a replacement and removing tenured faculty lines. And you’ll be more flexible by not having tenured individuals teaching so you can move them around the university. Whether you say it’s true or not, this is what I see down the road. Thank you.

**B. González:** Thank you. I want to assure you that that’s absolutely the opposite of the intent. The intent is to replace temporary instructors with teaching faculty. We want to give temporary instructors permanency in the university. It’s exactly the opposite of that. We will replace no tenure lines with teaching lines, because these faculty will not do research. If we want to keep being a research university, we cannot replace tenure-track lines with teaching lines. I mean that would not work in any case. Many departments, you will see, there are a lot of instructors who have been here for 20 years or more. Why are we not giving these instructors better conditions of employment. This is the idea of this, and it has nothing to do with replacing tenure lines.

**P. Cain:** Paul Cain, College of Law. This would apply, for example, to our legal writing instructors at the College of Law. Some of them have been here many years but have very little in terms of governance rights, security of position, those sort of things, that the clinical faculty got years ago when we transitioned from supportive professional staff to clinical faculty.

**B. González:** Correct. Absolutely. I think you are absolutely right. That’s exactly what we’re thinking about.

**T. Arado:** Hi, Therese Arado, College of Law. You had commented that we have instructors, and Paul did also, who have been here for quite some time. And this may be – ours aren’t part of the union – but this may be something that involves the union. Are there assurances that somebody who has been here for a significant amount of time won’t have to reapply for a position they’ve been doing for 20 years. I understand the promotion part is a different factor, but just the position, itself.

**B. González:** The position, itself, people will have to apply for those.

**T. Arado:** An internal application or a competitive? If you’ve been doing the job for 20 years

**B. González:** I can’t answer that exactly, because that has to be negotiated with the union, but yeah, the idea is that these positions will be opened and people will have to apply for them just the same as a clinical position.

**T. Arado:** I understand that. I’m just – I’m not sure how to say this the right way – Then somebody who has done the job for 20 years potentially could not be put back into the job?

**B. González:** Well, they will remain instructors. We will not

**T. Arado:** Does my question make sense? If anyone can help me clarify it, I’m always open for that.

**B. González:** No, I think that, so, again, I think part of the problem is I cannot answer your real question, because that’s something we have to negotiate. So, it’s, yeah, I think it’s not yet decided.

**L. Elish-Piper:** I’m going to ask a question that I think follows up on Therese’s question. I don’t know if this will make it clearer or not. It’s my understanding that the intention is that some instructors would be transitioned into teaching professor roles in areas where we know we have consistent, long-term needs for instruction. They would bring professional expertise. They would bring particular – maybe they have additional credentials that align with the professional area. But that all instructors would not be expected to become professors of practice, that it would be a subset. It would be an opportunity for some of those folks to come into the longer-term positions. It’s not an all or nothing.

**B. González:** That’s absolutely right. It will not be like, oh you’ve been an instructor this many years, you automatically become a teaching professor. That’s not how this will work. If somebody wants to be an instructor, a temporary instructor, for many reasons. I mean, I know people who want to be temporary instructors, because they don’t want the long-term commitment or whatever it is. But, yes, we certainly expect a fair number of current instructors to become teaching professors. But it would not be an automatic process. That’s maybe how I want to put it. Thank you, Laurie.

**L. Woods:** Good afternoon. My name is Lisa Woods. I am an instructor in the College of Law. And I just wanted to share my perspective as someone who would directly benefit from a category of faculty like this. I currently teach legal writing and analysis and academic success classes in our program at the law school, which are required classes. But I don’t just teach my classes and leave. I serve on four faculty committees right now. I serve on a hiring committee. I mentor students as a faculty mentor. The list goes on. And I tell you that just to show that we have faculty already here on the campus, who are doing the types of things that are contemplated by this new faculty category, and also to show that, for me, this isn’t just a job that is temporary and transient, but it is something that I would like to be my long-term career. And I know that there are other instructors who feel the same way. And to have the opportunity to have a rank and promotion track and increased security of position is something that would, I think, retain faculty like me and attract additional faculty, who would want to commit to the university in this way. So, I understand that there are a lot of complexities to the creation of a faculty category like this, but I would ask you to go beyond thinking about it, perhaps, in the abstract, and just remember that you have faculty here on the campus who are showing this commitment and doing this commitment right now who would greatly benefit from this change. Thank you.

