All University Council members will receive an Outlook invitation to this Teams meeting. Others wishing to join the meeting, please send your request to Pat Erickson at pje@niu.edu, no later than 12 noon, April 29.


VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Feniza, Lang, Martin, Penrod, Polansky, Staples, White,

OTHERS PRESENT: Blazey, Boutin, Bryant, Chinniah, Conderman, Dawe, Douglass, Falkoff, Hunt, Jensen, W. Johnson, Klaper, McCartney, McEvoy, Miner, Park, Walther, Wesener Michael

OTHERS ABSENT: Ferguson, Gelman, Groza, Hanna, Kortegast, Marsh

I. CALL TO ORDER

L. Freeman: I have 3:00. Pat, how are we on quorum?

P. Erickson: We have met quorum.

L. Freeman: All right, without further ado, I’m going to call the meeting to order.

Meeting called to order at 3 p.m.

L. Freeman: And the first order of business, I’m going to ask Pat to remind us of virtual meeting etiquette.

P. Erickson: Our etiquette is that we are all going to mute our cameras and our microphones when we’re not speaking. And, if we have a question or a comment that we want to make during the meeting, we’re going to type “question” or “comment” in the chat box. Our thanks to Jeffry [Royce], who is monitoring the chat box, and he’ll keep us up to date so that we can address anything that comes up in the chat box when there’s an appropriate time.
L. Freeman: Thank you, Pat. I think we’re all getting pretty good at this by now, but it’s always helpful to have a reminder.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

L. Freeman: Roman number II is Verification of Quorum, and Pat actually did that just a moment ago.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

L. Freeman: So, I think we’re ready to move to Roman numeral III, Adoption of the Agenda. And we’re going to do this by asking for a motion and a second in the chat box, but then doing a reverse vote. So, if you’re against adopting the agenda, you chat “no.” Otherwise, you stay silent. Did I say that correctly?

P. Erickson: Yes, that’s exactly right.

K. Thu: That’s how we did it in Faculty Senate last week.

L. Freeman: All right, so is there a motion to approve? So moved by Therese [Arado] and seconded by Reed [Scherer]. So, all opposed, type “no” in the chat box. Seeing no objections, I’m going to assume that the agenda is approved.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 26, 2020 MINUTES – Pages 4-6

L. Freeman: We’ll now move on to Roman numeral 4, Approval of the February 26, 2020 minutes, which are found on pages 4 to 6. Again, may I have a chat motion to approve? Therese [Arado] again, she’s fast. Richard [Siegesmund] and Cathy [Doederlein] dueling to second. We have a motion and a second. If you are opposed to approval of the February 26, minutes, please chat “no.” All right, having waited, I believe, a respectable amount of time, I’m going to move on to Roman numeral V.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

L. Freeman: Public Comment, and ask Pat to verify that there have been no requests for public comment?

P. Erickson: That’s correct; there have been no requests for public comment.
VI. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Recognition of University Council members whose terms are completed – Page 7

L. Freeman: All right then, I’m going to move on to Roman numeral VI, the President’s Announcements. Let me start by saying good afternoon. And it’s hard to believe how much has changed since we last met together in person in February. I fully expected the final meeting of University Council this semester to be one where we celebrated the significant accomplishments of shared governance, the thoughtful work of students, faculty and staff that led to the adaptation of a test-blind admissions policy, and reimagination of shared governance. I expected that, but I also expected us to be recapping the annual testimony to the General Assembly in Springfield, and reminding you to attend – in person – the myriad academic celebrations that usually take place in the spring, including commencement and the activities related to NIU’s 125th anniversary. I expected to be recognizing Pat Erickson for her significant contributions to this body and to NIU, but I did not expect to be thanking her for learning how to run University Council virtually.

Eight weeks ago, COVID-19 abruptly and significantly disrupted our professional and our personal lives. Together, we moved quickly and aggressively to do our part to ensure the health and wellbeing of our NIU community, to maintain teaching and learning, support our students, and provide flexibility to our employees so that they could work remotely. As I’ve shared before, I’m incredibly proud of what we’ve been able to accomplish together in a short amount of time. I’m proud of the ways that Huskies have united in the face of unprecedented challenge. Thank you.

As the end of the semester nears, we need to pivot from reacting to the initial public health emergency to addressing the longer-term challenges created by the pandemic. And I want to help our faculty, staff and students understand the challenges ahead and the very difficult decisions we’ll need to consider and enact together to ensure NIU’s future. While we continue to assess the full financial impact to date, we know that revenue reductions and real costs are already in the $40- to $50 million range for fiscal ’20. Future revenue losses and delays related to state funding, enrollment, housing, dining and canceled summer programming and events are anticipated to be significant.

My responsibility as NIU’s president is to ensure the sustainability of the university, and I am committed to doing so in ways that are as thoughtful and transparent as possible, respectful of shared governance, and in alignment with our values. There is no one, single action that we can take to get us where we need to be. And everything cannot happen at one time. Measures will need to be taken over the months ahead and will require constant evaluation and reevaluation.

Tomorrow I will communicate to the university community about the first cost-saving measures we will begin to implement to stabilize our finances through the summer and into the fall when tuition revenues will begin to return. And I just want to give you a heads-up now on some of the actions that will be detailed in that communication.

Across the university, we’ve asked our deans and division leaders to immediately suspend purchases that are not time-sensitive or essential. We’ve provided guidance from Procurement on how to reevaluate existing contracts, to identify opportunities to reduce costs or postpone services.
Non-essential capital projects and our campus master planning activities will be postponed. And the university is planning to pause all phone stipends effective June 1, while we reevaluate our policy on phone stipends and outline new eligibility requirements.

We are also implementing a hiring chill. For the foreseeable future, all hiring decisions will require approval by Executive Vice President and Provost Beth Ingram and the appropriate dean and vice president. More detailed guidance on the hiring chill will be forthcoming.

Earlier this year, the university instituted a voluntary retirement incentive program for faculty. And tomorrow, we’ll be announcing a voluntary retirement incentive program for staff. Those who are eligible will receive a separate communication from Human Resource Services next week that will outline program benefits, requirements and the associated timeline.

Finally, recognizing that shared sacrifices will need to be made, our senior leaders have stepped up to help by voluntarily offering to reduce their salaries for all of fiscal ’21. This includes multiple members of NIU’s executive leadership team, including Chief Financial Officer Sarah Chinniah, Athletic Director Sean Frazier, our vice presidents, deans and our highest-paid men’s and women’s coaches. Executive Vice President and Provost Ingram and I will each be taking a 12 percent pay reduction and forgoing our bonuses.

More decisions will need to be made as our circumstances evolve and there is more clarity about enrollment, state appropriations and fall operations. I’m committed to working collaboratively with shared governance and impacted collective bargaining units. That is why I asked Kendall to make sure that the proposed changes to our shared governance structures, changes that I endorse wholeheartedly, include a provision for University Council to operate outside of the academic year to advise the president and provost on critical, time-sensitive budget and other issues affecting the university. COVID-19 is not going to respect our academic calendar, and it’s so important that we continue to work together on decisions.

In closing, I want to thank the members of this year’s Faculty Senate and staff councils, student government and University Council for your thoughtful, substantive and transformative leadership. The names of those who will be completing their terms are in our packets. And I want to specifically recognize their service and contributions. This is a moment in the university’s history. Future generations of Huskies will look back on your accomplishments as a bellwether of shared governance at our university.

I’ll be happy to take a couple of questions now. And cognizant of the need for us to keep the agenda moving forward, I’ll be willing to answer more after we’ve addressed the outstanding business items. I’ll pause there and let the chat show so that Jeffry can direct questions to me. Thank you.

**J. Royce:** It may be helpful to indicate, those of you with questions, you’re more than welcome to just type the word, “question” in the box rather than taking the time to type out the entire question. Then we can call on you accordingly. It looks like Hamid [Bateni] put in a question: Is there any plan to increase tuition fees?

**L. Freeman:** No. As you may remember, our Board of Trustees set tuition and fees relatively flat. I
think we, actually, had a slight reduction in fees, if I’m recalling, at a previous board meeting. And this would certainly be the wrong time, given the impact of COVID-19 on our students and their families to try to balance the university’s budget on their backs. I think we’ve been proactive in recognizing the need of our students. The demand for the Student Emergency Fund made that point quite clear, as we had 3,000 requests and distributed almost $1 million in a little over two weeks. We will not be raising tuition and fees for the coming year.

