

4-6-2016

UC Transcript 2016-04-06

Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil>

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2016-04-06" (2016). *University Council Archives*. 9.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/9>

This Transcript is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Council Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, April 6, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Baker, Bauer, Bishop, Bond, Brubaker, Builta, Carlson, Chakraborty, Chen, Deng, Dhar, Domke, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Freeman, Gilson, Hanley, Hathaway, Henry (for Block), Holt, Jaffee, Khoury, Koss (for Kreml), Lagioia, Lee, Liberty-Baczek, Long, Love-Moore, Macdonald, Manning, McCord, Nicholson, Novak, Nissenbaum, Olson, Pavkov, Pitney, Riley, Rodgers, Saborio, Sagarin, Scherer, Slotsve, Staikidis, Sto. Domingo, Thu, Towell (for Schoenbachler), Vander Schee, Vazquez, Vohra, Wang

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Arado, Block, Campbell, Carey, Cordes, Doederlein, Jacob, Jemison, Joseph, Kreml, Naples, Penrod, Schoenbachler, Thomas, Wagenecht, Wood

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Clemens, Kaplan, Phillips, Pickett, Stoddard, Streb, Weldy

OTHERS ABSENT: Coryell, Falkoff, Hoffman, Konen

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Good evening, welcome. We all good more or less?

D. Baker called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: First, I call us to order and ask for an adoption of the agenda. Do I have a motion?

P. Vohra: So moved.

K. Thu: Second.

D. Baker: Any additions or deletions? All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Okay, thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2016 MEETING

D. Baker: Approval of the minutes, do I have a motion of the minutes?

K. Thu: So moved.

G. LaGioia: Second.

D. Baker: Edits? All those in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed?

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: President's announcements. I spent Monday and Tuesday in Springfield. Fascinating. And I came away feeling better Tuesday afternoon than I did going in Monday morning. I think that's positive. So here's what I heard. There seems to be consensus that we need to get something done. Thank you very much. I also heard consensus on what needed to be done at a certain elevation, fairly high elevation. There was an agreement that we need to have a tax increase in some form. Wasn't an agreement on what flavor of tax increase, but a tax increase. There was also an understanding there needed to be a budget reduction across the state, exactly who gets how much, but we need to cut. So I've been kind of predicting if we exercise more and eat less, we'll lose weight. Concessions, we need procurement reform; it shouldn't take us 74 steps at NIU to buy this microphone, which is the number of steps it takes to buy this microphone. There was also some hint that Workers' Compensation was in play, even though here had been a reform four or five years ago, that maybe something could be done there. There was also my sense, an understanding on both sides of the rank and file legislators that this is really, really bad for higher education, at all levels, at community colleges, at universities, for students, for faculty, and for staff. There's a real understanding that bad things are going on. That's good. Also heard whispers here and there that people are actually talking across party lines right now to try and find out something. Matt, appreciate it. And there seemed to be some urgency that there's a window over the next few weeks to get something done.

To update, the house passed a budget a couple weeks ago with a 6.5 percent cut for higher ed. The senate two weeks ago passed a similar bill, slight amendments, then sent it back to the house and now the house will reconsider. And if they pass, then it goes to the governor. So there's some hope that they can take that as a template and do these other things that I just talked about and make something happen for '16, and that that will break the log jam and get us to a '17 budget.

There was never a question about MAP. Always a positive. And my sense is people want to fully fund MAP, so that's good. But we can't seem to get off dead center to make it happen. Now, here's something maybe you and our closest 10,000 friends can help us with. And that is I heard about half the legislators I talked to say, I don't very often hear about this issue. Is there a higher ed issue? Now if you're an a legislator that's dealing with a bunch of stuff and higher education isn't a big deal in your district, the rest of government's going on. So I would say, if you have an opinion one way or the other, and don't use your NIU accounts to send emails, you should share your opinion. Again, I'm not telling you what your opinion should be. But whatever your opinion is, I would say share it. If it's a short email, that's fine. If it's a telephone call, telephone calls, my sense is often have more impact, even if you leave a recorded message. They discount all robocalls, but any personal telephone call they pay attention to. Because many of them get so darn few of them. It is amazing how little they hear about critical issues. So take 60 seconds and call somebody. And we have contact information on your website, right?

G. Long: [inaudible]

D. Baker: Okay. So regardless of where you live. I would say, Promod asked who should we be calling? I would say call whoever is representing you in the house and senate, and that depends on where you live. So in our district representative, Rep. Pritchard is immediately here and Senator Sieverson. Representative Demers is from Rochelle and on and on. You all live various places but find out and then do it. Okay, that's my report. Any questions on that? Let's move on.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws [Articles 15.5 and 15.6](#)
Undergraduate Coordinating Council and
Standing Committees of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council – Pages 3-24
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM
[Presentation](#) – Chris McCord

D. Baker: We got a lot of stuff going on today. I didn't mean to carry on too long about that. We don't have a consent agenda. So let's move right into the unfinished business and move through that. And do we all have clickers? Everybody got a clicker that's supposed to have a clicker? Anybody that's not supposed to have a clicker have a clicker? Could we test these things again and make sure they all work? Which one, where do we turn on? There it goes. Don't turn it on? Oh, it says new channel. What does it say if it says new channel? Did I screw it up? I screwed it up officially. Perfect. All right, so, just so we get a tally, we're all going to press 1. Are we ready? Everybody press 1. Make sure they all work, etc. Are we good? What have we got?