**B. González:** Thank you. Any other questions. As always, if you come up with questions afterward, I’ll be happy to respond to them, so just send me an email. I’ll be more than happy to tell you what I can. The UPI union has told us informally that we should expect their demand to bargain any time very soon, and so we expect to start bargaining for this very soon. So, it will be very important for Faculty Senate to take on the other pieces of this as soon as possible. Thank you.

**B. Creed:** On that end, I hear and accept the ask of us, because if this is a category of faculty on campus that will be eligible for promotion, I think that they should have similar rights, processes and protections that other faculty have. And that’s our clinical, our research, our tenure-track faculty that come through similar shared governance processes in retaining that promotion process within the faculty the way all other faculty promotion processes are. And so, I will either be working directly with the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee to give the charge to that group or establish a working group like was established for our clinical and research faculty. That working group was about two years ago at this point that came to fruition and now is the bylaws of the land governing the process for promotion and evaluation for those faculty titles. That will be something we will take on to meet that ask so that those faculty have that same centered role as other faculty members.

**B. González:** Thank you very much, thank you.

**IX. Unfinished Business**

A. Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award

Faculty will vote on the recipient during the February 19 Faculty Senate meeting. The recipient will be honored at the March 26 Faculty Senate meeting.

1. Professor Todd Reeves

 Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment

**B. Creed:** That brings us to unfinished business, which is the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. You will see on page 8 is a letter of nomination for Professor Todd Reeves. Actually, the letter is on pages 9 to 10, and the call is on page 8. We have one faculty member who has been nominated. For this, we will take a first and a second and then discussion, if there is any, and then a vote. We’ll do a voice vote on that. So, if I could have a motion to approve the nomination of Todd Reeves for the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. Thank you, Mark. A second? Thank you, Therese. Any discussion? All right, then I will call to vote; we’ll have a vote to approve the nomination of Todd Reeves as the recipient of this academic year’s Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. All in favor, say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** All opposed? Thank you, David. Any abstentions? Thank you, Daniel. So, Professor Todd Reeves will be the recipient of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. He will be invited to the March 26 Faculty Senate meeting to receive a certificate. So, thank you for that. Thank you for the nomination on that.

**X. New Business**

A. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws

 Article 10, Appeal Procedures for Academic Personnel Decisions

 Article 11, Sabbatical Leave Policy

 FIRST READING

 Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President

**B. Creed:** Up next is our new business. You’ll see we have a number of new business items. Under consideration, the first one up is a proposed to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Articles 10 and 11. That is on pages 11 through 20. Since this is a first reading, we just need a discussion. I’ll introduce the item and see if there is any discussion on it.

I won’t ready the whole proposal summary. As you see, it’s quite long, but it’s filled with details about the reason for it. This proposal combines two proposed amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws. One is related to the appeals of academic personnel decisions related to tenure related to tenure, promotion and sabbatical determinations. And the second part that is combined was providing clarity to sabbatical eligibility where there was an inconsistency between the Board of Trustees document and their timeline and the Faculty Senate Bylaws’ timeline. So, it was just bringing those into alignment.

The Faculty Senate Personnel Committee voted to forward these recommendations to the full Faculty Senate at their January 14, 2025, meeting. While you can see the principles that went into the updates of the appeals process, just a quick background, is last year there was an appeal that came forward to the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee. And based on those engaged in the appeal process and on the fact that this appeal process had not been reviewed in some time, the policies were looked at, and a working group was established to consider revisions, updates and improvements to the policies and to the procedures related to the appeal process.

You can see the following principles that tenure and promotion ought to retain in faculty’s purview, that there should be a pause until appeals are resolved, that some of the fact-finding work should not be done in open meetings to protect those involved in the case, and that – and you can see the other ones in there.

The Faculty Senate Personnel Committee reviewed the recommendations that came forward from the working group and engaged in conversations and updates of those recommended changes. And you can see the below recommendations for Articles 10.2 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

That’s the main gist of it. If anyone has any questions, I know there are members of the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee here. They can answer questions; I can, as well. Again, this is a first reading so this is discussion, opportunity for questions that can be included in any revisions to the language before a second reading at our next Faculty Senate meeting.

Not seeing anybody moving toward the mic, oh, thank you, Mark.

