TRANSCRIPT – FACULTY SENATE

**Wednesday, April 23, 2025, 3 p.m.**

**Altgeld Hall Auditorium**

**Northern Illinois University**

**DeKalb, Illinois**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Arado, Atkins, Barrett, Bohanon, Books, Brain, Burton, Cain, Campbell, Chomentowski, Creed, Duffin, Finch, Fotovat, Hartenhoff, Ito, Jong, Justice (for Stalcup), Kushimo, Liberty, McGowan, McKee, Mellon, Mills, Naples, Novak, Nyunt, Palese, Qin, Ross, Sabio, Salimi, Schmidt, Schwartz (for Bender), Sharp, Sibley, Sirotkin, Slagstad, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stansell (for Luo), Stone, Thomas, Vahabzadeh, Valentiner, Van Wienen, VanTilburg, Wang, Whedbee, Wheeler, Woods, Yang,

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Akst, Alex, Bender, Corpuz, Demir, Lampi, Libman, Luo, Stalcup,

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan, Buhrow, Elish-Piper, Falkoff, Jaekel, Nu, Puckett, Reyman, Sumner

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

**I. Call to Order**

**B. Creed:** I am going to call today’s meeting of the Faculty Senate on Wednesday, April 23, to order at 3 p.m.

**II. Verification of Quorum**

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

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

**III. Adoption of the Agenda**

**B. Creed:** That brings us to adopting the agenda for today’s meeting. If I could have a motion to adopt the agenda for the meeting today. All right, I see Pete and David, first and second, and some others too if you want that, as well. All in favor of approving today’s agenda, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** Opposed? The agenda is adopted.

**IV. Approval of the March 26, 2025, minutes**

**B. Creed:** Up next is approval of the March 26, 2025, minutes. Can I please have a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you, Felicia. Second? Thank you, Taylor. Any comments or discussion related to the minutes for last meeting. Seeing and hearing none, all in favor of approving the March 26, 2025, minutes, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** Opposed? Abstain? All right.

**V. Public Comment**

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

**P. Erickson:** We have one request for public comment from Virginia Naples.

**B. Creed:** All right. And just as a reminder, it’s five minutes for public comment.

V. Naples: Thank you. I thought long and hard about talking to our group, but I decided that I really would like to tell you some of my thoughts and ask some questions. We are facing unprecedented potential budget cuts. We don’t have any idea what is going to happen. And some of them are occurring within the university, but others are occurring outside the university. But this is the first time in my many long years of being associated with NIU that the budget cuts have been quite so up front and important in the discussion of individual departments. I know my department is being told that we’re losing TA lines, and I think that is the first time that has happened en masse across campus. So, we really need to be very concerned about how to deal with that issue. It is not simply that we have fewer people to do TA work, but it affects all aspects of teaching. It is, in effect, an increase in our workload, because we need to meet all of our classes, and we can’t necessarily do that. It is also a decrease in the opportunities for our graduate students to be able to obtain the kind of training that they get, because having been a TA is helpful for them when they’re looking for jobs, especially in academia, and also, their presence when they are speaking to groups of people, which we know everybody is going to end up needing to do, even if only selling yourself for an interview for a job.

The recent budget cuts have gone across all meetings; but in labor management meetings recently, the administration seems to have been reacting with surprise at how upset our faculty are. And I haven’t talked to any individual professors or members of my department or others who are not upset about this. So, this is a relatively new and higher level of stress and concern that we’re dealing with. There have been many previous decisions made about budgets that have not involved the faculty; and so, I’m speaking today to ask for an increase in transparency, an increase in communication in both directions. And I’m also asking for an increased amount of faculty input prior to major budgetary decisions being made. I know a lot of the decisions have been made and sometimes they have had some faculty input, and other times not. I think there is probably no one who hasn’t been affected by the increase in printing costs. But having spoken to the people who were involved in formulating that policy, they believed that they had sought enough input and that there would be no objection. And they claimed that they didn’t get much push back. I don’t know anyone who’s happy about the printing examples. And there are many other things; I could go on far beyond my five minute allocation of time.

But what this tells me – and other people have raised this question to me – is that, well, there appears to be a mismatch between the administrative goals and the vision for the university, and faculty goals and the requirements of us that we need to meet our mission. One of the other things that I heard in my recent faculty meeting about budget cuts was that the UFA, when we start our negotiations for the next contract next year, is being asked to forego asking for any raises for the faculty. Now, we unionized quite a few years ago, because we had fallen very far behind. We have had some good quality increases and input, protections for tenure and workload and things like that. But with the fewer number of faculty being hired and faculty leaving, workloads are going to go up if we are going to be able to meet our requirements for distributions for all of our majors.

It doesn’t matter if there is one person in a class or a thousand people in a class, if that class is required for a major for distribution, requirements for certifications or other things for different programs, they must have those classes available. Therefore, we must teach them. We have been, for a very long time, doing more and more with less and less. We are now getting to the point where we are being asked to do everything with nothing, or essentially nothing.

What I am hoping is that a message can be conveyed to our administrative leadership that the faculty need to be included at all levels of decision-making process, because we don’t know where the budgetary problems are going to end up and who they are going to affect and how. And so, I’m asking everybody among my colleagues here in Faculty Senate, plus all of the other people with whom I’ve spoken about these issues, please, if you have an idea that will help, if you can volunteer your time to work on some of these issues, or to become involved with the union or any other venue that will help to try to bring us all together to deal with these problems as best as we possibly can, please to do so. Thank you. [applause]

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

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

**B. Creed:** That brings us to the Faculty Senate president’s announcements. First, I want to say welcome to the last Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year. And a special thank you to those of you whose terms are ending. Thank you for the three years of service that you have provided to this place, and I hope our paths continue to cross.

I truly appreciate the work the members of this body have engaged in over this past year, both as a whole and also through its committee work and through the individual efforts of faculty senators. I think we’ve made a lot of great progress in various spaces and laid a very solid foundation for the work that is being planned for the upcoming academic year and beyond. With the past few months being filled with uncertainty and unanticipated work, I still just wanted to say thank you and congratulations to the work we have been able to do. And I want to say that we’ve collectively made progress in a number of areas of heightened concern. We’ve been able to collectively advocate, ask for supports and be involved in different collaborative spaces on decisions that are made on campus.

