VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Beyer, Borg, Burg, Chomentowski (for Freeman), Collins, Conderman, Costello, Cripe, Douglass, Garcia, Hulseberg, Ingram, Monteiro, Nicholson, O’Grady (for Boughton), Olson, Poyser, Scheibe, Stange, Teso-Warner, Timko, Vaughn, Walker (for Elish-Piper), Weffer, Yates

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bohanon, Boughton, Chinniah, Elish-Piper, Freeman, Holmes, Martin

OTHERS PRESENT: Blazey, Bryan, Saborío

I.  CALL TO ORDER

B. Ingram: Call to order.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

B. Ingram: Pat, can you verify that we have a quorum.

P. Erickson: We do have a quorum. And I’d like to take just a minute to remind everybody to complete your attendance slips and leave them at your place. We’ll collect them after the meeting. And also today, as every meeting, we are being recorded. And even though we might be able to hear you very well in this room, we ask you to remember to approach the microphone. If you don’t, your comments will not be captured on the recording. And also just a little extra reminder that we know it can be difficult to hear and understand through the masks that muffle our voices a bit, so we appreciate you speaking slow, loud and clear. Thanks.

B. Ingram: Thank you. Thanks for the extra reminders there.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

B. Ingram: Do I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

D. Douglass: So moved.

D. Collins: Second.

B. Ingram: Any discussion? All in favor, aye.
Members: Aye.

B. Ingram: Opposed, same sign. Abstentions? The agenda is adopted.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2021 MINUTES – Pages 3-5

B. Ingram: Do I have a motion to approve the November 3, 2021 minutes?

Unidentified: So moved.

B. Ingram: A second?

Unidentified: Second.

B. Ingram: Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes? Hearing none, all those in favor of approving the minutes, aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Ingram: Opposed, same sign. Abstentions? The minutes are approved.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

B. Ingram: Pat, have we had any timely requests for public comment?

P. Erickson: No public comment requests.

B. Ingram: All right.

VI. NIU PRESIDENT LISA FREEMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

B. Ingram: Well, now we’re moving to President Lisa Freeman’s announcements. Obviously, I’m not President Freeman. President Freeman was unable to be here today, but I’m here on her behalf and send her greetings. I don’t get the opportunity very often to address the council, so I thought I’d say a few brief words today.

This always seems like a crazy time of the year to me, no matter what campus you’re on. We’re nearing the finish line of the semester. Our students are studying, trying to finish up their projects in the libraries, in the Holmes Student Center. Our faculty are finishing up their grading and teaching, working on scholarship and artistry, trying to finish up projects. And our staff are getting their offices ready for the end of the semester and a long break. Our time is punctuated with celebrations and holidays. The days are getting shorter; it’s dark by 4:30. And we anticipate the ice and snow of our midwestern winter. And this semester, you know, it’s the fourth semester of a campus that’s been buffeted by COVID-19, and the news just keeps rolling in. So, I just want to say I’m thankful. I’m thankful to all of you for the work that you do for and at NIU to support each other – students supporting students, faculty supporting each other, the staff supporting the faculty and students. We’re still a few weeks away from winter break, but I know you – or all of us – are looking forward to some time with friends, family, pets, maybe some alone time. I personally have two books calling my name sitting on my nightstand right now. So, I just wanted to say thank you, and I hope that you
have a great end of the semester and hit the finish line with some energy left over to spend on your family and friends over the winter break.

So, I will turn the gavel over to you, Peter.

VII. ITEMS FOR UNIVERSITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

P. Chomentowski: Okay, we will move to items for University Council consideration. This was brought up a little bit to my attention about the voting procedures. So, for a little extra explanation for us, especially some of the people had some questions about people that are new to University Council. So, Ferald’s going to talk quickly about the voting procedures in University Council.