**J. Royce:** There’s another question from Jim [Wilson]. Will the SEM and Wiley contract be revisited?

**L. Freeman:** That’s sort of a two-phase question. Let me take both parts of it. Let me start by saying, because there’s so much uncertainty, and information is becoming more clear, and conditions are evolving, we’re looking at everything. No decisions have been made, but there is nothing off the table. With respect to the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan, obviously, in our current situation with some of the uncertainty about fall operations, we’ve had to make changes in our enrollment management expectations and tactics. Some of those have been very positive. We’ve actually had more attendance at our virtual admitted student days than we’ve had at our face-to-face admitted student days. In fact, more in one session than we had, I think, all of last year. Vice President Jensen can verify that for us later.

[S. Jensen (via chat box): Correct. Almost 1,000 students have visited our two virtual admitted student day events we’ve hosted so far. Last year we had about 350 students after two on-campus events.]

**L. Freeman:** So, we’re continuing to follow our mission, vision and values to try to make everybody know how attractive NIU is as an option. But we have to be flexible with plans that were made before the pandemic interrupted us.

With respect to the Wiley contract, we’re looking at every contract that the university has to see, what clauses and provisions are there to give us flexibility, and whether or not that flexibility is something that would be advantageous to us.

**J. Royce:** Amanda [Littauer] had a question as well: Is there a timeline for decision-making about on-campus classes in Fall 2020?

**L. Freeman:** You know, I think that the provost is leading that effort, but she and I, and I think the task forces that are working, or are about to be appointed, recognize that we need to make some type of statement no later than July 1, and preferably in the latter half of June. I’m going to ask Provost Ingram if she wants to add anything to that.

**B. Ingram:** Yes, we’re doing a lot of planning. There’s a lot of work going on behind the scenes. There’ll be some task forces that are inclusive of faculty governance, staff and students to help us make those decisions. And certainly, we will be guided by our values and the health and safety of the people who work for us. And our students and our community are foremost among those values as we make those decisions.
K. Thu: I might suggest just one more question, and then I think we’ll have time at the end to come back to you, President Freeman.

L. Freeman: I see a question about how different parts of the university will reopen. And I will say that Matt Streb from the President’s Office has a task force that’s already active and looking at how our staff will return to work with the governor’s executive order is lifted. Looking at things like PPE, plexiglass, social distancing, because the health and safety of our employees is our paramount concern. I don’t think that I’m stealing Matt’s thunder to say I think we’ll be encouraging employees, who can effectively work at home remotely, to do so up and through the end of July. And we’ll be preparing the campus and bringing folks back gradually before that. I know Dr. Blazey is working on a separate plan for reopening research labs, and that will have a different timeline, but there will be plenty of consultation and communication as those plans move forward.

J. Royce: There was, if you’ll indulge one last question, it was one I had typed in, but it’s the last one on the list. Was whether or not tuition waivers might be affected moving forward?

L. Freeman: Do you mean employee tuition waivers?

J. Royce: Yes.

L. Freeman: Okay, because, obviously, we have tuition waivers for students as part of their financial aid packages, as well. At this point, there is no plan to do that.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Reimagining Shared Governance – Pages 8-234
   SECOND READING/ACTION ITEM

L. Freeman: All right, I think we’re at my favorite part of the meeting where I hand the virtual gavel over to Kendall. And it’s so exciting to be doing this for consideration for the first piece of unfinished business. It’s been such a great, collaborative effort across our shared governance groups. So, Kendall, take it away.

K. Thu: Thank you, President Freeman. Before we move on, I just wanted to let everybody know that we have received and read the governor’s executive order concerning the Open Meetings Act. And I shared that with Ferald Bryan, just to make sure that we are complying to the letter. Complying with the Open Meetings Act, as well as following appropriate parliamentary procedures during this, I guess, now the new norm of meetings. So, Ferald, I’m just going to turn to you, like I did at Faculty Senate last week just to confirm that we’re on the up-and-up.

F. Bryan: Thank you, Kendall. Yes. Obviously, the governor’s order, as well as local regulations supersede Robert’s Rules. And I’ve double-checked, and even the American Institute of Parliamentarians has recently released some guidelines on running video meetings. And we’re very much in compliance as far as Robert’s Rules.

K. Thu: Thank you, Ferald. Before I turn to voting procedures, which I’m going to turn to Pat for
her guidance on, just a reminder of where we’re at with Item VII, Unfinished Business, Reimagining Shared Governance. This is a proposal that was introduced to the University Council in February. Of course, as you all know, our March shared governance meetings were canceled. The Faculty Senate, last week, considered its side of the shared governance proposal. It overwhelmingly approved their piece of it, with no conditions for the University Council. That vote was 54 to 6 to 4. So, we’re going to proceed with this vote just in the same way we would in person. However, there’s going to be a twist, because we’re going to do the voting in real time via Qualtrics voting system that, at last week’s Faculty Senate meeting, demonstrated was very effective. So, with that, I’m going to turn it over to Pat to talk about the voting procedure. And she’ll turn it back over to me. I’ll say a few more things about the proposal. And then I’m going to turn to a person that I’ve designated to make the motion. So, Pat, go ahead and take it away.

**P. Erickson:** Okay, hi everybody. As Kendall said, we’ll be using Qualtrics surveys for some of our ballots during the meeting today. When the time comes to vote, we will share the web address for the Qualtrics ballot in three ways: First, we’ll display it on your computer screen, just like you’re seeing that list of voting members on your screen right now. Second, we’ll type it into the chat feature. And then third, I’ll read it out loud. The web address that will be displayed on the screen is not a hyperlink. But the same web address that’s going to be typed in the chat box is a hyperlink. So, when we do that, you can just click on that, and a new browser will automatically open on your computer, taking you right to the ballot. And then you can enter your vote and click submit. If everything goes according to plan, I’ll be able to show you the results just on the screen here, just like you see information on the screen now. And, of course, my constant reminder is that, while we have a number of nonvoting members present today, as well as guests and visitors, as well as a couple newly-elected, but still nonvoting, UC members, remember that you only vote if you’re a voting member. And this is the list that you’re seeing on the screen right now. And that’s all I have, Kendall.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Pat. The proposal that’s before you is before you as a second reading. And the proposal is, as I’ve said before, sort of three big pieces. One is the proposal is to move the academic authority for the university over to Faculty Senate. The second is to reduce the number and size of committees that we have universitywide. And the third is to reconfigure the University Council and Faculty Senate.

With that, we’re just going to proceed like we usually do. I’m going to turn to Ian Pearson to make a motion. And before I turn to you, Ian, I want to say congratulations again on your fellowship. It sounds like we have somebody maybe eating crackers, so if you could turn your mics off? Thank you. I just learned that Ian received a fellowship to study a masters of public affairs at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, starting in the fall. Ian has been a wonderful student and contributed to the university. He’s been working alongside me and Richard Siegesmund, among others, in wading through all of the proposed language changes that have to be made for the proposal that we present to you. Ian tell you that Ian has read every single word of the entire constitution and bylaws, which is no small trick when you’re a full-time student and our Lincoln Laureate. With that, I’ve asked Ian whether he would be so kind as to introduce the motion. So, Ian?
I. Pearson: Well thank. So given parallel amendments approved by Faculty Senate at its April 22 meeting, I move to approve the proposed amendments to the NIU Constitution and the NIU Bylaws, which recognize the authority of the University Council in non-academic matters, change the structure of University Council, and provide for Faculty Senate to be the primary body authorized to deal with academic matters.

K. Thu: Thanks, Ian. And with that, do we have a second? So, we have two seconds [J. Royce, P. Skarbinski] At this point, we’ll open it up for discussion. Just to clarify, nothing has changed since February. The charts are all the same. We caught a couple typos here and there, so we fixed those. All of the proposed languages in the bylaws and constitution are linked in the packets that you got. And if this passes, then it would immediately go to a referendum among faculty, and that would require a majority of faculty to say yes. Because we are proposing changes to the constitution, that would then be followed by a proposal to the Board of Trustees at their June meeting. So that’s the process that we’re looking at. Questions? Comments? And I appreciate, again, all of the input that we’ve had over the course of this year. It’s been very helpful. This is not easy to do. I think it’s the right thing to do. We’re not going to get it all right. I can’t see the rest of Omar’s [Chmaissem] comment there.