As we move toward the summer, where many of us are off contract, that doesn’t mean the shifts in context are going to change, that anything’s going to take a pause when our contracts come off. So, I just want to make sure folks know that I will continue to be working in this role. I will continue to meet with senior leadership and trying to fulfill the duties of the Faculty Senate over the summer. And I also want to say, as you all are maybe off contract and trying to get to the research or the break that you rightfully deserve, I’m sure there will still be impacts of the agency changes, the policy of executive orders, of different efforts going on. And so, I want you to know, please do reach out to me if you have worries, if you have concerns, if you want more information about what’s going on. My commitment is to stay engaged with our campus, with our leadership and with the context as things change. So, do please reach out and do feel welcome to help over the summer if you so choose.

Next, I want to just cover briefly a couple housekeeping items. First, for those returning to Faculty Senate in the fall, you should have received an email about committee preferences. Please respond to those if you haven’t. And for those of you who have, thank you for sharing your preferences. This helps as we seat our committees and plan for our work in the upcoming academic year.

Second, I’m in the process of developing a multi-year curriculum for this body. I’m doing this work with some of the committees of the Faculty Senate to identify topics that are core to the duties and then build a calendar, so we build routinized and planned and predictable topics to come before those bodies so that we make sure we’re constantly returning to core issues. One of the things I want to do with Faculty Senate is a similar effort so we can ensure better understanding on core topics and ensure and improve transparency around core aspects of the academic core of the institution, which the Faculty Senate is charged with enacting, as well as aspects of great importance, like budgetary conversations. I’m looking for your collective wisdom as I build out that curriculum; and so, please look for a survey where I’m going to be asking you to identify some of these core topics that will come in front of the Faculty Senate. We’ve already identified two that will start being put into rotation in the fall. The first is understanding curricular philosophies and definitions and rationale for some of the decisions that are made around general education courses, around honors courses, around course minimums. So, some of the core aspects related to curriculum. Another one is around athletics, to better understand athletics as it plays a role contributing to mission, vision and values of our institution, understanding both the budgeting side of it, as well as the impact it has for our students and for our community. So, those are two types of topics that will come forward in the fall. But I’m going to be building a routinized and predictable schedule for the next Faculty Senate to consider taking on.

The third and final housekeeping. This is that I want to let folks here know that I’ve been meeting with our new-to-NIU faculty. Those are those faculty who are at the assistant professor level or were hired within the past three years at the associate or full ranks. I’ve already had three meetings with those faculty members, and I have a fourth one on Friday. I expect to have met with about 40 of our newest-to-NIU faculty members. The purpose of those is, one, for me to learn. I hear from you all, which are typically more seasoned or more comfortable in speaking out members of our campus. And I also want to make sure that I’m talking with those who maybe would prefer to share in a smaller or in a different manner and don’t know who to reach out to. I’ve been learning from those faculty members. I’ve been trying to answer and address any questions and provide resources to them, and ultimately, start building community through conversation with those groups of faculty members. I will be following up those meetings with a survey of that group of faculty, which will help inform our work in the upcoming academic year and beyond, particularly around how we can better support those groups of faculty and cultivate belonging holistically here at NIU.

The last thing I want to talk about is support for the international members of our NIU community, students, staff and faculty, including those five students who have had their visas revoked. For those who may not know, as I just said, we’ve had five students who have lost their visas in the past couple weeks here. This is part of a broad national pattern where hundreds of students have lost their visas without rationale or due process. For those who were not aware, today there was a rally on campus that brought together faculty members, union leadership, U.S. Representative Lightford, and demonstrated NIU’s support and commitment to our international students, staff and faculty, and also a demand and a call to action for campus and our broader community. For those who were not able to make it, it was really well attended, really well put together, and it was a powerful message that was sent.

In a similar vein, I have received a draft letter from some members of faculty here at NIU, asking Faculty Senate to consider signing on to support the letter and the actions called for in that. However, I received it too close to the meeting, so we couldn’t get it on the agenda for us to consider and have time to comply with Illinois Open Meetings Act constraints. That doesn’t mean it’s going to stop. It doesn’t mean it’s not going to be heard or addressed. I just need to figure out the right way forward to see how we can get faculty to support the letter. The ask, included in the letter were aligned with the actions that the [AAUP](https://www.aaup.org/) recommends institutions taking. As I said, I’m looking for a way to bring this letter to this group of faculty and maybe the broader community for consideration and, ultimately, support. We cannot do it in Faculty Senate, because we don’t have any more meetings for this academic year. If it’s still relevant, we can consider taking it up in the next academic year, as well. But in the meantime, we’re trying to find ways to move that forward.

I want to share that I’m in general agreement with the sentiments and commitments that are outlined in the letter. And from where I sit, I believe that NIU is already taking actions in alignment with much of what is detailed in the call for action. I have already begun talking with senior administration about the content of the document and ways that we can route any future iteration or affirmation of the sentiments to make an impact and to help guide NIU actions going forward. Given today’s rally, the attendance and energy that was at that, the letter that I received from faculty members and the conversations that I’ve had since receiving that letter and prior to receiving that letter, I can say that I am proud of the way the collective Huskie community is living our values and supporting our international members. And I’m happy to engage in conversation to share more about why I’m proud of that. Thank you, Mark, for your role in convening that. [applause]

**VII. Provost’s Announcements**

**B. Creed:** With that, I’ll end my announcements and turn it over to Laurie as part of the provost’s announcements.

**L. Elish-Piper:** Hi everybody. Greetings from Springfield. I’m down here, because we testified to the Illinois Senate Higher Education Committee yesterday for our appropriations hearing. We’ll be testifying tomorrow in the House Committee. Thank you for letting me join you via Teams today.

I want to share a few quick announcements and then pick up kind of where Ben left off. First, I want to let you know that, even though we are at the end of the semester, our Counseling and Consultation Services does not have waiting list. If you encounter students who are experiencing mental health challenges or feeling overwhelmed with stress, we are able to get them in for seeing someone within a day or two. And if it’s an emergency, they can be seen almost immediately. So, please share that information that our Counseling and Consultation Services team still has capacity to serve more students at this time of the semester.