**M. Van Wienen:** Mark Van Wienen here. Can you explain the last sentence, “…an amendment of Article 11.4.8 to align the [FS Bylaw] language with the Board of Trustees…”? What exactly is that language change.

**B. Creed:** In the current Faculty Senate Bylaw language, it is on page 19, the last page of this proposed change, it was, “A subsequent sabbatical leave may not begin before a faculty member has completed full time service for six years (i.e., 72 months) since the…” most recent sabbatical leave. The Board of Trustees document says you’re not eligible more than once in every seven years. So, the language in the Faculty Senate Bylaws created an unnecessary complication, or lack of clarity around eligibility. The way our policy work is the Board of Trustees is the governing body. Everything has to default up to that. We couldn’t set Faculty Senate eligibility to be less stringent than the Board of Trustees, and so, what we were doing here was to bring it directly into alignment with the language in the Board of Trustees document, because that’s the governing law. This inconsistency could lead to folks getting wrong information about when they were eligible. That was the idea, and others who were part of that conversation at the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee are welcome to share perspective on it. But it was to align the two so there wasn’t a perceived or real discrepancy between 72 months and seven years, which are clearly two different terms of time.

**M. Van Wienen:** I don’t suppose there’s been any discussion at the Board of Trustees to align their language with ours since ours is more precise.

**B. Creed:** That’s correct, there was not that route. All right, seeing no other comments on this, we will have this come before our next Faculty Senate meeting in March for a second reading.

B. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws

 Article 3.5.1, Social Justice Committee Composition

 FIRST READING

 Felicia Bohanon, Supportive Professional Staff Council President

 Natasha Johnson, Operating Staff Council President

 Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President

**B. Creed:** The next amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws is on page 21. This is a proposed amendment to Article 3.5.1, which is the membership or composition of the Social Justice Committee. This proposal removes the requirement that membership of the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee must come from the Faculty Senate membership to begin with. This was done for several reasons. One, on behalf of an ask of the Operating Staff Council and Supportive Professional Staff Council, they asked for flexibility to allow folks from their groups to serve on the Social Justice Committee that were not also serving on Faculty Senate. This is to ensure they were able to better fill their seats on the Social Justice Committee and ensure representation, and also allow for folks who may have the desire and the capacity to serve, to be able to step up and do so.

Second, flexibility is given to clinical faculty as there is only one clinical faculty member seated on the Faculty Senate, so to require them to serve both on Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee was thought to be an excess burden, an unnecessary burden. So, this improves the chances that somebody will sign up for Faculty Senate if they are also not obligated to serve in another way.

And then to make the membership language consistent, we also dropped tenure-track faculty having to come from Faculty Senate, itself. This provides flexibility in implementation. The procedures, the practices will be to start with faculty senators first, but currently, we do have some colleges that are unrepresented at Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee, so this would allow the chair of that committee or the Faculty Senate president to find a faculty member that could represent that college on this body.

If there are any questions or comments, happy to address them. Again, this will come before us for a second reading and a vote at our next Faculty Senate meeting.

C. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws

 Article 8, The Academic Personnel Process

 FIRST READING

 Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President

**B. Creed:** The final set of proposed amendments for today is related to Article 8, The Academic Personnel Process. While it does seem like we just voted on this last year to update and overhaul Article 8 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, one of the things that was asked for or required in that document was a continued review of all academic personnel processes in years that are multiple of five. So, we didn’t feel it was right to just say everybody else do it, but not Faculty Senate. That’s one reason. Two, there were several open items that had been elevated last year that were not addressed in that change, including time in seat requirements, as well as an issue elevated by the faculty union to make sure that the Faculty Senate Bylaws required the written rationale if somebody was non-reappointed. And so, we had multiple places for doing this work, and it was brought together in a package. We established a faculty working group on this topic as folks had an opportunity to volunteer for that. That group came together, presented recommendation to Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, which then interacted with those recommendations, updated them as was deemed appropriate and had brought those forward.

There are five recommended changes. You can see here, the first is review cycles. During the time I spent going around to the college councils and college senates, and talking with faculty members and administrators, there was a recognition that having this mandated every five years was out of step, potentially, with the work that was being done. Some folks had done work recently and wanted that to count, or were saying, we’re going to do work in two years, so should I just wait for the next cycle to do it? So, what it tried to do was to give some flexibility, but say at least once every five years, was the update on the review cycles. The second part of it is that its alignment with Faculty Senate Bylaws, currently, it just says with the university mission, vision and values. We want to make sure that it’s aligned with our Faculty Senate Bylaws.