J. Royce: I’ll be happy to read it out. Omar mentioned: I noticed that there are 44 seats for tenure-track faculty. I assume the proposal makes it clear that all faculties are included.

K. Thu: That’s right. There’s no change in the tenure-track faculty representation. All of the units that elect their faculty senator to the Faculty Senator remains the same. So, all those units will still be represented.

Well, it maybe that we’ve talked through this so many times that maybe you’re anxious to get to your drink at the end of the meeting. Thanks for the question, Omar. Again, as I think – and I want to recognize Richard Siegesmund as well, because he’s played such an important role in closely reading what we’re doing and providing counsel to me in working on all this. Even when Richard was traveling abroad to I don’t know where it was – Belgium – or wherever, Richard always took the time to chime in and do a teleconference call with us, no matter the time of day. And I know that Richard is going to be retiring. It’s a loss to the university, but congratulations, Richard. You very much deserve it, and we have benefitted from your contributions to the university for many years. It sounds like you’re dying. You’re not dying. You’re not going away. But I really do appreciate all that you’ve contributed.

Additional comments or questions before we move to vote? Okay, well this will leave us a little more time at the end of the meeting for questions for President Freeman. Oh, here we go, go ahead Cathy. I can’t read that, Jeffry. Could you?

J. Royce: Cathy said: Not for anything on this specific motion or vote, but I’d love for us to consider a change in the future where a referendum on changes to the constitution would go to faculty and staff, not just faculty.
K. Thu: Good point. Thanks, Cathy. Others? Okay, I’m not seeing additional comments or question. Let’s go ahead and move to the vote. We have a motion, a second. And now I’m going to turn it back over to Pat to guide us through the voting procedure. Jeffry, you might want to re-post the URL in the chat box several times so folks can link in.

J. Royce: Yes, I’d be happy to. Pat, will you be putting it in the first time?

P. Erickson: I am typing it in right now.

K. Thu: And just so you know, one of our colleagues in political science, Scot Schraunfagel, tried last week to vote twice. And he couldn’t. So, thanks for checking that out, Scot.

P. Erickson: You all should see it in the chat now. And hopefully, you can just click on that and go right to the ballot. I’ll read it if that’s helpful. H-t-t-p-s://forward slash-forward slash-go-dot-niu-dot-edu-forward slash – now here’s the six-digit code – x as in x-ray-s as in Sam-l as in Larry-l as in Larry-c as in cat-z as in zebra.

K. Thu: We’re going to take some time and make sure that everybody has an opportunity to vote. If you are having any problems at all, just indicate so by typing a note in the chat box. [pause] Pat, you have some sort of indication of how many votes have come in so far.

P. Erickson: Yes, I’m just going to refresh my screen. We have 48 people who have voted. We do have a few more voting members in the room than 48, but maybe not everybody wants to vote.

K. Thu: Well, let’s wait another couple of minutes then, just to make sure that everybody has an opportunity. [pause] As I understand it, Pat, then you and Ferald will be conferring to look at the outcome of the vote.

P. Erickson: Right, we’ll be looking to see that we have two-thirds and two-thirds to approve.

K. Thu: Okay. So, I’m going to leave it to you, Pat, to let us know when you think it’s time to close the vote and tally the votes up.

P. Erickson: All right, I’ll refresh the screen one more time, and I see we have 51 votes now, so I think we should call it.

K. Thu: Okay.

P. Erickson: And I’ll share with you in just a second. I’m just bringing it up on my own screen.

K. Thu: Okay.

L. Freeman: I’ve turned on my camera so everyone can see me smile at the result.

P. Erickson: Okay, and there you should see it now: 47 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain. That’s a 92 percent approval rate; we surpassed the requirement. [virtual applause]
K. Thu: Congratulations, everybody, and thank you again to all of those who played such an important role in making this happen. It’s going to put the university in a better place, more efficient, less work for many of us. And I think it’s probably very timely as well, given what’s going on. So, thank you again. I appreciate it. Now we have the small task of implementing the changes over the summer. I look forward to that. And I can’t name you all by name, but you know who you are, who worked closely with me. And I want to send a special shout-out to Pat. We have a lot of praise for Pat, but she's the one who’s been keeping track of all the language strikes and additions and changes through the entire course of the constitution and bylaws; and it could not have been done without Pat’s perseverance and patience and organization. So, thank you, Pat.

P. Erickson: I apologize for being a professional pest.

K. Thu: You’re the best.

L. Freeman: You are the best, not the pest.

K. Thu: Exactly.

K. Thu: Let’s move on to New Business. We have a few items here. I’m going to tackle the first one, letter A, which is the temporary appointment of Dean Ledgerwood. And I’m going to turn to Provost Ingram.

J. Royce: Kendall, if you would allow me to interrupt you very quickly. There was one question that came through. Can you quickly remind the group what the next steps will be?

K. Thu: Yes. As I mentioned, what has to happen next, because we are proposing changes to the constitution, we are required to send out a referendum to tenure-track faculty. I think maybe some of you have been involved in something similar in the past. And we need to have a majority of those tenure-track faculty voting, vote yes. We already have the Qualtrics survey question – we, like I did it. It was Pat – already helped craft the Qualtrics survey. It’s ready to go out, probably tomorrow. Is that right, Pat.

P. Erickson: That’s correct, Kendall.

K. Thu: So, that will go out. The deadline for getting the results back is what, Pat?

P. Erickson: We’re going to make the deadline – I’ll close it on Sunday evening, May 10.

K. Thu: Okay, May 10. Assuming that the faculty agree and vote to approve the change, then it has to be approved by the Board of Trustees. The piece of it that deals with the constitution. The Board of Trustees doesn’t approve our bylaws in the senate or UC. It’s just the constitution piece that requires Board of Trustee approval. They’ve already been alerted that this may be coming down the pipeline. And so we anticipate that that would occur in the June BOT meeting. Did I leave anything out, Pat or Ferald?
**P. Erickson:** I don’t think so.

**F. Bryan:** You covered it.

**K. Thu:** Okay, thank you.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

- **A. Temporary appointment timeline waiver request per NIU Bylaws, Article 19.5.2.2**
  Judy Ledgerwood, Acting Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – Pages 235-236
  Beth Ingram

**K. Thu:** With that, let me move back to letting Provost Ingram take over and talk to us about Item VIII. A. in the agenda.

**B. Ingram:** Thank you, Kendall. And let me add my congratulations as well. It took a lot of work, and I’m really proud to be a Huskie. I also wanted to take a moment here to just publicly thank Laurel Rigertas and Judy Ledgerwood for taking on interim leadership positions this year. This is not what they signed up for. Spring was not easy. And they both led their colleges with vision and thoughtfulness, and really served on my leadership team this year. So, I just wanted to thank both of them.

As you know, we’re going to welcome two new deans on July 1. Bob Brinkmann and Cassandra Hill. Laurel’s appointment, actually, runs until the end of June, but Judy Ledgerwood’s appointment ends on May 15. And according to our bylaws, I am coming to you to ask that we extend her appointment from May 16 until June 30, to span the time between the end of the semester and when Bob Brinkmann will be joining us. And, so this is a motion ask that you approve her temporary appointment timeline waiver so that she can stay on until Bob Brinkmann joins us on July 1.

**K. Thu:** So, do we have a motion to approve? Jeffry, do we have motions and seconds?

**J. Royce:** Provost Ingram made the original motion, and it looks like Ian Pearson was the first to put in so moved, so I guess we’ll give him credit for seconding.

**K. Thu:** Okay. So, any discussion? We’ve done this before, and it’s usually just sort of a proforma move. Okay. If none, I think we’ll do the reverse voting procedure again. If you disapprove of this motion, please indicate by saying “no” in the chat box. Or you can say “abstain” in the chat box. We’ll give you a few seconds, and then we’ll interpret the results. [pause]

[S. Schraunfagel (via chat box): Judy's extension was unanimously approved by the College Senate.]