You probably noticed that enrollment is open for summer and fall. If you would please encourage your students to register soon. It helps them with their planning, but it also helps us with our planning, as well.

Remember to submit your book orders before you head off for summer, because we want to make sure that there’s ample time for the bookstore to get those books and course materials so that students can come to class the first day with the materials they need to succeed.

As Ben said, he shared a draft letter with me pertaining to the visa revocations that have been affecting international students. And I just want to take a few minutes to say that I, and other senior leaders, appreciate and welcome the faculty sharing their support for international students, staff and faculty, just as what happened today with the rally.

I and other leaders are committed to continuing to work on supporting our international members of the NIU community; and we want to do that in collaboration with faculty, as well as in coordination with other colleges, universities and organizations. NIU has been working, as Ben noted, in alignment with the majority of the things that were asked for in the draft letter.

One area I wanted to talk a little bit about was legal fees for impacted individuals. We’ve been connecting those folks with immigration lawyers, who provide pro bono legal services, and we’ve been doing that in collaboration with the Governor’s Office and other immigration advocacy organizations and agencies across Illinois, to make sure that students have access to the legal representation that they need in this situation.

Also, I wanted to let you know that our International Student and Scholars Office is very closely monitoring developments, and they are reaching out to students who are on visas to provide them with relevant information, as well as to answer their questions.

You may have also seen recently that, on behalf of NIU, President Freeman signed on to the [American Association of Colleges and Universities’](https://www.aacu.org/newsroom/a-call-for-constructive-engagement) [statement about constructive engagement](https://www.aacu.org/newsroom/a-call-for-constructive-engagement) and response to ongoing government intrusion into higher education. To date, over 200 university presidents have signed on. This document allows them to speak with one voice about the impact of recent federal actions on higher education.

I look forward to receiving this faculty letter or statement after it’s gone through whatever the appropriate channels are, and also to engaging with faculty and others on campus to continue to support our university and our students, faculty and staff, specifically those who are on visas.

In closing, I hope that finals week, as it’s approaching us rapidly, that the semester continues to be positive and productive for you. And I also hope that you are able to take a little bit of time to participate in some of the many celebrations and award events that are scheduled, as well as commencement, because those things remind us why we’re here, and they also are evidence of the incredibly positive impact of the work that all of you do.

Those are my announcements for today. I thank you for the opportunity and also for allowing me to join via Teams.

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

**VIII. Unfinished Business**

A. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws

Article 4.4.1.3, Graduate Council Administrative Representation

SECOND READING/VOTE

Jessica Reyman, Acting Dean, Graduate School

Amy Buhrow, Assistant Vice Provost, Accreditation, Assessment and Evaluation

**B. Creed:** That will bring us to unfinished business. We have two items of unfinished business. The first up is a proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, which you’ll see on page 9, which is related to Graduate Council administrative representation. We are taking a second reading and a vote. In order to do that, we’ll have a motion and a second. And then we’ll open up the discussion. So, if I can have a motion to approve the proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 4.4.1.3. Thank you, Jim. A second? Thank you, Cynthia. For discussion to open it up, I’ll turn it over to Acting Dean Reyman.

**J. Reyman:** Hi, everyone, good afternoon. I’ll just go ahead and read the proposal to amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws. This is in relation to the Graduate Council administration representation. This is the second reading.

The edits here, first of all, specify that the dean of the Graduate School is a nonvoting member of Grad Council, except when voting as necessary to break a tie vote. That is simply a clarification. That information appears later on in the bylaws but not in this line specifically. And so, that’s been added here just for a point of clarification.

The second bullet, likewise, removing ex officio language since the University Libraries’ representative is an appointed position and not “by virtue of the office.” It’s not technically ex officio, so we’re removing that from the bylaws, as well.

But the primary change here in this amendment is the third bulleted item here, adding the assistant vice provost for assessment and accreditation as an ex officio, nonvoting member for the purpose of sharing information on assessment and on accreditation regulations and processes as they relate to curricular and policy proposals. As you know, the Graduate Council approves curricular changes, graduate level curricular changes, and policies related to graduate education. It would be useful to have the AVP for assessment and accreditation there as an ex officio member to, first of all, open those lines of communication in case there are things that we need to consider as we’re making those approvals for graduate curriculum and any policy proposals. Already we’ve seen that it’s been helpful to have the communication between the Graduate School and Amy Buhrow on some of these policies this past year. And so, having a formalized seat on the Graduate Council is being proposed here.

**B. Creed:** Thank you. And the one thing that I will also add is the difference between the first reading and the second reading. We received feedback – so thank you, James – that it wasn’t quite clear enough that the first bullet was in there. That’s the one change in the language that you can see online in the yellow highlighted spot.

Seeing no questions or discussion, we’ll the motion to a vote. In order to do that, I will turn it over to Pat to lead us through that. If you don’t have a clicker, please grab one. I’ll say that and steal that from you, Pat.

**P. Erickson:** Thank you. First, let’s make sure that everybody knows whether or not they’re a voting member. If your name is on this list, or if you’re here today as an alternate for someone who’s on this list, then you’re a voting member. And then, let’s review what it takes to pass a bylaw amendment. To become effective, an amendment must be approved by a vote of two-thirds of those voting, provided at least two-thirds of the voting members are present. Currently, Faculty Senate has 60 members seated. So, two-thirds of 60 is 40. I’m going to open our balloting poll now, and I’m going to ask everyone, who is a voting member, to click 1 or A; and that will help us determine that we have at least 40 voting members in the room. Just from looking out there, I’m sure we do, but let’s make it official. Okay, we stop that exercise; we’ve gotten to 44, so we know we have enough people in the room.

Now I’m going to open a new poll, and I’ll remind you that you can click 1 or A for yes, you agree with the motion to approve the proposal; 2 or B is no, you don’t agree with the motion; 3 or C is abstain. If you click 3 or C, you’re telling us that you’re present, but you’re choosing not to vote. If you click 3 or C, that will have no impact on the vote calculation. You should get a check mark or a smiley face on the screen to tell you that your vote was counted. Anybody else? Anybody having trouble with their clicker? All right, I’ll close the poll, and that passes.