The second is about annual written feedback. We wanted to recognize that there was lack of clarity around clinical faculty members that get written review. This was clarified to say all assistant rank faculty members have the right to written evaluation.

The time in rank for promotion, we considered multiple options, and the recommendation that is coming forward is to retain the requirements for time in rank as a university level policy and elevate the flexibility for negotiating at the time of hire and providing college specific routes for being extraordinary or to come off of that secure timeline.

It was recognized that there was nothing done consistently at the university level, at the Faculty Senate level, about how to count previous effort, previous productivity. And so, that was brought in. It was decided to add language to guide the counting of work done prior to time at NIU.

And then finally, was this addition of switching from a “should,” which gives somebody – like you should do it, but I’m not going to – to a “shall,” where it’s expectation that written explanation for non-reappointment is guaranteed to all faculty.

So, those are the five general changes. I saw two people stand up for comment or just to stretch legs, I’m not sure which. If anybody has questions, comments or thoughts, please feel free to share.

**W. Mills:** William Mills, Engineering Technology. There’s the issue of last year we voted on changes at the university level to section 8 that is eventually going to require changes to the bylaws in departments. My question is, if we have a department now that decides not to look at their bylaws, is there a requirement, since we’re saying every five years for review, and the bylaws haven’t been updated, how does that happen? Is there also a requirement now that bylaws are reviewed every five years at least?

**B. Creed:** The Faculty Senate Bylaws?

**W. Mills:** In a department.

**B. Creed:** Department policies, the same expectation, at least once every five years, would apply.

**W. Mills:** What if a department is already more than five years out but is interpreting the section 8 revisions and the ongoing requirement [inaudible] with a plan right now. Some departments, from what I’m seeing, are interpreting that means that, even though we’re more than five years since we last reviewed it and section 8 has changed, that they don’t have to review and/or change their bylaws, and they could have people coming up for tenure, who are trying to make use of the revised section 8. My understanding right now is that a department could say, well, we’ll just have to go through an appeal. But it seems to me that that’s a waste of everybody’s time when you can reasonably anticipate that, if your department bylaws aren’t updated to take it into account, that there should be a requirement, shall be a requirement, sounds to me, that if your bylaws haven’t been reviewed in the last five years, now you not just come up with a plan, that you need to review to meet the five-year requirement.

**B. Creed:** To make sure I’m understanding

**W. Mills:** You know what I’m talking about.

**B. Creed:** Yeah, to restate the question and make sure I get it right: What is the requirement for a local department or an academic unit, to review and do the examination of their local policies governing promotion and tenure at the academic unit level? The current set-up is every five years, everything that’s in a multiple of five. So, that’s this year. So, that process should be started and underway. That’s the intention of this. This change does not alleviate that expectation that bylaws are reviewed every five years. What it does do is it says, if you revised them just this past year, we’re not going to force you to do it again this year, just for performative sake. But the idea is that at least once every five years, the local policies ought to be reviewed at least every five years.

**W. Mills:** What if a department’s more than six years since it was last reviewed.

**B. Creed:** Then they would be triggered to review their policies.

**W. Mills:** By September when tenure applications would be due, normally, within a department?

**B. Creed:** That is not the stated expectation and timeline for having it all the way up and through and everything manifest. It’s that the process should be engaged with this year. The way that the language is, just pulling it up, “It shall undergo review at least once every five years to ensure alignment with the university goals, university mission, vision and values, and aligned with Faculty Senate Bylaws.” This is a process. I think we all work in higher ed, that’s why we’re here. We understand that to get these things fully approved and updated, there’s cycles of approval, particularly at an academic unit level. First they go up to the college, and then they go up to Faculty Senate Personnel Committee for review. So, that process is expected to be begun and initiated and worked toward, and solutions for those cases that may be benefitted from changing the bylaws, I think that’s something that starts at the local level to figure out the solution to. I hope I’m answering that question. There’s nothing in here that says by September 1 of 2025, everything needs to be updated and done. That was never the intention. The intention was to create these rhythms for improvement and continuous improvement, rather than, here’s the deadline for all work to be done by.