**K. Thu:** Thanks, Scot. Okay, seeing no “no’s,” I believe the motion is carried. Thank you.

**B. Ingram:** Thank you, everyone.
B. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws, Article 11 Grievance Procedures for Faculty and Staff – Pages 237-267

Therese Arado

FIRST READING

Proposal to waive waiting period

K. Thu: So that brings us Items B, C and D under Item VIII. And I wanted to say a couple words about Item B and C, the proposed amendments to the bylaws. If you look at the bottom of each of those, B or C, you’ll see the last line says, proposal to waive waiting period. And both of these proposals are first readings, so they don’t get a vote. When this was brought to my attention, I thought, well maybe as an option, we could waive the waiting period for a second reading. Usually you have to wait at least a month or one period or one month before you do a second reading. But you can optionally waive the waiting period for the second reading if you get three-quarters of the members to say yes. So, first of all, I want to make sure that everybody understands that this option was my doing, not Therese or Provost Ingram. They weren’t trying to shove this through. It was just me putting this on there as an option.

At our Steering Committee meetings last week, there was a little more concern about the Academic Planning Council change, and whether or not we should waive the waiting period for that, because that’s a pretty significant change, and it hasn’t been – we haven’t had the same amount of time to vet it as we have with the grievance procedure for non-represented faculty and staff. Therese and her group has been working on the grievance procedure for a year and a half. So, that’s had a lot of time and energy put into it. The grievance procedure is more time-sensitive than Academic Planning Council, because, according to the estimates that we’ve gotten, the grievance procedures for non-represented faculty and staff would affect roughly between 400 and 500 employees on campus. So, if we wanted to waive the waiting period for that one, I think that would be more important than probably letter C. I’ve talked to Provost Ingram about not waiving the waiting period for the APC, and I don’t think any of us are going to shed a tear if anybody decides we want to wait a little longer for the APC.

So, with that little caveat, I’m going to turn it over to Therese to talk about the proposed amendment for Article 11 Grievance Procedures for Faculty and Staff.

T. Arado: Thank you, Kendall, I appreciate it. As Kendall mentioned, we have been working on this and looking at changes to this Article 11 for about a year and a half. The group that was involved was really a cross section of the university. There are several in University Council here that participated. So, if any of them realize I missed somebody, please feel free to let Jeffry know in the chat so they can get acknowledged. The group was made up of Lindsay Hatzis, Sarah Garner, Sarah Klaper, Ian Pearson, Jeffry Royce, Holly Nicholson, Pat Erickson, Marlene Bryant, Kevin Reynolds, Cathy Doederlein and Brian Smith. And I am sure there is somebody in that group, or somebody that I missed. But we covered people from HR perspective, people from the Ethics and Compliance Office, all of shared governance. And we met almost monthly for a while, and then a little less frequently, and looked at Article 11 to see how we could improve it for those people who are not covered by any collective bargaining agreement. And that, as Kendall mentioned, between 400 and 500 people, it includes SPS classification, faculty who are not part of collective bargaining. That includes the entire College of Law, as well as faculty who go in and out of administrative
positions. There are Operating Staff positions where people go into a position that’s not part of collective bargaining. So, it’s not like there’s just one group. This is kind of people from a whole variety of places around campus, but they’re all in the same category and don’t have a grievance process in a collective bargaining agreement.

And so, what we did when we looked at this, is we realized that most of it is procedural. And in being procedural, it really didn’t belong in the bylaws. So, if you had a chance to look at Article 11 with the cross-outs, you’ll see that Article 11, itself, has been made into a very short bylaw that, summing it up, says, we believe there should be a grievance process and we have it. And in order, then, to see the procedure for the grievance, we created a separate document that is the grievance procedure document and pulled that all out of the bylaw. So, that’s what we’re asking for today is to approve the bylaw that acknowledges we have the grievance process. And then the process is a separate document that will link to all of the relevant materials.

We tried to also reduce – legalize isn’t the right word – but we tried to reduce the language so that it was clearer, and people knew who was covered by this, how it was covered, and where to go for information. So, we tried to make it understandable for all of us, because it was quite the bylaw prior to this. I don’t know if I can answer questions or if anyone has questions. Maybe first we should have a motion to accept this.

**K. Thu:** We don’t actually have to have a motion.

**T. Arado:** Oh, it’s a first reading, that’s right.

**K. Thu:** So, maybe we can see whether there are any concerns or questions so that we can gauge whether to move ahead with a motion to waive the waiting period.

**J. Royce:** I would be happy to quickly comment in favor of waiving the waiting period, simply because, as you mentioned, this change only impacts those faculty and staff who are not covered by a collective bargaining agreement, which really is not that many faculty and staff on campus. And out of those voting members of this body today, those of us who find ourselves in that group, I think all of us were part of the committee that actually put these rules together. So, as far as the need to go back to our constituents to gain feedback, I think at this point, it may be redundant. And so I would fully support waiving the waiting period.

**K. Thu:** Thanks, Jeffry. And I want to thank you, and particularly thank Therese, for all of the heavy lifting you’ve done in putting this together.

**T. Arado:** This group was great. Fabulous feedback quickly. And you worked with Ian on the other ones, but Ian was really quick at giving feedback too, which was wonderful. He has a good eye for detail. But thank you to all of this group that was involved, really great work.

**K. Thu:** I see a comment from Sean [Farrell] that I can’t completely read.

**J. Royce:** First of all, it looks as if Richard [Siegesmund] officially moved to waive the waiting period. Omar [Chmaissem] seconded. Then as far as discussion, Sean had a comment, I’m trying to
look at it as well. Do we need to have “establishment of” in the article title? It seems a bit awkward to my eye, and the title might simply start with “Grievance Process.”

T. Arado: I think “Establishment of” is because the actual process is not part of the bylaw. The bylaw is – I mean we could certainly reword that if we had a friendly amendment to clarify it – but the bylaw is acknowledging that there is a process and codifying that there is a process. So, that can’t be taken away. And then the process is separate.

K. Thu: Sean, do you want to follow up?

[S. Farrell (via chat box): That’s fine, I guess.]

K. Thu: Other comments or questions? Again, this is a little more time-sensitive, and if there are grievances that come up through the summer, then this would be in place before shared governance reconvenes in August. If there are no other comments or questions, we have a motion and a second to waive the waiting period for the second reading. If that passes, then we would make a motion and get a second to, actually, vote on the proposal as a second reading. So, Pat, I’m going to just turn it over to you once again.

P. Erickson: Okay, give me just a second, I’ll pull up the URL to vote on whether or not we want to waive the waiting period. So, you should see it there, and I will type that in the chat, give me just a moment. Okay, it should be there. Let me know if it’s working or not. I guess I should read it too. H-t-t-p-s-colon-slash-slash-go-dot-niu-dot-edu-m as in mary-7-c as in cat-5-s as in Sam-y as in yarn.

K. Thu: Again, if anybody’s having problems with the vote, please let us know via the chat box.

J. Royce: We do have a comment from Paul [Kassel] asking whether the rules of order require us to utilize the NATO alphabet when reading the URL or not.

K. Thu: I think you’re right, Paul. We need to go back and rescind all of our motions and our votes. How are we looking, Pat?

P. Erickson: Okay, I’m just refreshing the screen. Forty-seven people have voted. We probably have 50 to 52 voting members present.

K. Thu: Let’s wait another minute or so.


K. Thu: So, Pat, we’ll leave it to you to decide when to close.

P. Erickson: I think we can close it. It seems to be stopped there. So, give me a minute to call up that report, and I think this one needs to pass by 75 percent.

K. Thu: Correct.
F. Bryan: Yes, that’s correct, Pat.

P. Erickson: Thank you. And, hopefully, you can see it now. It passes by 95 percent – 47 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain.

K. Thu: Okay.

T. Arado: Excellent. So, now we can move on to a second reading.

K. Thu: Correct.

T. Arado: I won’t repeat why we’re doing this.

K. Thu: Ferald, just to make sure we’re doing this appropriately, does Therese actually have to read it again?

F. Bryan: She should place a motion to pass the amendment. And that needs a second.

K. Thu: Okay, go ahead, Therese.

T. Arado: Okay, so, I move to pass Article 11 as it has been rewritten in our bylaws.

F. Bryan: Move to approve, yes.

J. Royce: And Cathy [Doederlein] has seconded it.

K. Thu: Any remaining discussion? So, I think we need to have a recorded vote for this; so, again, I think we’re going to have to move to a Qualtrics vote so we have a clear record. So, I’m going to, once again, turn it over to Pat.