Yes – 48

No – 2

Abstain – 0

**B. Creed:** Thank you.

B. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws

Article 1, Membership of Faculty Senate

SECOND READING/VOTE

Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President

Katy Jaekel, Director, Center for the Study of Women, Gender and Sexuality

**B. Creed:** That brings us to our next proposed amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Again, this is another second reading. This is related to Article 1, Membership of Faculty Senate. Before we start discussion, once again, I’ll ask for a first and then a second. Can somebody make a motion? Thank you, Taylor. Second? Thank you, Emily.

I will start us off to open up the discussion, and Dr. Katy Jaekel is here, as well, to answer questions. I’ll start off by saying, again, as a reminder, this proposal updates language related to the voting membership of the Faculty Senate, to use a single, consistent term, “academic unit.” This update aligns with language shifts that were approved last year related to the promotion and tenure changes. Beyond just simply aligning language, this also allows for Faculty Senate representation of the research centers, which deliver academic curriculum. There are five such centers and one institute that would be represented underneath that. We had the presentation at our last Faculty Senate meeting from three of our current directors, and I just want to open it up by saying this is something that I also am supportive of. It’s been part of a conversation and collaboration; I think there is good value in letting these centers and institute be represented at Faculty Senate. If there are questions, or if Dr. Jaekel would like to share anything, please, now is the time for comments or questions or discussion.

Well, thank you for coming.

**K. Jaekel:** Thanks for having me.

**B. Creed:** All right, with no discussion, I will call the motion to a vote, and Pat, if you can once again lead us through that.

**P. Erickson:** Okay, it’s the same thing again. Click 1 or A for yes, you agree with the motion to approve the proposal; 2 or B is no, you don’t agree; 3 or C is abstain, you’re here but you’re choosing not to vote. Clicking 3 or C will not impact the vote calculation.

Okay, we’re going to close the poll, and that passes. [applause]

Yes – 47

No – 2

Abstain – 1

**B. Creed:** Thank you all for voting on both of those.

**IX. FS-UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – report**

Emily McKee, FS/RGE Liaison/Spokesperson

**B. Creed:** Up next is a report from the Faculty Senate/University Council Rules, Governance and Elections Committee; and I will turn it over to Emily McKee to lead us through that.

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

Per FS Bylaws, Article 2

1. Nominee – Ben Creed

**E. McKee:** Hello, everybody. We’ve got a few orders of business. Our first item is to elect the Faculty Senate president for the 2025-26 academic year. We have one nominee, Professor Ben Creed. Ben’s letter of acceptance of nomination was emailed to all Faculty Senate voting members last week and is also in your agenda packet and up on the screen. All Faculty Senate voting members present may cast a vote in this election process. The nominee must be approved by a simple majority of those voting. For the voting process, we’ll use the clickers again. It will be the same choices as before, but for the purposes of being thorough, I’ll read it through again. There are three options: 1 or A is yes, to accept the nominee; 2 or B is no, to reject the nominee; and 3 or C is abstain. If you click 3 or C, you are telling us that you’re present but choosing not to vote; and clicking 3 or C will not impact the vote calculation. Pat, could you open that for us.

**P. Erickson:** Anybody else need more time? Okay, we’ll close the ballot. And that passes. [applause]

Yes – 47

No – 0

Abstain – 2

**B. Creed:** Thank you.

**E. McKee:** Thanks, Ben, for serving again.

B. Approve faculty candidates running unopposed to serve on various campuswide committees – walk-in

**E. McKee:** Our next item of business is to approve faculty members who are running unopposed to serve on various campuswide committees. This list was emailed to you separately, as well, from the agenda packet, and it’s also displayed up on the screen. May I have a motion and a second to approve the faculty candidates who are running unopposed. First, David. Second, Pete. Thank you. Do we have any discussion? Seeing nobody approaching the mic, we’ll vote time not with the clickers, but by voice vote. All in favor, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**E. McKee:** Any opposed, say nay. Any abstentions? Okay, so that passes. Thank you very much.

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

**E. McKee:** The next item is to elect faculty candidates, who are running opposed, to serve on various campuswide committees. To complete this process, Pat will be sending a Qualtrics ballot by email following today’s meeting, so you can watch for that.

D. Faculty Senate Personnel Committee 2025-26 – Election of representatives for terms to begin in fall 2025. Those elected to serve on the FSPC must be tenured faculty members of Faculty Senate. Following the meeting, a Qualtrics ballot will be distributed to the tenured and tenure-track faculty members of Faculty Senate.

**E. McKee:** Another item of business is to elect tenured faculty members to serve on the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee for terms beginning in Fall 2025. To complete this process, too, Pat will be distributing another Qualtrics ballot by email following today’s meeting, so you can watch for that. Please note that only the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Health and Human Sciences will need to complete the ballot process this year; so only faculty representing those units will be receiving it.

E. Election of Faculty Personnel Advisor

Nominee – Virginia Naples

Nominee – Carrie Kortegast

**E. McKee:** Our next item is to elect a faculty personnel advisor to serve a three-year term. We have two nominees: Professor Virginia Naples and Professor Carrie Kortegast. These letters of self-nomination are found on pages 14 to 15 and 16 to 17, respectively, in your packets. All Faculty Senate voting members present may cast a vote in the election process. To be elected, a nominee must receive a majority of those votes cast. We will be using the clickers for this process, as well. Again, 1 or A is to vote for the first nominee, Professor Virginia Naples; 2 or B is to vote for Professor Carrie Kortegast; 3 or C is to abstain. And again, if you click 3 or C, you’re telling us that you’re present, but choosing not to vote; and clicking 3 or C will not affect the calculation of the vote. Pat, could you open the poll?

**P. Erickson:** Okay, it looks like that voting has stopped, so we’ll close the poll.

1 – Virginia Naples – 18

2 – Carrie Kortegast – 20

3 – Abstain – 11

**E. McKee:** Okay, it’s a close one. We have our second nominee, Carrie Kortegast, elected. Thank you very much, Carrie. And thank you to both nominees for putting yourselves forward. It’s important to the process.