F. Bryan: Thank you, Peter. I rarely say anything, as you know. I prefer to seen and not heard, but I appreciate Peter and Pat asking me to say a few words about this. These questions that he’s referring to came up before Thanksgiving during the Faculty Senate meeting and, subsequently, some other emails that were exchanged. I wanted to just do a brief review about voting procedures of the University Council in things like today when we have a typical motion to vote on.

For those of you who have never seen it – I know you religiously read the university bylaws very carefully in its detail – but Section 3.3.1 tells us that, when a motion is called during a University Council meeting, members may vote in favor of the motion, against the motion, abstain from voting or indicate that they are present but not voting. For the way we do things, that simply means, on the last item, you just don’t vote, because we usually have only three options for you.

But please note the other language, the other qualification, as Roberts might call it. Those present and not voting shall not be counted in computing whether the appropriate majority has been attained for passage of a motion. That implies, if you don’t vote, if you vote present, then we won’t count you. The implication there could be significant for voting for an amendment, for example, that requires a two-thirds vote, because, even if you vote to abstain, we might have to consider as part of the total people who vote. And we’ll explain that when that becomes appropriate.

My second and last slide, I promise. Roberts reminds us – and I know you love to quote Roberts Rules, all 720 pages of it. He explains that to abstain means not to vote at all, and a member who makes no response when abstentions are called, and usually, the president or Peter makes requests for listing those who abstain, just as much as who responds to that effect. To be honest, Roberts doesn’t like abstentions or people to vote present. He’d prefers, or the people who edit Roberts prefer. [inaudible].

And a final note, and this is not applying today, but it could apply in the future, in the spring, these voting procedures do not apply to motions proposing an amendment to our bylaws. Those voting procedures are qualified, and I won’t bore you with quoting those today. Those are the bylaws, Section 12.2, which relates specifically to amending our bylaws. We will review those procedures when appropriate. But we’ve had to qualify those to make sure we have a sufficient number of people in this body present to vote.

If there are any questions, I’ll be happy to take those, but otherwise, I’ve given you something to read and think about over our holiday, and I wish you a very good holiday. Thank you.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you very much, Ferald.
VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Motion to reduce the number of spring 2022 semester UC meetings:
   UC meetings will be held March 2 and May 4 as scheduled;
   UC meetings dates, February 2 and April 6, will be held on an if-needed basis.

   February 2, 2022 – meeting held only if needed
   March 2, 2022 – meeting will take place
   April 6, 2022 – meeting held only if needed
   May 4, 2022 – meeting will take place

P. Chomentowski: We’ll move on to section X, which is new business. I’m going to jumpstart a
discussion on a new topic, and I’ll start by making a motion to discuss reducing the number of the
spring 2022 semester University Council meetings. This would mean that the University Council
would be held on March 2 and May 4 as scheduled. And the other meetings on February 2 and April
6 will be held on an as-needed basis. Can I get a second for this motion?

S. Weffer: Second.

P. Chomentowski: I’d just like to start the discussion. There’s been a decrease in business in the
University Council after the restructuring of shared governance. This means that the majority of the
information and new business that had come before University Council before did consist of
academic matters. Since the restructuring, all the academic business now has been shifted to where
it comes from the Faculty Senate. So, if you’ve been attending our meetings regularly, you’ve
noticed that the new business, unfinished business and even consent agenda has reduced drastically
so far this year. So, this was something that came up as could it be an option for everyone. And we
thought about it as just also being respectful for our NIU employees’ time and things like that.

Is there any discussion on this? Sure.

D. Douglass: As the SGA, we personally object to this motion. The effort to reshape shared
governance on this campus several years ago brought us into discussions on important university
matters, and we represent the student body when we say that we expect our administration to uphold
its promise to support us. These meetings, and other governing councils like it, are one of the only
consistent forums for discussion and connection across divisions on campus, even when there is not
formal business to discuss. I worry about the implications of reducing responsibility attached to this
body and reduction of its future efficacy, so we urge a nay vote. But with that being said, I would
like to hear more on the reasoning for introducing this motion and from those who agree that it is
necessary. Thank you.