**W. Mills:** Okay, that wasn’t my specific question.

**B. Creed:** Okay, missed it.

**W. Mills:** My specific question, what about a department that hasn’t done a review in six years and is taking the guidance from the [Faculty] Senate about the 2024 section 8 as that there’s no need for them to make any changes right now, to even look at the bylaws right now.

**B. Creed:** I think there is nothing in the 2024 revisions, the current bylaws as they currently stand that suggests anybody shouldn’t be reviewing their policies this year. The current language is that this is the year that folks are supposed to be reviewing policies at the academic unit level and the college level.

**W. Mills:** And you have the additional trigger? Like, I guess, when did the five year – is the five-year part last year? Was it on the books before last year.

**B. Creed:** It came on the books last year, about a year ago, if my memory serves, in about two days will be a year since it’s been on the books about. That was the first time any sort of cycle of review was required. Previous to last year’s approval and change of the bylaws, the amendments to the bylaws, there was no expectation for process to review tenure and promotion policies. That was only instituted last year as part of that broader package that came through.

**W. Mills:** So, being cynical, couldn’t somebody interpret that, since it didn’t come in until 2024, that they don’t really have to – I’m not saying I agree with it but – could somebody misinterpret it in spirit that it would mean that they have until 2029 to do the

**B. Creed:** The way it’s currently written, I would say there’s no room for that, because it says, “year of 2025.” It specifically says multiples of five years, and 2025 is one of those multiples of five. So, that would be the expected year to do it. The change would say, “at least once every five years.” It has nothing about starting in this year as the count date. So, the expectation is that folks under the current bylaws, because this hasn’t passed yet, would be expected to be doing that work this year, this calendar year. If the bylaws change, folks that went through the cycle of review and did that in the past five years, would have a little breathing room. But those who have not done it, the expectation would be that they’re doing it.

**W. Mills:** I think that’s the clarification I’m looking for. If you’ve done it in the prior five years, you’re not triggered necessarily at this time. But I also think, my understanding, and correct me if I’m wrong on it, is even if the bylaws have been reviewed in the last five years, and a faculty member did go up for promotion, and promotion was going to be based on the changes under section 8 where impact of practice comes into play, and the existing bylaws doesn’t actually take implication, is it going to be a requirement that we go through the whole appeal procedure, even though it clearly doesn’t meet the section 8? Or, is there a way of short-changing when there’s an obvious thing? Could a faculty member bring it to the [Faculty] Senate Personnel [Committee] or the parliamentarian or something and say, this is reasonable chance? Because in court they do this a lot. If there’s a reasonable chance an appeal would be expected, you can kind of not have to wait and go through the whole process, which last year you know how painful and all that it was.

**B. Creed:** I’ll have to consult and figure out what the right answer is. I don’t know the answer off the top of my head about what that route it. And I know currently the language in there is that the current policy on the books is the one that governs. That’s part of the Faculty Senate Bylaws. The current policy is the one that governs. That’s in there. I usually carry around my whole actual physical copy of it, but I don’t have it in front of me today. But there is language that says the current one is in place.

**W. Mills:** You mean the last year’s 2024 revision.

**B. Creed:** The one that is currently the law of the land. The one that has been most recently approved by the department or the academic unit and the college would be the one that’s in play and current. There’s that language, so that’s part of why I need to figure out and get consult on what you’re asking about, which is some future state, which we don’t know what it is, because it’s a very specific ask that you’re asking, because it’s two parts. One is, say we use something like a patent that’s currently not given credit for scholarship, research or artistic productivity. It’s not currently in my localized tenure and promotion policies. It may be in the future, but I don’t know the weight it’s given in my policies yet. So, to say I’m going to get tenure because of some future state where we don’t know what the future state is because the Faculty Senate Bylaws doesn’t say a patent is worth six points on a 20-point scale. It’s hard to know what the future state of the local policy is going to be, because the Faculty Senate provides the space for these types of scholarship, but it doesn’t provide the weight for the priority or the equivalencies. That’s localized by design, that colleges and academic units know that better than I can for all of campus or that we collectively can for all of campus. So, that [inaudible] my answer because it’s hard to know because we don’t know what the future state is. And I think it’s different.