F. Election of NIU representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Page 18

Nominee – Tiffany Puckett

**E. McKee:** Our final item is to elect NIU’s representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE. We have one nominee: Professor Tiffany Puckett. Tiffany’s letter of self-nomination is on page 19 of your packet. All Faculty Senate voting members present may cast a vote in this process, as well. The nominee must be approved by a simple majority of those voting. For this process, we’ll also use the clickers: 1 or A is to accept the nominee; 2 or B is to reject the nominee; and 3 or C is to abstain. If you click 3 or C, you’re telling us that you’re here, but you choose not to vote, and your clicking 3 or C does not affect the calculation.

**P. Erickson:** Voting seems to have stopped, so I’ll close that ballot.

Yes – 44

No – 2

Abstain – 4

**E. McKee:** And that is approved, so thank you, Tiffany, for your service, as well. And that wraps it up for me. Thanks, everybody.

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

**X. Items for Faculty Senate Consideration**

1. Annual Academic Program Report

Marc Falkoff, Academic Planning Council Assistant Chair

Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President

**B. Creed:** That brings us to items for Faculty Senate consideration. We have two items under this. The first one is the annual academic program report, which you’ll see included in your packet on pages 20 to 21. It’s going to be myself and Marc Falkoff presenting it. I’ll move to that other mic, just so it feels more official, I guess.

**M. Falkoff:** My role is to let Ben talk and to nod sagely behind him.

**B. Creed:** He did promise that he would be nodding. I just want to, first, start with a little bit of background. I know we’ve briefly mentioned this topic before. But as we go over this, you may want to bring up the annual academic program report, which was shared yesterday with the faculty senators, and then also the letter, which is in your packet. The background here is: This was initiated by the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee in November of 2024. From that initial ask by the Board of Trustees, I have worked collaboratively with Provost Elish-Piper to ensure shared governance bodies were engaged at various key steps along the way.

The Academic Planning Council, which is a body of the Faculty Senate, has had several meeting where they weighed in on the process, discussed the various metrics, saw early versions of the report and offered feedback along the way. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee is another shared governance body that was engaged and informed a few times in the ways you can see on the screen. At the same time, the provost worked with the deans in order to ensure that they had access to the process and could inform the process, share information or perspectives on the metrics and saw reports along the way, as well.

All of the feedback that was brought together through the APC, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the deans, myself, the provost and the Provost’s Office, came together to create that report that was shared with you all yesterday. The Provost’s Office is the team that pulled the data, cleaned the data, prepped the files and did their iterative work, so I just want to make sure to give kudos to that team for all of the effort that went into it.

That final report is being brought here for the Faculty Senate to look over, along with that written document. Hopefully, you’ve had a chance to look at both of those reports. Within the report, you’ll see that there are metrics related to staffing, credit hours, enrollment, retention and degrees conferred. Every piece of data that’s included has a three-year trend to it. We chose three years, because that’s kind of post-COVID. As we go forward, we may add another year or two, dependent on the metrics being presented.

The written narrative that’s in your packets was something that I took the leadership on writing and crafting, and then had the APC weigh in on. The idea is that both the written report and the annual academic program report should be thought of as alpha versions. These are really the first iterations of this, and we have been building a process for the upcoming academic year so that it’s a continuous improvement cycles, where we can make sure that both reports, both the narrative, as well as the data, are improved as we go forward.

This is somewhat small text, but the idea here, the main take-away, is you can see it’s going to be a year-long process as opposed to just a couple of months process. And the idea is that each year, you’ll go through a cycle where in the fall the Academic Planning Council will take up the report and any sort of lessons learned from the previous year, take a look at the measures and metrics that were used, think about what more relevant or better or more accurate or more timely information could be included in that report, share those recommendations with the Provost’s Office and their team. Then that draft report will be polled on that data. And then feedback will be taken from APC and other groups on campus. Ultimately, the Academic Planning Council will craft the narrative document going forward, in collaboration with the Faculty Senate president. And all of that will be routed in a way that, hopefully, contributes to campus’ knowledge and transparency of data related to our academic programs across campus.

We’re using this request that came from the Board of Trustees in a way to further promote the general commitments that we all hold toward more transparency, more data-informed conversations and more decisions that are able to use consistent shared data as we go forward, and to help facilitate learning on campus.

One of the things that we would like is for this group, if there’s any concerns or questions about the data in the report, to please share them after this meeting. I’ll send out an opportunity to share that feedback with me so that I can then share it with the Academic Planning Council for next year, as well as the Provost’s Office, so we can continue improving as we go forward.

Why are we presenting this here today, besides to inform you and to create this routine and system? Ultimately, we will open it up for conversation about both of these reports. But then, fundamentally, we’re going to ask, by voice vote, if people are willing to make a motion, a second and then affirm that the Faculty Senate can be the signing body and that we can then ask the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees to route this letter, this written narrative, along with the data report, forward. So, we’re not asking if the Faculty Senate will approve the data report going forward. That’s not our ask. Our ask is this narrative component with it.

Before I open it up to questions or comments from the floor or discussion, I’m going to see if, Marc, you had anything to add? Did you do your job in nodding? Yes? Good. All right, are there any questions or comments about this?

**D. Valentiner:** I have a question for clarification. Is this going to be a one-time thing, or is this going to be an annual process?

**B. Creed:** The intention is that it will be an annual process as kind of a annual review of all the programs on consistent metrics. And the hope is that, going forward, too, that we can use this report in things like Academic Planning Council or in the Faculty Senate to inform our conversations and allow also departments or schools and colleges to be able to easily understand what’s going on across campus.

**D. Valentiner:** And did you consider the work burden that this adds. I mean, on an annual basis, that sounds like it’s going to be a lot of effort that goes into it every year.

**B. Creed:** Agreed. And as this year – I don’t know if members of the APC would agree – but the hard work of culling the data and knowing what data is available, pulling the report, doing the iterative process of – I think we’re on version maybe 11, maybe Laurie knows what the final version number was – but that was all owned by the Provost’s Office and her team. And it was intentionally decided to prioritize data that was already collected within our system so that new data collection was needed for this go-around. And if anything is recommended going forward, that we would start building the processes so that it wouldn’t fall on a faculty member or a chair or a dean even to collect the data is a customized way. The idea here is that these were all data points that were already in some system on campus.