H. Nicholson: I would agree with Dallas and say that I want to see this council remain relevant and
influential and encourage the constituency group leaders to get together and figure out if we should
be doing things different to bring resolutions up to University Council or maybe streamlining the
speakers that have to come to each council. Maybe they come to University Council – at least
discuss some things we can do to have a more robust discussion in University Council and make
sure that this body remains influential. Thanks.

P. Chomentowski: Sure, Terry.

T. Borg: I guess I’d like to hear more discussion about who will make the decision, “only if
needed.” Is that a decision of the president, a decision of yourself in your role? Or, can any member
call the meeting as being needed?

P. Chomentowski: Good question. We were leaving it as needed, I don’t know.

B. Ingram: I think what you mean to say if there is business to be conducted. So, if a member had
business to be conducted.

P. Chomentowski: Yes, well if there was business to be conducted by anybody as a member of the
University Council, then we would actually convene the meeting. So, that kind of gets at what we
were looking at, that’s what I was understanding. Yes?

D. Collins: A question to go off of that. In the months of February and April, if this were to get
passed, since those are the ones that are “only if needed,” say we missed that week. Would we be
able to call a meeting say the following week to kind of make up for that month if we missed it?

P. Chomentowski: No.

B. Ingram: I think that’s because of the Open Meetings Act that requires us to have the meetings
on the schedule at a point in time. Is that right, Pat?

P. Erickson: Yes, I agree with that. And I think the logistics would make it unmanageable, because
shared governance currently has that 3 p.m. slot on every single Wednesday. So, I suppose if we
could gather this group on a different day and time, in time to give public notice, that could be done.
But that might be a logistical undertaking.

P. Chomentowski: Go ahead Dallas.

D. Douglass: Firstly, I agree, Pat, the logistics of trying to schedule something, that would be a
nightmare as I’m well aware in SGA. But then secondly, if the overriding factor is that any member
can call a meeting on one of the as-needed days, with any order of business, how often do we have
meetings that have no business whatsoever. I can’t recall that ever being the case, personally. I
mean, presentations are always here, but new business, I think we’ve had new business every
meeting. So, I wonder what are the chances that we don’t have any new business for those two
meetings and if the chance is slim, then I fail to see the purpose of introducing the motion. Thank
you.

P. Erickson: Ferald and I were talking a few minutes ago about how, it doesn’t happen very often,
but we both do remember in history, there have been times when the University Council meetings
have been canceled more on the – I shouldn’t say spur of the moment – but closer to the time when
it would have been scheduled, due to lack of business. That would be quite a while ago, the last
time that happened, maybe ten years ago.
S. Weffer: I think part of the issue is adapting to the new reality. For example, sitting on UCPC both last year and this year, the volume of work on UCPC last year was significant. The amount of work this year is minimal. And so, we have moved on UCPC to a much lighter schedule. I think this is trying to introduce the idea that we introduce the flexibility of a decreased schedule; there’s no guarantee that there will be a decreased schedule. But I also think there is a larger question to ask about this body existing, given the new structure. In part of the research in the restructuring, there’s a lot of our sister campuses that only have one sort of major body. And so there was this issue of duplication. That was part of why we streamlined. I think it’s a little awkward this year, like many transitions. And I think this allows us the ability to start thinking about what comes here and what is the volume of things that come here and how do we adjust that schedule. So, I think it’s important that we use this ability with this motion to have this discussion, but also we should probably start thinking about how do we engage into a larger theoretical or constitution/bylaw discussion about: Do we need this body? Why does it exist? And how do we move forward? I think just putting the motion out there is getting us to have this discussion. And so we should have it. And while we might not end up missing any dates this year, I could imagine that the volume moving forward could conceivably decrease to the point where this is a once/semester, twice/semester regularly body. But we’ll see.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you.