**W. Mills:** But

**B. Creed:** The difference in. I feel like this may be a sidebar conversation.

**W. Mills:** Sure, I’m happy to do a sidebar, sure. I don’t want to take up time. I just want to raise it as an issue.

**B. Creed:** Thank you. Any other discussion or comments on the multiple changes within this one? Thank you. This again will come before us at the next Faculty Senate meeting. If you have any questions, comments, concerns about any of these, prior to that second reading, please do reach out. Happy to engage in conversation or provide answers as I’m able to, so you can make a more informed vote at that meeting.

**XI. Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees**

A. Operating Staff Council – report

 Natasha Johnson, President

 1. [Civil Service Emergency Fund](https://www.niu.edu/operating-staff-council/emergency-fund/index.shtml)

 Tamara Boston, Operating Staff Council member

**B. Creed:** That brings us to reports from councils, boards and standing committees. Operating Staff Council, I believe we do have a report. Oh, go ahead, Felicia, if you want to do Supportive Professional Staff first, that’s good.

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – report

 Felicia Bohanon, President

**F. Bohanon:** The Supportive Professional Staff Council is accepting nominations for SPS awards. The deadline is February 28. They’re also accepting nominations for SPS certificates, and the deadline for that is March 3. We’re also accepting nominations for the SPS personnel advisor, and the deadline for that is March 7. We sent out the SPS Workplace Climate Survey, and that was disseminated to staff earlier in the week, and the deadline for responses to that is March 7. And then, we’re also asking for support for the SPS scholarship by giving to the Huskie High Five Campaign. Any questions? Thank you.

**B. Creed:** Thank you.

A. Operating Staff Council – report

 Natasha Johnson, President

 1. [Civil Service Emergency Fund](https://www.niu.edu/operating-staff-council/emergency-fund/index.shtml)

 Tamara Boston, Operating Staff Council member

**B. Creed:** I think we’ll now do the Operating Staff Council report.

**T. Boston:** Our report is that we are currently fundraising for the Civil Service Emergency Fund. Oh, by the way, my name is Tamara Boston. I am from the Operating Staff Council. And thank you for allowing me to come and speak to you all about the fundraising that we’re doing. When I joined the Operating Staff Council, I decided to lead this effort, because I understand firsthand how quickly the cost of living had begun to change and how everything from gas to groceries had really outpaced the wages of operating staff members, leaving a significant strain on their finances. The Operating Staff Council Emergency Fund was created during the COVID-19 pandemic, and it was actually inspired by the Student Emergency Fund. A dedicated civil servant envisioned a similar support system for their colleagues, and since then, the fund has provided over $5,000 in assistance to civil service employees facing unexpected financial hardships.

However, since I’ve been on the Operating Staff Council and chairing the emergency fund, we have actually run out of money. We’ve run out of funds, and that is not a way to operate that particular fund. It is not a way to actually even operate. To make it sustainable, we decided to take a two-pronged approach to supporting that fund. The first one is that we are doing a crowdfunding campaign. You can go to [crowdfund.niu.edu](https://crowdfund.niu.edu/project/45492), and you can give through that means. But we are also looking at payroll deduction. Payroll deduction is a way to sustain the fund. We are doing a give 5 campaign. If we can get as many folks as possible around campus to give and donate out of each payroll check $5, it will help to really sustain the fund.

In addition to asking for your support for the Civil Service Emergency Fund, I will ask that you all would share information to your networks, as well. And I believe that together we can create a sustainable fund that will be a resource to uplift the civil service employees that support our entire community. And I want to thank you all again. The website is [crowdfund.niu.edu](https://crowdfund.niu.edu/project/45492). Thank you.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Tamara, and I’ll make sure to include that in the summary that goes out afterward.

B. FS-UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – no report

 Emily McKee, FS/RGE Liaison/Spokesperson

**B. Creed:** Next up is the Faculty Senate-UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. Emily McKee will help lead us through a few items.

1. President of Faculty Senate/Chair of University Council 2025-26

 Call for nominations

* Nominations for the office of Faculty Senate president will be taken from the Faculty Senate floor during the March 26 Faculty Senate meeting. Faculty Senate voting members are asked to review the list being provided at this time and use the coming weeks to prepare for making nominations during the March 26 meeting.
* Letters of acceptance of nomination will be due in the Office of Faculty Senate by Friday, April 11.
* Letters of acceptance of nomination will be provided to Faculty Senate voting members via email by Wednesday, April 16, and also will be included in the April 23 Faculty Senate agenda packets.
* Election of the 2025-26 Faculty Senate president/University Council chair will be held during the April 23 Faculty Senate meeting.