**M. Van Wienen:** Hi, Mark Van Wienen. Can you articulate a little bit how this process, this annual process of reviewing programs is related, or not, to the regular program reviews that take place on a rotating schedule, which has a longer frame, whatever it is, seven years or what have you?

**L. Elish-Piper:** The program review that the IBHE requires in an eight-year rotation. The Board of Trustees requested this annual summary report to provide them data on a more regular basis, because they felt that only getting a summary report every eight years didn’t really allow them to have a good handle on our academic programs and what’s going on across those on a regular basis. So, this will be an annual report as per the request of the Board of Trustees to sort of, I guess I would say, complement what’s required in the eight-year program review cycle by the IBHE.

**E. McKee:** Hi, Emily McKee. I would just – I’m not sure – I don’t have a position on this, but I want to raise a concern, which is that, in order to be low demand, these are necessarily all quantitative data that are already available and are, therefore, limited in the scope of the picture that they can actually paint of the programs. Program review within departments has been moving toward being more inclusive of qualitative data, which I think is really important. And this seems to be moving in the opposite direction. And I would be wary of seeing this as a legitimate proxy and being overly confident in what it really tells us. So, I would want to urge us to use this with caution and not try to put too much weight into something like this.

**B. Creed:** I agree with that, that I would caution no decision should be made off of this data by itself. But it, hopefully, will give a couple of key metrics about a program that we can then, whether it’s us as faculty members or whoever would use this, can then ask other questions that we can use more relevant and accurate data, and contextualized data, for any sort of decision making. And I think that’s part of where the caveats came from as the primary focus of the narrative letter is a list of warnings or caveats. But if there’s something that we can add, we can always consider adding that in as part of an approval of this written narrative. But I think your point is well taken by me that this data is very simple. It’s very quantitatively driven. It doesn’t tell the full context of the why or the how or the what even.

**L. Elish-Piper:** I’ll jump in again to say that I agree completely. This is a summary report, it was our version 1.0. The APC, for example, did discuss if there were ways that we could add in more descriptive or qualitative data; and we did not have that consistently available across all programs. But that doesn’t mean that that wouldn’t be something that we could look at in the future if it was determined that that would be helpful to include such information. And also to reiterate Ben’s point, this is a snapshot of our academic programs. It is insufficient for making any sort of decisions by itself. And so, we think that it is a valuable resource to just provide that snapshot, but certainly we do understand the limitations. And when we present this to the Board of Trustees at the May meeting, we will also reiterate that to make sure that it’s clear that this is just a snapshot and doesn’t provide all of the detail and all of the intricacies and all of the unique factors and features in each of our academic programs.

As this is an endorsement, or an agreement to approve these two asks, what I would ask is for a motion to be made to cover these two things. We can use the language on the screen if you would like. A motion, a second, and then we’ll just take a voice vote.

**T. Arado:** I move to approve the language on the screen [To approve the Faculty Senate serving as the body officially signing the written report, and to ask the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees to share the written report with the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee by way of inclusion in the official report.].

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Therese. A second? Thank you, Pete. Any further discussion or commentary on this?

**A. Finch:** Hi, Alicia Finch in the Department of Philosophy. I guess I just have this – I’ve been sitting here the whole time with concerns. And my concern is that we can tell the Board of Trustees whatever we want, but what will make them believe us. And I guess I’m a little bit uncomfortable if the Faculty Senate, if we as a body don’t think that the Board of Trustees should be doing much with this snapshot of data, maybe we shouldn’t be the body that signs it. I feel like if we vote for this, we’re kind of saying, “yes, we think the Board of Trustees should get this data every year.” Do we really, do we mean that? I guess that’s just the concern I’m raising, because I’m just concerned about what they’re going to do with this. And I say that as somebody who’s in a small department – philosophy – that’s the butt of a lot of jokes. And so, I just wouldn’t want us to get in a situation where we just hand the Board of Trustees the tools to start chopping up our departments. That’s my concern.

**B. Creed:** I can go first, Laurie, and then you can jump in if you want. And the same thing, Mark. Sorry to make you stand. I think, first, the Board of Trustees has the right to ask for this report, regardless of what we feel about it. That’s my understanding is that this is well within their scope. And so, what we’re asking again for the Faculty Senate to do is to send along a written narrative saying there are limitations with the data. It’s limited, that it should be taken that way. And if the letter is not clear enough for that, we can figure out a way to update that letter, improve the letter and the language in it. Or, we can also choose not to send anything with it and just have the data go by itself. The data, from my perspective, is going to go with us or not. And so, we can decide, do we be involved in the whole process of making it better than maybe it would otherwise be, or at least being part of that iterative process to improve it. And then also, creating a wrapper around saying there are a lot of caveats. This is simple quantitative data based on a simple set of metrics. There’s a lot more information out there. That’s why I think the Faculty Senate should send a letter along with it. If this letter’s not the right one, I’m open to that. I make a lot of mistakes, pretty much everyday, ask my kiddos.

**A. Finch:** No, no, I just want to clarify. So, the data’s going either way. So, we’re not endorsing it?

**B. Creed:** We’re not endorsing the data at all. It’s simply the letter.

**A. Finch:** Okay, so all we would be doing is saying, “Hey, we want to have a voice in at least saying what we think the data means or what its limitations are,” or something like that?

**B. Creed:** Correct. And we’ve discussed deeper and longer letters where we went college by college or program by program. But that is too much of an ask for us to contextualize every data point as far as workload goes and stuff like that. So, this is more holistically about like, we were involved, we endorsed the process of being involved throughout. And then we want to put caveats on it.

**J. Justice:** Jen Justice, subbing for Scott Stalcup today in the English Department instructor staff. This is more just a clarification. Assuming that this data exists and is, therefore, accessible and not something that we can control, that it’s going, has there been communications with union representatives on methods of recourse should it start to be used in a way? Is that an avenue that we could preemptively look at, if it has not been already, not in the assumption that it would be misused, but in the idea that having collated data without context is a problem and potential trap; and, therefore, having some idea of what responses are available to us should it be used in a way that is harmful to our departments. Is that something that has been considered or could be considered?