D. Collins: I agree with your logic there. Right now we’re kind of in a weird year, where last year there was a lot of work to do, and this year it seems like this semester has been pretty lax compared to previous falls. But this council, I feel, is very important on campus, because you have input from students, you have input from most departments and offices here on campus. And at least meeting once a month gives us the opportunity to double-check on everyone’s work and just make sure, like is there any chance we can collaborate or is there any chance – you have opportunities that you need help getting information out to the campus about. Also I feel that this year is different, because yes, we’re thinking about downsizing a lot of things, but I feel like that’s only because we’re just now coming back from COVID, and we’re just now getting back into the swing of things. I kind of anticipate next semester catching up quite quickly. I see us being pretty busy next semester, and that’s what I’m afraid of. If we’re so busy next semester, but we don’t have enough time to check out what else is going on on campus, how will we really know what needs to be promoted to students versus what can be bypassed and what we don’t need to spend so much time on.


G. Beyer: I want to congratulate Devlin and Dallas for speaking up at this meeting and giving us a sense of why the students and the study body feels that this is an important meeting for them to interface with us as faculty and administration. I second Holly’s motion of the same. I think it’s important for faculty to hear from operating staff, as well, for us to have a wider sense of how the university comes together.

And furthermore, and I just want to underscore this. I brought this to you in an email a couple months ago, but I’d like everyone to hear this. When Kendall was president of this body, he had a vision, and that vision included the way that we seat people around this space. When I sit here facing forward, I see the president, I see the provost, I see you, I see Pat. But I don’t see the rest of these folks, and I don’t find this a particularly conducive set-up for conversation. And I don’t think it really helps us see eye-to-eye when it comes to speaking to different constituencies on campus.
So, I’d like to propose, just as University Graduate Council has the ability to set this room up. This is a flexible space, and I would for one would love to see us sit in the round, just as the Board of Trustees does so that we can have conversations where we meet face-to-face and speak eye-to-eye and bring ideas to the table, not only because I think it would help conversation, but I also think the simple fact of changing the space and the set-up of the space has the ability to change the tenure of the conversation, and the kind of conversations we have in the space. I think it would lend itself to these collaborations, to use a word that Devlin and Dallas brought up. So that would be on extra detail that I’d like to posit for the good of the whole.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you.

L. Saborio: I just wanted to add to Greg’s comment, because it has a lot to do with what I was just thinking. Maybe we need to reimagine how we use University Council and create, instead, maybe some smaller working groups or – I don’t know, just thinking out loud here, right – just reimagine how you want to use this group in terms of moving forward, not just a reporting body, but maybe we’re looking at different items of concern across campus and create small working groups. And then bring folks together to collaborate on issues. Thank you.

D. Douglass: When you said, see eye-to-eye, I was laughing, because I thought if I stood up, you’d still be here. One final comment, and then I’ll leave it. But Greg and Holly, I think we’re all touching on kind of the same issue here. I’m somewhat uniquely qualified to comment on this, because as the speaker of the senate, I operate a body that’s very similar to this one. And something that I think we’re all probably feeling in this discussion is that we’re not doing enough, or that we’re not doing anything period. And in the student center, we’re feeling the same way. I think, ultimately, the only way to battle that is to encourage more collaboration; and less meetings is not conducive to more collaboration. So, I stand by my assertion that we should keep all of our meetings scheduled. We can always cancel them; it’s harder to get them rescheduled once they’re canceled, in my opinion. And having a more [inaudible] space is more conducive to collaboration, or maybe changing some other smaller details, making it easier to write legislation and bring it to this body, which is something that I’m trying to get my senators to do. It’s difficult, but it’s possible. I think this body definitely has potential; and, while that may not be the case five years from now, I’d like to give us the chance to find out.