P. Erickson: Okay, you should see the URL on your screen now, and I’m going to stop talking and type it in. [pause] And now I’ll read it. H-t-t-p-s-colon-slash-slash-go-dot-niu-dot-edu-slash-v as in Victor-t as in Tom-s as in Sam-j as in jump-1-t as in tom. My own alphabet.

K. Thu: So, Paul, did she get it all right?

[P. Kassel (via chat box): Close enough.]

K. Thu: Whenever you’re ready, Pat.

P. Erickson: Okay, I’m just going back into the Qualtrics right now, give me just a second here.

K. Thu: Okay.

P. Erickson: Looks like we have 45 people who have voted. Forty-six. [pause] Seems to be holding at 46, should we close it?
K. Thu: Sure.

P. Erickson: Okay, sorry give me just a second here, I clicked the wrong button. And now you should see it in just a moment. Looks like almost 98 percent; 45 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain.

T. Arado: Wonderful. Thank you, everybody.

K. Thu: Congratulations, Therese, and thanks for all the work all of you put into this. It’s very much appreciated.

C. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws, Article 15.3 Academic Planning Council – Pages 268-270
Beth Ingram
FIRST READING
Proposal to waive waiting period

K. Thu: With that, let’s go ahead and move on to Item C under Roman numeral whatever it was, the first reading of the proposed amendment concerning Academic Planning Council. And I think you’ve already heard my preface to that conversation. So, I’m going to turn it over to Provost Ingram to introduce the motion, introduce the proposed amendment, I should say.

B Ingram: Thanks, Kendall. And as Kendall said, this is something that APC started to talk about in the fall, but probably had a few more discussions in the spring. And I wanted to thank them and Carolinda Douglass who helped to put the language together in this proposed amendment. It was something that, as Kendall said, we haven’t had as much time to think about, but it was tied to the reorganization that we just approved a few minutes ago.

The goal of the proposed bylaw change is to return more authority over program review to the departments and the colleges and streamline academic processes by decreasing the number of approval steps for some of those processes. To summarize what’s going on, the APC, which would receive program review reports and provide input on the program review process but would no longer be responsible for conducting program review. That would revert to the colleges. And for accredited colleges, the accreditation process can serve as that program review. So, that decreases the amount of work that the faculty are doing at the central level pretty substantially.

The final approval for new academic programs within shared governance would be held by Baccalaureate Council for undergraduate level proposals and the Graduate Council for graduate level proposals. So, the additional layer of approval by APC would be removed, but there would be two faculty governance groups that managed new program approvals.

The membership of APC would be decreased due to the decreased workload. The APC would not, actually, be doing program review any longer. So, it would include eight faculty members, one from each college and one from the University Libraries, one student, either a graduate or undergraduate, and two ex officio members from the administration, myself as executive vice president and provost, and the vice provost for institutional effectiveness, who is also our accreditation liaison officer here at NIU.
The APC would report directly to the Faculty Senate and will retain, and I think perhaps enhance its role in serving as a voice of the faculty, in advising me and the Faculty Senate on policy issues and proposed changes to academic policies. So, in my mind, what this does is it takes away some of the work that APC has been doing and moves it to a more local level, but enhances the APC’s role in thinking about university-wide policies that govern academics and being the voice of the faculty in those deliberations, but also being responsive to the new Faculty Senate configuration in moving academic policies forward.

Honestly, I think, as Kendall said, if we want to take more time to think about this and get more input, I think that would be entirely appropriate. I do think APC is going to be playing a strong role starting in the fall, given our response to COVID and a lot of the policy changes that we would want input on or changes in how we are managing academics.

Apparently, there’s a typo. It says “prosed” instead if “proposed.” A prosed article is also nice. Is that a word, prosed?

K. Thu: As long as it’s appropriately prosed. Questions, comments?

J. Royce: It looks like Richard has a question.

R. Siegesmund: I have a question regarding if the change is left for a second reading, to be addressed in the fall when University Council reconvenes, how much summer work of the programs that would be expected to produce their program review reports, would have to go on in a sense? If we move today, are we saving a lot of pain amongst our colleagues who would probably need to prepare those reports for submission early in the fall?

K. Thu: Good question. Beth, can you answer that?

B. Ingram: Part of this bylaw change is to move program review closer to a local level, and I don’t think – I would assume that this would pass in the fall. And so, we would probably need to keep operating the way we’re operating now until the bylaw was actually changed.

K. Thu: Other questions or concerns? I mean we certainly can put this on the agenda for the very first meeting in the fall and certainly get it circulated again to make sure that people have adequate time to vet it.

B. Ingram: And if you have feedback today or questions today, certainly it would be nice to know what those are.

K. Thu: Absolutely. So, unless we hear a motion to waive the waiting period, we can just leave it as is, and we’ll come back to it in August. I’m still contemplating Richard’s question. What kind of a bind might this put programs in that are – do you see any problems with this? I don’t know whether Carolinda’s on this call or maybe Beth, to give that anymore thought? I don’t know what the problems would be, but.
B. Ingram: There is a motion to waive the waiting period [in chat box].

J. Royce: There are two motions, so maybe we would consider that to be a motion and a second. [R. Siegesmund and B. Bond noted in chat box.]

K. Thu: Okay.

J. Royce: Richard is the first on my screen, at least, with the motion. And Bradley for the second.

K. Thu: Okay.

[J. Ledgerwood (via chat box) Programs are beginning to gather the data for their reviews.]

K. Thu: Thanks, Judy. I guess the question, as Provost Ingram has laid this out, does anybody in the UC see a red flag? Certainly, the proposal is in keeping with what we’re trying to do with shared governance in general. So, we have a motion. We have a second. Do we have anymore discussion? This is a motion to waive the waiting period. Are you okay, Beth, moving ahead?

B. Ingram: Yes.

[L. Elish-Piper (via chat box) It’s a good idea in my opinion.]

[H. Bateni (via chat box) I like to support the idea as a member of APC.]

K. Thu: Thanks Hamid. So, Pat, you’re putting in yeomen’s voting work today.

P. Erickson: Okay, you should see it on the screen.

[F. Bryan (via chat box) Requires a three-fourths vote to waive the waiting period.]

K. Thu: Thanks, Lori and Ferald.

P. Erickson: And now it should be in the chat. H-t-t-p-s-colon-slash-slash-go-dot-niu-dot-edu-slash-x as in x-ray-5-c as in cat-o as in owl-t as in Tom-g as in golf. [pause] And can somebody type in the chat and let me know if it’s working.

K. Thu: Yes, it’s working. It worked for me anyway.

P. Erickson: Thanks. [pause] Forty-five people have voted. [pause]

K. Thu: Leave it up to you again, Pat, to signal when we’re closing.

P. Erickson: Okay. Forty-six people have voted. Maybe another few seconds. [pause] Forty-seven. [pause] seems to be holding there. I think we’ll call it.

K. Thu: Okay.
**P. Erickson:** Just a second here. We have 43 yes, 2 no, 3 abstain. It needs to pass by 75 percent, and as you can see, it does.

**K. Thu:** Okay, well congratulations. So, now we need to move to make a motion for the second reading. And Beth, if you want to make the motion.

**B. Ingram:** I so move to have this as a second reading.

**K. Thu:** Do we have a second?

**J. Royce:** Ian Pearson was the first on my screen to second.

**K. Thu:** This is good practice if you ever want to get on Jeopardy. So any further discussion? Seeing none, I’m going to turn it back over to Pat for another vote.

**P. Erickson:** Okay, I’m just going to call up that page. I have to refer to my notes here. And now I’m going to type that. Okay, it should be there now. H-t-t-p-s-colon-slash-slash-go-dot-niu-dot-edu-slash-r-8-r-4-p as in peter-6. [pause] And Hamid is telling me I can cut and paste or copy and paste from the pdf document. Wow, not something I’ve ever done, believe it or not.

**K. Thu:** I always have trouble copying from a pdf document.

**P. Erickson:** Maybe I’ll – I’m a little afraid – on my screen, if I go to it, it’s a live link. On yours’ it is not.

**K. Thu:** Right. So, how is our voting looking.

**P. Erickson:** Okay, let’s check that. Forty-three have voted. [pause] Now forty-five. Maybe a little more. [pause] Seems to be holding at forty-five, which is less than we had before. Anybody else?