**E. McKee:** We have several items of business. First is that it’s time to be in our process for electing a Faculty Senate president to serve in the 2025-26 academic year. The list of those eligible to be nominated is on page 25 of your packet and also on the screen. Nominations for the office can be taken from the Faculty Senate floor during the March 26 meeting, and voting members of Faculty Senate are asked to review the list now being provided and use the coming weeks to prepare to make a nomination on the floor at that time.

Letters of acceptance of nomination would then be due to the Office of Faculty Senate by Friday, April 11. Those letters of acceptance will be provided to Faculty Senate members via email by Wednesday, April 16. And then they’ll also be included in the packet the April 23 meeting. Elections for the 2025-26 Faculty Senate president will be held at that April 23 meeting.

2. 2025-26 [Student Grievance Panel](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/_pdf/student-grievance-procedures-and-hearing-guidelines.pdf)

By-lot drawing of three tenured faculty members and three instructors to serve on the 2025-26 grievance panel for student grievances. Members serving on the panel might be called upon to review a student grievance should one be filed during the 2025-26 academic year.

**E. McKee:** Next up, we need to select three tenured faculty members and three instructors to serve on the 2025-26 student grievance panel. Members selected to serve on the panel might be called upon to review a student grievance should one be filed during the 2025-26 academic year. And these panel members will be selected by lot from among the tenured faculty members of Faculty Senate and University Council. And then from among the instructors on Faculty Senate and University Council.

So, first the tenured faculty members. Oh, lucky me, Emily McKee from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Just the lottery you want, right? The next lucky winner is Greg Beyer from College of Visual and Performing Arts. And Lisa Liberty from the College of Education.

Next, we’ll choose three from the instructors. Vicky Books from the College of Education. Brian Bender from the College of Business. And Jason Akst from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Department of Communication.

 3. Faculty Personnel Advisor – Call for self-nominations

Letters of self-nomination are to be submitted to Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President by Monday, March 17, and will be included in the March 26 Faculty Senate agenda packets for information only. Faculty Senate members will elect the faculty personnel advisor at the April 23 Faculty Senate meeting.

**E. McKee:** The next item is to call for self-nominations for the position of faculty personnel advisor. The term of NIU’s current FPA, Professor Carrie Kortegast, will expire at the end of this spring semester. And on page 27, you’ll find information on the position in your packet. For this election process, letters of self-nomination should be sent to the Faculty Senate president by Monday, March 17, and those letters will be included in the March 26 Faculty Senate agenda packets. And elections will take place at the April 23 meeting.

4. NIU representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE

Letters of self-nomination are to be submitted to Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President by Monday, March 17, and will be included in the March 26 Faculty Senate agenda packets for information only. Faculty Senate members will elect the FAC-IBHE representative at the April 23 Faculty Senate meeting.

**E. McKee:** And then finally, the next item is a call for self-nominations for the position of NIU representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE. The term of NIU’s current representative, Professor Tiffany Puckett, expires at the end of this spring semester, as well. And information on that position is on page 28 of your packet. For this selection process, letters of self-nomination are also due to the Faculty Senate president by Monday, March 17, and those letters will be included in the March 26 agenda packet. Elections will also then be taken for that position on the April 23 Faculty Senate meeting.

That’s everything.

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

C. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – report

 Tiffany Puckett, NIU representative to FAC-IBHE

**B. Creed:** Speaking of the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE, they’re up next with a report. Please come on up, Dr. Tiffany Puckett.

**T. Puckett:** Good afternoon, I hope everyone is doing well and staying warm. I do have a few things to report. The Faculty Advisory Council met on January 24 at Olney Community College, and a few things. Both higher ed funding bills have already been reintroduced, and they are pretty much identical to what they were in the fall. There is a listening session tomorrow at Western Illinois University if you know anyone who’s in that area who would like to have some conversation around that bill. For those of you who have students who might be interested in the [DFI Fellowship](https://www.ibhe.org/dfifellows.asp), that application is due on March 2.

The standing committees and working groups have continuously been in conversation regarding the two-year colleges being able to issue bachelor’s degrees, as well as some of the executive orders and things that are coming down. Our meeting on Friday should probably continue those conversations. We’ve been having a lot of conversations via email, especially considering that it’s reported recently, possibly, that the Governor’s Office is going to be recommending that some community colleges be allowed to provide bachelor’s degrees. And then we’ll also have some conversations around the most recent Dear Colleague letter, etc. Those are probably going to be the heavy conversations on Friday’s meeting, which is going to be held on Zoom. And I’ll report back after that meeting, which I’m sure is going to be interesting.