P. Chomentowski: Yes, Holly, go ahead.

H. Nicholson: My final comment, as well. I would just be remiss if I didn’t point out that we worked really hard to get an increased staff representation on this council, and it concerns me to talk about dismantling or reducing the influence of this body now that we finally have some more equal representation. Thanks.

S. Weffer: So, I guess I’m making up for lost meetings this semester, but I think if we look objectively at Kendall’s project for the last two years, there was a lot of effort put on what the Faculty Senate would become, but not the same amount of time and effort and discussion on what this body would become. And so I would encourage us to think about if we want this to be a different sort of body, which is what I’m starting to hear a little bit of, let’s get it on the agenda and figure out how we do that, and do the reimagining. Because I think Kendall – and it’s not a slight against Kendall – I think a lot of the effort was put on the Faculty Senate side. I don’t know how much was – I mean, from my own conversations, I don’t recall any conversations on University Council last year talking about where do we go from here. How do we re-envision it? What are we
doing? Aside from the personnel committee, which basically was almost completely dismantled, because most of that work was around tenure and promotion and those sorts of cases. We haven’t done that work here. I’m willing to withdraw my second if consensus seems to be moving away from that, but I would encourage everyone, if you want to dialog, create a dialog. I do disagree; I don’t think more meetings means more collaboration. I think most faculty would probably argue fewer meetings means better collaboration. Big meetings like this are not conducive to collaboration, I don’t think. Let’s start throwing out some ideas of what we see this body being, because I think that’s the work that actually needs to be done.

**P. Chomentowski:** Anyone else? Okay, the motion is on the floor, so we’re going to vote on whether or not we would like to entertain this motion or not. So, we will have Pat take care of this.

**P. Erickson:** Okay, you’ve all got your clickers if you’re a voting member. And you remember that we don’t need to turn them on; you just click the number that corresponds with your vote. One = yes, that you agree with the motion to reduce the number of meetings in the spring 2022 semester. Two = no, you don’t agree with that motion. And now, I’m not really sure what 3 means anymore. Three means abstain.

**F. Bryan:** And if you don’t vote at all, you don’t vote at all.

**P. Erickson:** Thank you, yes.

**P. Chomentowski:** If you don’t vote, it doesn’t count. Did you open it?

**P. Erickson:** You can go ahead, yes. We seem kind of stopped there. Anybody else need more time, or is anybody having trouble with their clicker?

**T. Borg:** [inaudible]

**P. Erickson:** Okay. Why don’t you push the channel button. Do you see that over on the left? And then 45 is the channel, so type that in. And then hit that middle button. And then try again. The clicker won’t let you double vote.

**T. Borg:** [inaudible]

**P. Erickson:** You should get a smiley face or a checkmark, I believe. I never vote, but I think that’s what it is. Is it good now? Okay. Everybody okay?

Yes – 6  
No – 18  
Abstain - 0

**P. Chomentowski:** All right. So the motion does not pass. And then I guess when we come back to University Council, I think we should all think about what we just talked about and how we would actually want to maybe re-look at what is the charge of University Council. A good question that Simón said, I think a lot did get focused on what was the new charge of Faculty Senate. And not a lot was put into what is now the charge of University Council. So, I think that is a conversation we have to come back to and have again and start to look at how does this body actually work, and what should this body be doing. How do we get new business brought before this board?
XI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

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

P. Chomentowski: With that, we’ll move on to reports from councils, boards and standing committees. Linda?

L. Saborío: Good afternoon. I actually don’t have a report. The FAC did meet last Friday, but it was a working meeting, so we did not have any guest speakers. And the chair had to attend a conference in Boston, so I was asked to step up and chair this meeting. For those of you who don’t know, we start at 9 in the morning, and we adjourn sometime late afternoon. So, between the zoom and hand raising and the chat and the groups, I really don’t know what we talked about. It was quite a bit of work. I do remember that we did adjourn sometime near happy hour, close enough for me, so, that was important. And that’s my report. I came here today to say hope you all have a relaxing and enjoyable holiday break.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
   Felicia Bohanon, Holly Nicholson, Peter Chomentowski
   Katy Jaekel, Karen Whedbee, Greg Beyer

P. Chomentowski: We’ll move on to University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. I’ve got a few things about the recent Board of Trustees meeting, which was last week, Nov. 18, the week before Thanksgiving.