**K. Thu:** We might be losing a couple people. I think we’re good, Pat.

**P. Erickson:** Okay. Give me just a second to call that up. And that one is 41 yes, 0 no, and 4 abstain. So that passes.

**K. Thu:** Congratulations.

**B. Ingram:** And let me just say thank you to the members of the APC for the work that they’ve done this year. And to Carolinda who leads a lot of the work that goes on in that committee. And I look forward with the reconstituted committee in the fall.

**K. Thu:** And thank you, Beth, for your leadership on this. And again, my thanks to all the committee members. This makes things cleaner, right, in the fall, so we can all start off with a fresh new starting line for shared governance, and the APC is part of that. So, congratulations, everyone.
D. Student Grievance Annual Report per NIU Bylaws, Article 12.6 – Kendall Thu

K. Thu: The final item under Roman numeral VIII is a student grievance annual report by me. This will be the shortest item on the agenda, which is I have received no student grievances, so there is nothing to report.

IX. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Linda Saborío – report

1. March 20, 2020 FAC-IBHE meeting report – Pages 271-272


K. Thu: To quickly move on to Roman numeral IX, we have our usual slate of reports from councils, boards and standing committees. Linda, are you with us?

P. Erickson: Oddly, I have not seen Linda on the participants list, but her report is in everyone’s agenda packet if they want to look at it.

K. Thu: Yes, I would advise folks to take a look at it if you haven’t seen it. Linda did report to Faculty Senate last week. There were some useful recommendations from the FAC, which were, actually, consistent with what NIU has already done. So, please take a look at those if you have a chance.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
   Jeffry Royce, Catherine Doederlein, Kendall Thu
   Alex Gelman, Sarah Marsh, Jason Hanna

K. Thu: Next we have the UAC, University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. I have nothing to report from that group. So, I’m going to ask whether Cathy [Doederlein] or Jeffry [Royce] or anybody else would like to say anything about the last meeting of the BOT, which was essentially giving emergency powers to President Freeman. I don’t know whether, President Freeman, you want to say anything about that either?

L. Freeman: I would be happy to. To try to get out in front of the permission we would need from the Board of Trustees to be able to pay employees under the unprecedented circumstances of the pandemic, as well as to allow buildings, such as the Holmes Student Center and Neptune, to be used by public health authorities, we needed board approval. At the time that we held the board meeting
to delegate powers related to university operations to the president, we did not yet even have the ability to hold open meetings electronically. And so, Bryan Perry and the General Counsel’s Office on the board worked very carefully to craft a limited delegation of powers so that we could do what we needed to do to take care of the Huskie community. The two items I mentioned are the only things that we used those delegated powers for. And the powers were delegated from the date of the meeting until the May 14 Board of Trustees committee meeting. This week I wrote a letter to Chair Barsema saying that we no longer would need the delegated powers beyond that date, because we now had the ability to meet electronically, and we had taken care of the emergency needs of the university. So, it was a great act of trust by the board and by the university community. I appreciate it. I didn’t take it lightly, but I really do think it helped NIU get out early to do the things we needed to do.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Lisa. Any questions on that front? So, this means that this just sunsets, the BOT doesn’t need to have to take any action?

**L. Freeman:** Right.

**K. Thu:** Okay. Any questions, comments from anybody on this? Okay, if not we’ll move on. Thank you.

**C. Academic Policy Committee – Vicki Collins, Chair – no report**

**K. Thu:** We have no report from the Academic Policy Committee.

**D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Therese Arado, Chair – report**

**K. Thu:** A report from the Resources, Space and Budget so, Therese, you are on again.

**T. Arado:** Hello again. The RSB last met on Friday, March 6. The world was beginning to change in a significant manner at that point; and we’ve since, obviously, moved into a very unprecedented state. But at that meeting, a lot of discussion took place that is still applicable now.

We had a very good conversation with CFO Chinniah and Provost Ingram regarding resources and strategies meeting in prioritizing activities. One of the recurring themes from the committee was that, in making decisions, especially in things at that point, like updating buildings and other facilities, was putting safety first. And so it was very nice to hear today, in thinking about the future and how we reopen things, that safety is a priority. And I know the committee would appreciate hearing that as well.

The other discussions that took place, ironically, were trying to decide what types of things could be streamlined and possibly put online. We didn’t think at that point that it would be everything! But we talked about taking forms and processes online, such as transportation, key control, benefits usage and more. So, while the conversation took place before we had drastic changes, the
conversation really was applicable to what we’re doing now and what the university is looking at now. So, it was good that we were able to have that conversation. Since they can provide some insight into our current environment in the future, it was a good meeting to have right before all of this happened.

And I want to thank the committee for all of the information and the feedback that they gave throughout the year, and CFO Chinniah and Provost Ingram for coming and really being very open and willing to hear people’s thoughts and conversation. It was really, I think, a good group and a good rapport amongst everything. So, thank you all to the committee and to the provost and CFO for their participation.

K. Thu: Thank you, Therese. Any questions for Therese and the committee? Reed [Scherer], I see your comment that you got kicked out of Teams and had trouble reentering. I hope you’re functional now.

E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – report

1. Election of 2020-21 executive secretary of University Council per NIU Bylaws – Page 277

Kendall Thu – Page 278

K. Thu: So, that brings us to Rules, Governance and Elections. I’m going to turn it over to Richard, and, Pat and Richard, remind me, do I need to be kicked out for this conversation.

P. Erickson: Not at all.

K. Thu: Okay.

R. Siegesmund: All right, the final nominee for the office of 2020-21 executive secretary of University Council is Kendall Thu. His letter of acceptance is included in your agenda packet on page 278. And I move to accept this nomination, to close the nominations, and to approve the election of Kendall Thu to this position. May I have a second for that motion?

J. Royce: It looks like Therese [Arado] officially beat me to the second.

R. Siegesmund: All right, okay. So, is there discussion? Hearing none, I’m going to ask Pat to move us to a vote.

P. Erickson: Okay, so you should see the URL up there on the screen and here it is in the chat. It’s h-t-t-p-s-colon-slash-slash-go-dot-niu-dot edu-slash-t as in Tom-7-y-k-s as in Sam-7.

K. Thu: I think, Pat, we may have set a record today with the most votes, the number of votes we’re taking.

P. Erickson: I think so, too. Wasn’t that just lucky!
R. Siegesmund: And considering there was all the debate of whether we could, actually, vote in this kind of an environment, too, just a few weeks ago.

K. Thu: Right.

P. Erickson: Forty people have voted so far. [pause] We’re up to 46. [pause]

[J. Royce (via chat box): I tried to vote twice because Kendall has done such a great job.]

K. Thu: Jeffry, my check is in the mail to you, so look for it.

P. Erickson: I think we’re holding at 46. Shall we call for the results?

R. Siegesmund: Yes, why don’t we do that.

P. Erickson: Okay, give me just a moment.

K. Thu: And while you’re doing that, thanks everyone for your patience. Obviously, this takes a little longer at certain junctures.

P. Erickson: Okay, sorry about that delay. Just a second here. Okay, there we go. 44 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain. Congratulations, Kendall.

R. Siegesmund: Congratulations.

K. Thu: Thank you, everybody.

L. Freeman: I’m going to lead the real applause, while everyone else does chat.

K. Thu: Well, we’ve come a long way this year, but we have a lot of work yet to do. So I appreciate the vote of confidence, and I’ll keep working hard on behalf of everybody.

F. University Affairs Committee – Hamid Bateni, Chair – no report

K. Thu: We have no report from Hamid.

G. Student Government Association – report
Naomi Bolden, President
Ian Pearson, Speaker of the Senate

K. Thu: We have the Student Government Association. I don’t believe, is Naomi with us?

N. Bolden: Yes, here I am.

K. Thu: All right. Well, we certainly want a final report from you and Ian. So, take it away, Naomi.
N. Bolden: Yes. It has been a long road. I just want to say first, thank you to everybody for just constant support and always being there for SGA. I know I speak for both Ian and myself, when I say we really appreciate it. This is my last official report as being a part of University Council. And even a part of SGA, this is my last term. I’ll be graduating in December, so for some of you, this may be the last time that we see each other, but I just want to say that it’s been really great being able to serve alongside you all. And I really hope that things change for Antonio [Johnson] and for Brad [Beyer] for next year, and they get to have the same experience with you all that Ian and I have. So without further ado, I will go ahead and introduce Antonio Johnson, who is my successor as the fifty second president of the Student Government Association.