**B. Creed:** I have not talked with anybody, faculty-wise or with the provost, about the union involvement and recourse and stuff like that. We already have policies in collective bargaining agreements and structures in place that this doesn’t fundamentally change, that we still have those avenues for response or to address concerns as it goes forward. I guess that’s my response, is that it hasn’t been directly connected and talked about, what role the union should play in this. And my sense is this is a shared governance, shared leadership within the structures of the university to create the report, to inform the report, to write a letter about the report within the university. If the union wants to respond and share a letter on behalf of the union or make public statement or public comment, there is obviously avenues and channels for that to occur. But this is through the formalized shared governance processes of the APC and the Faculty Senate. I don’t know if that satisfies, answers the question. I probably completely missed it. I express myself on my face too so that’s what I’m reading. I apologized if I missed it.

**D. VanTilburg:** Hi, student representative for the College of Liberal Arts. I just didn’t see within the data if there’s a way to show the interrelation between all the departments. And is there an approach that you’ve been looking at to add on to it later down the road. If we are to do this yearly as a university, we should remind the Board of Trustees that you can’t just get rid of one portion of this; it will have effects with everyone else.

**B. Creed:** Laurie, feel free.

**L. Elish-Piper:** This is version 1.0. We had a really tight timeline to put this together. And one of the things that we really wanted to do was to try and provide more connections or context in the report. Really the only thing that we were able to do with the short timeline that we had was to show the three-year trends. We felt that that at least showed some movement or some pattern over time. But we absolutely are interested in looking at ways to make the report more useful. We really want this to not only inform the Board of Trustees and respond to their request to be able to see an annual summary of academic programs on our handful of metrics, but we really

want this report to be a valuable resource for programs. We want to make sure that data is more accessible and that it can be used. It can be helpful in planning. It can be helpful in generating additional questions and seeking additional data to drive that continuous improvement process.

When the Board of Trustees requested this report back in November, one of the first things that was brought up was the role that shared governance should play in the development of the set of metrics that we would use, and also in the process of preparing and finalizing the report, because we wanted to make sure that we were able to take those voices into consideration. And so, I think that we were able, this first year, work collaboratively with Faculty Senate, specifically with the APC, but also with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and Ben, to get that input. But we know that the report is version 1.0; and so, we absolutely are interested in looking for ways to make it better. So, if people have feedback on different metrics or different ways that we could show patterns or trends or connections, we would absolutely be interested in that feedback, so we can prepare a version of the report next year that builds on what we did this year, but is more informative and more useful.

**E. McKee:** Emily McKee again. I would have one suggestion for the letter, itself; well, two suggestions. One, for the framing of the letter, I think it would be, in my opinion, useful to include a caveat that’s more strongly worded, perhaps, this should not be the basis for decisions. This should be a basis for starting conversations, for asking questions, for figuring out where to look further. I would also suggest that maybe one of the caveats that might be included – and I agree with the student rep’s comment, as well – is that just by the nature of the way these data are arranged and what’s available, it presents a picture very much of department by department, and misses a lot of the interdisciplinarity, misses a lot of the overlap of people who have a foot in two places or a class that serves multiple programs, things like that. So, that might also be worth putting in the caveats – that it misses some of the interdisciplinarity, because it necessarily puts it in one box or another, the headcount or the credit hour.

**B. Creed:** Thank you, Dan, and thank you, Emily. Maybe what we can do then is, right now the last paragraph starts out, “As such, the attached report should be seen as baseline information, providing a narrow snapshot of a limited set of metrics related to NIU’s academic degree programs … and therefore should not be the basis for any decisions – adding that. And then maybe another caveat saying, “Programs are not” – if you give me permission to wordsmith a little bit after the fact, I don’t know if we can do that, but we can figure that one out. But to say something like, “Departments and programs are presented as siloed programs and misses the nuance and interconnectivity of courses, programs and of what different departments do,” like the flatness of the data should be a bulleted caveat, as well. So, I would say, with those two changes, do we need to take any sort of motion to amend the motion, or can we just maybe accept with the voice vote with those two additions, that we have recorded, that we add in the direct language in that sentence, “and as such should not be used as the justification or basis for any decision.” And then the additional caveat saying, “These are very discreet data points, rather than their true interconnective nature of it? This side of the room is nodding, so I can look over here, sorry. All right.

So, then I think with those two caveats, we can ask for a voice vote to approve our signature and then passing along the letter to the UAC to the BOT. And what I will also commit to doing is sharing that letter, once it’s finalized, back out with this group so you can see it.

All right, so all in favor, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

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

**W. Mills:** I will abstain.

**B. Creed:** Abstain, thank you, Bill. Thank you for standing with me, Marc. You did a better job at the rally, but you did a great job here too.

B. Endorsement of NIU action calling for constructive engagement

Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President

**B. Creed:** Next up is another similar type of item, as far as an endorsement goes. This is related to what Provost Elish-Piper mentioned in part of her announcements, which is NIU signing on to the [Call for Constructive Engagement](https://www.aacu.org/newsroom/a-call-for-constructive-engagement) that the [American Association of Colleges and Universities](https://www.aacu.org/newsroom/a-call-for-constructive-engagement) put out. On Tuesday, NIU President Freeman added her signature to the initial call and signature release. At the beginning, it was 150 colleges; now, as Provost Elish-Piper noted, we’re over 200 educational institutions and organizations, including five or more, depending, I’m not sure of the latest count, Illinois public institutions, have signed on. President Freeman and I had briefly discussed this prior to the signing, and I just want to share that I am fully in support of this action that she took on behalf of the institution.

What we’re asking for today is, as Pat put in the email, a “heck yeah” from the Faculty Senate. We don’t really get to undo anything, but it’s more that we get to put our voice out there saying we agree with this action, and we support the actions that were taken on behalf of NIU. If the Faculty Senate does endorse today, our signature for that, it will also enable me to work in coordination and collaboration with the Council of Illinois University Senates, which is beginning to talk about how do we collectively share a faculty response, as well, to this call, that supports those institutions that have signed on and share those commitments, as well. It also allows me to work with the National Council of Faculty Senates, and I’ve already been in contact with the president of that group, and there is work to coordinate, again, as a national kind of corollary to this work that was asked of the institutions as themselves to speak for the faculty, as well, directly.

So, that is what the endorsement does. One, it’s a way to put an exclamation mark on it. And the other one is that it enables me to move forward with those other conversations, to do that coordinating and collaborative work across faculties across the country.