On the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee, there was a request to merge departments, which was approved. So, the Department of Geology and Environmental Geosciences and the Department of Geographic and Atmospheric Sciences merged and now will be known in the future – the Department of Earth, Atmosphere and Environment.

Under the Special Board of Trustees meeting, of course, everyone probably knows that President Freeman presented her University Goals. A few other things of interest: The Chief of Police spoke about the new off- and on-campus security force. I don’t know that everyone’s heard about this, but it started a couple weeks ago. So, there is now a security firm, Kates Security that is trained by their security office and by the NIU police. They are unarmed security that now walk the campus; they do not have vehicles. The idea is having a larger presence in the neighborhood and on campus. They started a couple weeks ago; and they are working with the police just to provide more of an eyes-on-the-street, you might say. So, that is something that is working on campus, and you might see them. They are in clothes that have bright yellow markers on them that say security. So, you might see them walking through the campus and around the surrounding neighborhoods.

They approved the bowl game participation. On Saturday, NIU’s football team will play in the MAC Champion, on Saturday afternoon. And on Sunday, Dec. 5, will be the bowl selection. I looked it up, one of the main predictions is NIU playing the Arizona Bowl in Tucson, Arizona. There was approval of the expenses for the trip to be put out ahead of time for the bowl participation, which NIU will be invited to this year.
Of other interest, Sean Frazier, who was the athletic director, was re-named to the associate vice president and director of athletics and recreation. He will be overseeing also the recreational aspects of NIU.

And that’s it; do you have anything? Does anyone else that attended the meetings, Holly, or anyone, Greg? Sure.

J. Burg: I just wanted to add that the NIU men’s soccer team actually went to round 2 in the NCAA tournament. And we’re also conference champions and MAC champions, just in case no one knew. I’m their number one fan!

P. Chomentowski: Unfortunately, I watched that game, and I was at wit’s end the whole time, because I graduate from the University of Pittsburgh. So, I was sitting there the whole time watching the game, like, errr. And I’m sorry to say I did have to pick a side. Sorry NIU, but, unfortunately, I did at that moment in time. That’s what happens sometimes. But they did make it really far into the NCAA tournament, and they were great games that they actually held, especially the ones they held on campus were really fun to watch.

C. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – no report
Holly Nicholson, Chair

P. Chomentowski: We’ll move on to Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. We have no report.

H. Nicholson: I did have a quick update for Rules, Governance and Elections. We did meet. We got some great work done. We had Professor Michelle Demaray and Professor David Gunkel come and talk about their research on cyberbullying, as well as the work that’s been done previously to identify the needs on campus for cyberbullying resources. We then split into three working groups. One is Resources, so what will go on the website, as well as defining cyberbullying. Two is Data Collection, so gauging across campus what the needs are and what the knowledge gaps are. And three, Reviewing Current Policies and Processes to see where cyberbullying will fit into those instead of creating a new policy. That’s the update for that.

D. Student Government Association – report
Devlin Collins, President
Dallas Douglass, Speaker of the Senate

P. Chomentowski: And now the Student Government Association, Devlin and Dallas.

D. Collins: Hello everyone. We just wanted to report again that we still have ongoing searches for our election commission for our spring election cycle. This position is open to all students on campus. All they need to do is be a full-time student. It doesn’t matter if they’re a graduate or undergraduate student. Really, we are just looking for someone that has an interest in politics or organizing. That way they can assist us in organizing our upcoming election cycle and put together our new election timeline for how we’re going to be operating in the spring. That’s really my main announcement that I really want to get out to you. We need help trying to reach out to students and see who could be interested in this position.
D. Douglass: And to follow up, once we have our election commissioner settled and we’ve begun the process of hunting down students to recruit to run in our elections, we would really appreciate some help. Our body does not function, and we cannot actively represent students if we don’t have students running for our positions. So, we’re going to need to rely on our mentors and our administration and our faculty and our staff in recruiting students that you think are engaged, active, well-suited for representation and political work. Any of us are happy to provide more information. We love SGA. We want more students involved.