A. Johnson: Hello everyone. I’m honored to be here, and I look forward to working with you all in the future.

K. Thu: Hey, Antonio. Good to have you. We look forward to working together. Thank you so much, Naomi, for all you’ve done this past year. It’s been a challenge for everyone. And we certainly look forward to seeing what a bright future you have, Naomi. I believe law school is someplace in your future.

N. Bolden: Yes, I am applying for fall 2021, and I can say definitely that NIU is on that list. So, I may be seeing you all for another four years, who knows.

K. Thu: Thank you, Naomi. And then Ian.

I. Pearson: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. For my last University Council report, I’d like to first thank Kendall, Jeffry and Cathy for their leadership on campus and also for their personal mentorship all year. I really appreciated it. And I really enjoyed my time serving in shared governance. I wanted to provide a quick summary on how we’ve adapted to our new virtual climate. The SGA Senate canceled its March meetings in order to plan for a virtual April. We were able to hold three meetings in the month of April to conduct essential business such as passing a fiscal ’21 budget, electing a new senate speaker, and approving cabinet nominees. And outside of that business, the SGA has shifted its efforts to support our fellow students on campus and advocate for additional financial support to the Illinois Congressional Delegation.

I want to thank my leadership team for stepping up to lead while trying to adapt to online classes at the same time. It certainly was not easy, and I’m very proud of their efforts. And I want to thank all of you members of UC, again, for a wonderful senior year. And I promise to carry forward my Huskie spirit. And so, I’ll conclude by introducing Brad Beyer who will serve as speaker of the senate starting June 1. Brad, do you want to say hi?

B. Beyer: Good afternoon, everyone. Very happy to be here. Looking forward to getting started once Ian’s term is over. This will definitely be a different transition and somewhat challenging, but I trust both Naomi and Ian’s leadership to sort of guide us to where we need to be to make sure that the responsibilities of the Student Government Association are still upheld. So, it’s great to be here everyone.
K. Thu: Welcome, Brad. We look forward to working with you as well. You have big shoes to fill with Naomi and Ian, but I’m sure you’re up to the task and look forward to all the work ahead. And I just want to say again on a more personal note, thank you to Ian and Naomi. Ian, it really has been a great time working with you through the course of the year. Again, I don’t know where you find the time to do everything, but it certainly has been a pleasure, and I look forward to keeping track of your career going forward, because there are great things ahead for you. And Naomi. I don’t mean to leave Naomi out. Thank you both. It’s been great, and I look forward to the new student leadership team.

L. Freeman: You make us so proud. I just don’t think we can say how proud you make us. You’re just so impressive. And you hear that from everyone in this body, but I hear it from people around the state who have the opportunity to interact with you. So, thank you for representing NIU so beautifully.

K. Thu: Absolutely. Okay, thank you.

H. Operating Staff Council – Jeffry Royce, President – report

K. Thu: Next, we have the Operating Staff Council report from Jeffry. You’re going to have to take your gaze away from the chat box for a moment.

J. Royce: Yes, I will. Thank you, Kendall. First of all, Ian, thank you for your kind words. You and Naomi have been incredible leaders on behalf of the student population. And your contributions cannot be overstated. Your loss will be long felt, but we’re proud to see you move on to the next challenges in your careers.

I’d like to congratulate everyone on the adoption of our newly remagined shared governance structure. It certainly represents a testament to Kendall’s leadership, our administration’s support and the hard work of everyone involved. The OSC has been fortunate to not miss a single meeting through all of this excitement, and we made a rather successful transition to Teams along with many other councils and committees. There have, understandably, been concerns with regard to how sustainable our current staffing arrangements are; but, in general, there has been overwhelming support and praise for administration’s leadership and communication through these past several weeks. I look forward to following up in the near future to some specific concerns regarding the availability of PPE and related messaging consistency, and continue to be grateful on behalf of shared governance to continue being included in these discussions.

I’d like to offer my congratulations to our Outstanding Service Award winners this year by reading their names into the minutes. If I mispronounce anyone’s name, please reach out to Jay [Monteiro], my vice president with your complaints. Jennifer Ridge, the admin assistant in College of Health and Human Sciences; Leslie Shive, program assistant in International Training Office; Patricia Wallace, program coordinator in Research and Compliance; and Alan Clemens, program director in Report Card. And lastly, I’d also like to recognize the recipients and parents of our annual Operating Staff Dependent Scholarships. Thanks, primarily, to the donations of the faculty and staff, we were able to award over $3,000 in scholarship awards this year. Hannah Secor won $1,000 award. Her mother is Jill Secor in Human Resource Services. Olivia Monteiro also won $1000
award. Her parents, Jay in Campus Dining Services and Christine in Internal Audit. Morgan Haga won $1,000 award. Her mother, Sandy Jakubiak in Human Resource Services. And lastly, Sam Hancock won a $240 award. His mother, Barbara, in Housing and Residential Services. I hope it goes without saying that it’s been a terrific year with many accomplishments by shared governance. It’s been an absolute pleasure working with all of you, and especially arguing with you as well. Please continue to stay safe, persevere, and go Huskies!

K. Thu: Thanks, Jeffry. I think I’ll cherish those moments when we had differing opinions most.

[I. Pearson (via chat box): Congratulations all award winners! A big thank you to all the staff who give to support students – it makes a huge difference.]

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Catherine Doederlein, President – report

K. Thu: So, let’s move on to our last report from Cathy Doederlein. Cathy, last but not least, the SPS Council.

C. Doederlein: Thank you so much. Echo a lot of the things that various colleagues have said, including Jeffry in his report. Certainly, thanking Pat for all of her hard work to keep us on track, and congratulating Naomi and Ian on their graduation and next steps, and just thanking them for all of their hard work. And congratulations to Kendall for reelection to continue the great work you’ve been doing with the University Council and Faculty Senate.

Just want to echo the thoughts as far as thanking the efforts of the president and the senior administration for doing everything that they can to protect faculty, staff and students. And thank you for the pay reductions that people are taking, as well, to be able to try to help with some of the budget factors. One thing that I would just mention is I know I’ve had a lot of colleagues ask, with the parking refund that had been proposed, if that’s something that we can decline taking or we can direct our refunds to the Student Emergency Fund. So, just figured I’d put that on record here that I know there are people that are definitely interested and willing to consider doing that. Even if it’s a small dollar amount, every little bit helps, I suppose.

We are in the process of our election. The nomination process has just closed, and we’ll be electing people to council for new terms. If you’ve got colleagues that have been nominated, definitely encourage them to run and, hopefully, participate so they can join us on council next year.

We also have our awards that we missed the opportunity to celebrate in person, but we can still have awards season over Microsoft Teams. So, I’d also like to recognize our recipients. Stephanie Richter, the director of Faculty Development and Instructional Support in the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning. I think the nomination was, actually, done well before any of the COVID-19 stuff happened; but, obviously, that’s been a pretty vital office, and Stephanie’s played a vital role in that. Eric Hoffman, coordinator of Computer Assisted Instruction in English. Merlynette Griffin, the nursing academic advisement coordinator in the School of Nursing, who’s certainly, I’m sure, had her hands quite busy with students and their clinical placements and how that’s been impacted. Again, a nomination that happened prior to all of this. And then Dara Little, assistant vice president for research and sponsored programs in Research and Innovation Partnerships. So,
congratulations to those presidential recipients, and thank you to the president for reaching out to
them personally to congratulate them.

We also have a few other awards that we issue to people: Collette Maher from College of
Engineering for supervision. Liz McKee and Brian Glick, both honored, Liz from Alumni
Advancement and Brian Glick from Student Conduct for their work in institutional advancement.
Greg Anderson from College of Law for his partnership and collaboration efforts. And Margee
Myles received the Gary Gray Award for service to our council, and she’s out of the College of
Business.

A lot of people to thank for their efforts and just congratulations to everyone for the hard work that t
his semester has been and the academic year. Just thanks and congratulations all around.