**B. Creed:** Did you want to share?

**L. Elish-Piper:** Yeah, today in the Governor’s budget address, he mentioned that community colleges should be able to offer baccalaureate degrees in areas that are aligned with specific workforce needs. That does not make it allowable. It still has to go through the general assembly and would still have to be approved through the process. Although, the fact he said it makes it more likely that there would be support. There are currently two bills that are in the legislature on this, and so we’ll see how it all plays out. But we’re definitely looking at ways to demonstrate that we serve transfer students well on campus. We serve them well in some of our location-based programs that are at university centers or on community college campuses. All the things that we’ve done to ensure transfer students have clear accessible pathways with preserving as much of their transfer credit as possible. So, we’re definitely looking at ways that we can push back against that. But the governor did say it today, so he put it out there. But that does not make it official or does not make it something that can be implemented until it goes through the general assembly.

**T. Puckett:** And thank you for that clarification. I know the two-year caucus and the four-year caucus have been having continued conversation about it. It’s sort of like the conflict of the four-year caucus is completely against supporting any bills that are going to allow for providing four-year bachelor’s degrees from two-year institutions. I’ll report back at the next meeting.

Does anybody have any questions? Thank you.

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

D. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report

 Felicia Bohanon, Natasha Johnson, Ben Creed

 Brad Cripe, Larissa Garcia, Tom Skuzinski

**B. Creed:** UAC to the BOT. It says no report. My only report is that the meeting day is tomorrow; so please do click in if you are interested in any aspect that’s on their agenda, including tuition and fees recommendations, including updates from our federal and state liaisons and various aspects as posted on the public agendas.

E. Baccalaureate Council – no report

 Alicia Schatteman, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

**B. Creed:** There’s no report from the BC,

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – no report

 Therese Arado, Chair

**B. Creed:** from FRR.

G. Social Justice Committee – report

 Ben Creed, FS President

**B. Creed:** Social Justice Committee, the only thing I will report is that we had a conversation this past session where we invited Provost Elish-Piper and CDO Sumner to join us to talk about the federal context that we’ve got those updates in kind of what NIU is doing in response and the values that we retain. And there will be efforts to try to continue to learn from faculty across campus about any sort of barriers or systemic or systematic barriers to faculty success. That still remains part of the mission, or the charge, that that group is taking on.

H. Student Government Association – report

 Ja’kobe Jones, SGA President

 Manny Corpuz, Speaker of the Senate

**B. Creed:** I don’t think I saw Manny for an SGA report.

**XII. Information Items**

A. [Policy Library](https://www.niu.edu/policies/) – Comment on Proposed Policies

B. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/apc/index.shtml), Academic Planning Council

C. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/athletics/index.shtml), Athletic Board

D. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/bc/index.shtml), Baccalaureate Council

E. [Minutes,](http://www.niu.edu/board/meetings/index.shtml) Board of Trustees

F. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/ciuae/index.shtml), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience

G. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/gec/index.shtml), General Education Committee

H [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/gc/index.shtml), Graduate Council

I. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/hc/index.shtml), Honors Committee

J. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/operating-staff-council/meetings/index.shtml), Operating Staff Council

K. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/spsc/meetings/index.shtml), Supportive Professional Staff Council

L. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/uap/index.shtml), University Assessment Panel

M. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/ubc/index.shtml), University Benefits Committee

N. [Minutes](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/minutes/uciel/index.shtml), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

O. [Minutes](http://www.facibhe.org/meetings/minutes.php), Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE

P. 2024-25 FS meeting dates: Feb 19, Mar 26, Apr 23

**B. Creed:** That brings us to informational items. A through O are the standard ones, the Policy Library and the minutes. There is a policy currently up for comment in the Policy Library related to extra compensation for faculty. So, please take a minute to look at that updated policy and provide feedback. You’ll see our next meeting date is a little over a month from now, March 26. That’s one week later than usual due to spring break.

**XIII. Adjournment**

**B. Creed:** That brings us to adjournment. Do I have a motion to adjourn the meeting? Thank you, David. Second? Thank you, Kryssi. All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.