And I also just want to thank all of you for such a robust discussion. I love when motions fail, personally, even if I make them. I think it’s exciting. This is what government is. It’s cool. So, thank you. That’s all. Any questions?

P. Chomentowski: All right, thank you, gentlemen.

E. Operating Staff Council – Holly Nicholson, President – report

P. Chomentowski: Operating Staff Council, Holly.

H. Nicholson: For Operating Staff Council, just three things. First, a reminder that we have a dependent endowed scholarship, and the deadline will be coming up I think end of January. So, if you know any staff that have college-age students that are coming to NIU or are here, encourage them to apply for that scholarship. We’ve been able to give a lot of money in the past, so that’s great.

The Outstanding Service Award time is coming up soon. Think of your favorite staff member who goes above and beyond in all the areas of their life and nominate them for the award. It comes with cash, so, I mean that’s pretty fun.

The third thing is escaping me. Oh yes, the third thing is we continue to fundraise for our staff emergency fund. So, please consider giving to that fund. It’s on our website. Thank you.

P. Chomentowski: Thank you.

F. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Felicia Bohanon, President – report

P. Chomentowski: Supportive Professional Staff Council, is there anyone here to give a report? Then we have no report.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Policy Library – Comment on Proposed Policies (right-hand column on web page)
B. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Baccalaureate Council
E. Minutes, Board of Trustees
F. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
G. Minutes, Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
H. Minutes, General Education Committee
I. Minutes, Graduate Council
J. Minutes, Honors Committee
K. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
L. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
M. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
N. Minutes, University Benefits Committee
O. Minutes, Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
P. Minutes, University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
Q. UC 2021-22 dates: Sep 8, Oct 6, Nov 3, Dec 1, Feb 2, Mar 2, Apr 6, May 4

P. Chomentowski: Informational items, we’ll move down to Q. This is the last meeting for the fall 2021. Our next meeting will be February 2 in 2022 in this room still.

Any other questions or concerns?

Unidentified: [inaudible]

P. Chomentowski: Sure.

G. Beyer: Where do we find out more about Kates Security if we’re interested?

P. Chomentowski: Let’s let Devlin speak, because the Student Government Association has been working with the chief of police.

D. Collins: I was in conversations with Chief Mitchell around the time that Kates was implemented on campus. You can actually find Kates – they should have an actual website that is operational. But it’s Kates, K-A-T-E-apostrophe-S, Kate’s Private Security Agency. I’m familiar personally with this agency, because they operate out of Chicago. Growing up out of Chicago, I would see Kates all the time in their cars patrolling all the time. They are trained in de-escalation tactics. They are also trained to deal with any situation before they need to call the police. So, they can deal with any domestic violence. They can deal with anything happening in parking lots. They can deal with carjackings. But if a weapon does come into play, they will call the police so that they can deal with it. But, you should just be allowed to access their documents and things through their website. It should just be kates.com. Katesprivatesecurity.com [Kates Facebook site].

Unidentified: [inaudible]

D. Collins: Thank you, I knew it was one of those things.

D. Douglass: Sorry. For the record, the url is katesdetectiveagency.com

P. Chomentowski: Thank you.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Chomentowski: All right, well with that, I’ll ask for a motion to adjourn the University Council meeting for today.

H. Nicholson: So moved.
Unidentified: Second.

P. Chomentowski: All right, all those in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

P. Chomentowski: All those opposed, please say no. Any abstentions? Meeting is adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.