K. Thu: Thank you, Cathy. And thanks for your leadership, as well. It’s always good to hear your
voice and listen to what you have to say on behalf of not only the SPS, but the university as a
whole.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

K. Thu: So, I did want to leave a few minutes at the end here for any additional questions for
President Freeman. I think we can take a few minutes for that, and then we’ll adjourn. And then, if
anybody wants to tip their glass, we can do that after the meeting is adjourned. Any additional
questions? Go ahead, Jeffry, if you want to go back into your familiar role?

J. Royce: Absolutely. We’ve had a couple comments already. VP Chinniah made a comment in
reference to Cathy’s idea. I wonder if she’d be willing to talk about that,
because I’ve heard from
several staff members, as well, with questions regarding the parking refunds.

S. Chinniah: Sure, happy to. Hi everyone. Just wanted to confirm that it is a great idea to direct the
parking refund to the Student Emergency Fund. I think it’s something – I don’t want to speak for
President Freeman – but one that she strongly endorses. Kind of did speak for you, I’m sorry about
that.

L. Freeman: That was safe.

S. Chinniah: Okay. In response to the inquiries we’re getting about that, the opportunity to
designate your parking refund to the Student Emergency Fund will be made available. Obviously,
we’re still waiting for clarity on what that parking fund will look like as the campus moves back to
normal operations. So, once there is clarity, we will offer guidance on how to direct the refunds
over.

J. Royce: Thank you, Sarah. Therese had a unrelated question. Will the early retirement option be
offered again to faculty? The most recent one required an application by early January. In all that
has changed since then, it may have changed individual’s thoughts about the possibility.
L. Freeman: I would say that that’s not a definite plan at the moment, but as I’ve said, everything is on the table. We’re interested in taking your suggestions and hearing what you think are good options. So, I will take that under advisement, and thank you for making a good suggestion.

J. Royce: We also have a question from Natasha [Johnson]. Do you know if there is any plan for international GA’s to continue working, as many of them do not have the option to go home and are not able to work outside of the university, because of special requirements?

L. Freeman: We’re continuing to try to do everything we can to support our students, particularly our students like international GA’s who are vulnerable and have few options. Many of them were served by the emergency fund. GA’s are a mixed class; they’re paid in different ways, they have different types of stipends and hourly wages, so it’s not a blanket solution. But I appreciate you raising it, Natasha. We are certainly concerned about our students, and we’ve been working with many of them individually.

K. Thu: Other questions or comments?

L. Freeman: I guess I can say that many of you may know that the emergency fund had tremendous demand. We gave out just under $1 million to about 3,000 students over the course of two weeks. We had to hit pause on that when we exhausted the available funds, but our Cares money showed up yesterday, and the plans for replenishing the Student Emergency Fund are being enacted, and so we will again be able to support students who have extraordinary COVID-related needs.

J. Royce: There was a question from Naomi [Bolden]. If courses are online in the fall, how will students with clinics, labs, etc. be able to fulfill those requirements.

L. Freeman: We have not made a decision about what the fall will look like, because we’re watching public health guidance and thinking about the safety of everyone involved. But we want to have face-to-face instruction to the extent possible. And to create conditions that allow us to do that with social distancing as might be required by public health policy at any point in time, we may need to change the way we schedule things. But we’re very aware of, first of all, the value and importance of face-to-face instruction and having students on campus. And we know that particular types of classes, studios, performing classes, laboratory classes, clinicals, are the ones that lend themselves very poorly to virtual learning environments. And so a priority is to maintain that type of instruction, even if we need to do our scheduling differently. I think maybe I’ll let Provost Ingram weigh in on that.

B. Ingram: I think you pretty much covered it, Lisa. I would say that there are several groups that are involved in thinking about what fall looks like and planning for many different scenarios. And one of those groups is focusing on the things that you can’t do as well virtually, so, clinics, performances. The deans and the associate deans are really brainstorming how to bring those experiences to students in all sorts of different scenarios that might be in the fall. One advantage we have now is that we do have some time. We have some months to plan. And we all have contacts around the country that we’re keeping in touch with about ideas for how to give students the best experience possible in a variety of different health-related scenarios.
J. Royce: There are a couple comments. I don’t know if they amount to questions, but I’ll read them anyway, just in case. Reed [Scherer] mentioned that many international GA’s are worried about being able to return if they are able to go home at all for the summer. I don’t know if we want to address that before reading the next comment.

L. Freeman: I would say that, if Brad Bond is on the call, he might be able to talk about the efforts that our International Division is making to work with international students who have those concerns.

K. Thu: Brad, are you on? Okay.

[J. Ledgerwood (via chat box): International programs is advising that international students not go home this summer because embassies are not open and they might not get visas to come back. ]

J. Royce: Amanda [Littauer] had a comment that looks like it was addressed a little later down the chat by Sarah.

[A. Littauer (via chat box): I had many students who didn't get funds or who didn't know how to tell whether deposits to their accounts were housing refunds, emergency funds, etc. They may need more guidance moving forward. (They also just may need to read their email more carefully).]

[S. Chinniah (via chat box): thanks for this feedback! Students did receive an email, as well as an updated student account statement, that explained refunds or grants. We will continue to look at how we best communicate this important information.]

J. Royce: Stephen [Binderup] asked if our work is not feasible to do from home, would we be enabled with any additional funds for software licenses?

L. Freeman: I think if there are needs that our campus has, it’s important to bring those forward, so they can be taken under consideration as we plan for fall operations. So, Stephen, you’ve chatted in this room, and I’ll ask the provost to follow up with you so we understand exactly what you’re asking for.

J. Royce: Hamid [Bateni] had a question. How do you see COVID-19 impacts NIU recruitment, retention activities? Any thoughts or suggestions?

L. Freeman: I’m going to ask the provost to talk about everything we’ve done to try to promote persistence. But I will say, if you saw Vice President Jensen’s chat earlier, our Division of Enrollment Management has pivoted as quickly as our teaching faculty did, to figuring out how to engage students and families in a virtual environment. The videos they’re delivering with financial aid information, the platforms they’re using to host virtual recruitment events, they’re doing a tremendous job of trying to make our campus seem as vibrant as possible and communicating with, actually, more students and parents than ever before. I will say that I think many students are kind of waiting to see what’s announced, what the virus does, and what the fall will look like. And I think we have to understand that. We’re all tracking the national surveys and what’s being said by
students and families in Illinois so that we can respond to their concerns honestly and effectively. Beth?

**B. Ingram:** I guess the one thing I would add is that the platform that enrollment management used to create the virtual events for visit days and admission days is also being used for summer orientation. And it’s been a great collaboration to find ways to connect with students virtually when we can’t connect face-to-face. We haven’t run an orientation yet, but the visit days, I think, have gone very well, so I’m hopeful that the orientation days will go well too.

One of the things that we did as we were moving into the stay-at-home order is we started thinking about ways to make it easy to students to re-enroll for the fall, because they wouldn’t be on campus. And I know our advisors have been working their tails off to contact students, to have virtual advising appoints, to be in touch with them, to see how they’re doing. And it’s paying off in the re-enrollment number, which are very strong, similar to prior years. And so our students are re-enrolling for the fall, and I think that says that they trust that we’re going to watch out for them, and they’re confident that we can deliver a good educational experience in the fall. So, that’s all the hard work that the faculty and staff and other students are doing on campus. So, I’m grateful for that effort.

**K. Thu:** Thank you, Beth. I don’t want to cut things off, but this might be a good time to wrap things up. I want to thank everybody. It’s been a challenging year. I think people have risen to meet the challenge. I think we’ll do that in the future. I really appreciate President Freeman’s signal to understand the financial challenges that we’re facing and her willingness to walk the walk and take a cut in her own salary. I think that sends a very important and strong signal to the rest of the campus community.
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XI. ADJOURNMENT

K. Thu: So, with that, unless anybody has anything to add, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn. And then those that are interested in staying for a few more minutes – I don’t want to do this within the meeting, itself. So, we have a motion to adjourn; we have a second. Again, a reverse vote. Everybody who’s against adjourning the meeting, please signify in the chat box. And then – Ian doesn’t want to leave – and Reed’s already been sipping his scotch so he’s ahead of us. So, I consider the meeting to be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.