For this one, it would just be a motion to endorse NIU’s action of signing the Call for Constructive Engagement, a second, and then we would take a voice vote after any discussion. So, can I have a motion? Thank you, Taylor. A second, James. Any discussion or conversation? So, then we will take a voice vote. All in favor of endorsing the action, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** Opposed? Abstentions? Great, well, thank you all. [applause]

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

A. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – report

Tiffany Puckett, NIU representative to FAC-IBHE

**B. Creed:** All right, that brings us to our reports. The first one up is our Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE report from newly re-elected Tiffany Puckett.

**T. Puckett:** First of all, thank you for re-electing to this very important position. I look forward to my continued service. FAC has not had another meeting in between our last Faculty Senate meeting; however, we’ve had a lot of conversation via email around the different responses to students having their visas revoked, as well as the different various resolutions that universities and different organizations are creating in response to the president’s executive orders. We do have a meeting tomorrow, and that is going to be hosted by Joliet Junior College, followed by two additional meetings, one in May and one in June, both in Springfield. I will be participating in those three upcoming meetings. Thank you, and I hope everyone enjoys their summer, and I look forward to continuing serving you in this position. Thank you. [applause]

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

Felicia Bohanon, Natasha Johnson, Ben Creed

Brad Cripe, Larissa Garcia, Tom Skuzinski

**B. Creed:** The UAC to the BOT, we have not met since the last time Faculty Senate met. As was mentioned at the May 8 meeting, that report will go forward, but that is the next meeting of the subcommittees. And then the June Board of Trustees meeting is when the final budget recommendations for the university will be heard and, ultimately, approved.

C. Baccalaureate Council – no report

Alicia Schatteman, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

**B. Creed:** There is no report from the Baccalaureate Council.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – no report

Therese Arado, Chair

**B. Creed:** The Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee does not have a report.

E. Social Justice Committee – report

Ben Creed, FS President

**B. Creed:** And Social Justice Committee’s report, which I mentioned earlier, we were working through a survey to follow up with those new-to-NIU faculty members to help guide the work not just of the Social Justice Committee, but of campus, in better supporting those members of our faculty, who are newest to our campus. And they are working through a similar process of identifying topics and routines to bring data and information to that body in a rhythmic and routine way in the upcoming academic year.

F. Student Government Association – no report

Ja’kobe Jones, SGA President

Manny Corpuz, Speaker of the Senate

**B. Creed:** SGA, I do not believe has a report today.

G. Operating Staff Council – no report

Natasha Johnson, President

**B. Creed:** Operating Staff Council, no report.

H. Supportive Professional Staff Council – report

Felicia Bohanon, President

**B. Creed:** And then, Felicia, I think we have a report from Supportive Professional Staff Council.

**F. Bohanon:** We did present two SPS Dependent Scholarships. One went to Isabella Montoya, who is a health sciences major, and she received a scholarship in the amount of $750. And then we also made an award to Mya King, who is a leadership management major, and she received $1250. The SPS Staff awards went to Scott Mooberry for advocacy, Felicia Bohanon for cultural competency, April Startzel for excellence in supervision, Phil Voorhis for institutional advancement and also Liz Guess for partnership and collaborations. We elected our SPS personnel advisor, who is Cody Carter.

I had hoped to be able to share the results of the SPS survey, but when I started looking at the data, there were some errors. And so, I thank that committee, but what I did want to share with you were some of the concerns that came up. The last question asked, “What are the issues and concerns would you like the SPS Council to address?” Many of the issues that were brought up at the beginning of this meeting are similar concerns the staff have. So, they talked about budget challenges make it difficult to plan for staff professional development and departmental progress. Staffing. Workloads. Career advancement. I have a concern about financial resources available to provide merit increases to staff who do great work, bring in new projects and increase funding above and beyond. Also, there was a concern about LGBTQ awareness, particularly on transgender visibility. Higher wages. And then also creating a path to incentivize high performers. How do we give merit increases? Is there a path for SPS personnel? We should be treated in a similar manner to faculty members at NIU. Pay raises. Merit increases. Equity adjustments. Pathways for promotion. Etc. And then lastly, in terms of institutional transparency, are budget challenges and opportunities for SPS advocate for real [inaudible] professional development. Back-up through leadership HR to addressing personnel issues and not just simply telling units with limited budgets to figure it out and handle the critical benefits of FMLA, etc. And we have in recent months had the provost, also President Freeman came to speak to us last month. We also had John Acardo. A lot of these issues are issues that the SPS Council has been addressing directly, in terms of being able to move forward. But these were some of the concerns. And I will, when the data is available, share that so it can be shared out. Thank you.

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

**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. [Annual Report](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/annual-reports/index.shtml) – Carrie Kortegast, Faculty Personnel Advisor

Q. [Annual Report](https://www.niu.edu/university-council/committees/annual-reports/index.shtml) – Ben Creed, Faculty Senate President

R. 2025-26 FS schedule:

Sep 3, Oct 1, Oct 29, Nov 19, Jan 21, Feb 18, Mar 25, Apr 22

S. [Spring Commencement](https://www.niu.edu/commencement/)

Graduate School – Friday, May 9, 4 p.m.

Undergraduate – CLAS, CEET, CVPA – Saturday, May 10, 10 a.m.

Undergraduate – CEDU, CBUS, CHHS – Saturday, May 10, 2 p.m.

**B. Creed:** That brings us to our informational items. A through O are the standard informational items. You’ll see that the annual reports from Carrie Kortegast, who is our faculty personnel advisor, and my annual report as Faculty Senate president, are included in the packet on P and Q. You’ll see the schedule for the upcoming year’s Faculty Senate meetings. You’ll see also the spring commencement. And I will share some of the opportunities for celebration related to graduation, as well, in the post-meeting summary.

**XIII. Adjournment**

**B. Creed:** As we move toward adjournment, I just want to say again, thank you for a good academic year and the work and the collaboration as we go forward. And I look forward to continuing to serve in this role for campus.

Can I have a motion to adjourn the meeting? Pete, it’s a good last moment, right? And a second? Thank you, Lori. All in favor of adjourning the meeting, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**B. Creed:** Thank you. Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.