P. Erickson: 48. 38 must be present to vote.

D. Baker: We got 48, we need 38 for voting purposes, all right. Wow, outstanding, congratulations. And if yours doesn't work, trade it in. Here we go. Great. Unfinished business. Oh, you want the mic?

G. Long: All right. Good afternoon. Before we get into our unfinished business, because we do have a second reading on NIU bylaws 5.5 and 15.6, would just like to remind you that during our last meeting we did change the bylaws voting threshold. So I've asked Pat to put that up there again very is quickly for you. As stated, to change a bylaw requires the presence of 60 percent plus 1. So we certainly made that. To become effective, an amendment must be approved by the greater of a), a majority of the total voting membership of University Council or b) two thirds of the voting members in attendance. So we've met our minimum figures here. So is this will be decided by two thirds of the members in attendance. So this is our first vote using the new voting threshold. Before we do that, I need a motion to accept and then we'll have a discussion on it. We have a motion?

W. Pitney: So moved.

S. Farrell: Second.

G. Long: All right. And to start discussion, I'd like to ask Chris McCord to share some background information on this please.

C. McCord: This is a revision of our curricular approval process at the university level. We did a presentation on this at the last meeting, and I'd like to go very quickly through it. Pat, you want to advance? So we are changing the curricular process in a couple ways. We're reducing the number of committees and we are also streamlining the number of steps that a curricular approval process has to go through in order to be approved.

So currently we have an Undergraduate Coordinating Committee with six committees that report to it. You see them identified there. The most important thing is we are proposing to consolidate the Undergraduate Coordinating Committee, the Admission Policies and Academic Standards Committee, and the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum into a single committee and then also consolidate the Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education and Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment into a single committee. So those three committees would be replaced by a single Baccalaureate Council. And the two committees at the bottom would be replaced by single Committee on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience. The key thing is the top one. Right now we have proposals that come into the CUC, may or may not get referred to APASC, get minuted to the Undergraduate Coordinating Committee. Now this would simply serve as a single committee which would have curricular authority at the university level, very much parallel to the Graduate Council where there's a single Graduate Council that graduate issues come to. Go ahead.

So the new structure would be much streamlined. We would largely unchange the General Education Committee. Honors Committee would continue to have jurisdiction over those aspects and would report up to the Baccalaureate Council on those issues. This was meant to impress you with the cumbersomeness of the process. There's a lot of backing and forthing, a lot of one committee reporting to another. Because those committees have all been boiled into one, all that backing and forthing goes away and the Baccalaureate Council acts on curricular proposals. Go ahead.

And again, items specific to gen ed or honors remain with those committees. The other thing is we have a curious process now in which committees don't exactly refer things up to super committees, they minute them. They send their minutes up and the minutes are either approved or disapproved or sent back. Instead, we are proposing a much cleaner structure: Simply, a committee makes a recommendation, they vote it up or down, they send it up to the next level, the next level approves it or disapproves it. It's much more action-oriented. Much less of this sort of left-handed way of doing business.

Finally, this same sort of process applies to University Council. It is mandated in the constitution that substantive issues come to the University Council. We have again a rather convoluted process by which that now takes place. We're preserving that essential function that ultimately substantive changes can come to the University Council, we're preserving the essence of it, which is they come to University Council essentially for approval or disapproval, not for action, that is, not for modification. University Council can vote something down, or not. Right now the process is very complicated and very drawn out. It can take literally months to know whether or not University

Council is going to choose to take an action. So we're tightening the timelines, simplifying the process by which University Council either acts to disapprove or chooses not to act.

And then finally, you can see very briefly the membership proposed for each of the committees. It is in our current environment perhaps not a small thing that the total number of people called upon across the community to serve on these committees goes down, and we hope that therefore will be easier to staff these committees and actually make them functional. So those, in summary, are the proposed changes.

G. Long: Any questions, further discussion from the group?

D. Domke: What's wrong with doing things the left-handed way?

G. Long: An unintended slight I'm quite certain since I'm a lefty as well. Anyone else? Barbara?

B. Jaffee: I have a question. I'm wondering when I look at the Undergraduate Coordinating Council at the top with its 16 plus faculty members, the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum with its nine faculty members and APASC – I'll have to use the acronym since I have no idea what those initials stand for – with its eight faculty members, and then I go below the line and I see a Baccalaureate Council with 16 plus faculty members. It looks to me as if the CUC and the APASC have just been cut.

C. McCord: They've been merged.

B. Jaffee: How is it merged if it's still the same number of people as the original Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

G. Long: It has to do with the tasks they're assigned. The tasks of those committees have been merged into a much more efficient structure.

B. Jaffee: So, what was 16 plus, 9 and 8 faculty members involved in the university level curriculum process is now 16 – well, the plus is mysterious. I don't know what it means.

C. McCord: The plus, very quickly there's a slightly complicated apportionment process that allocates seats to the colleges and you have sort of three different mechanisms of determining how many seats you get, and each college gets the most favorable of the three. So there's a guaranteed minimum of at least 16 faculty but, depending on how the different processes break, you could get 17 or 18 faculty overall.

B. Jaffee: So the bottom line is as it appears there, the 9 and 8 faculty that were on CUC and APASC, just aren't involved in university level curriculum. It's the number that are serving now on university coordinating council, right? One committee, more work, fewer faculty in total. Is that right? Am I missing something?

C. McCord: I think that's an accurate characterization. There are fewer faculty serving on these committees. It will be everybody's judgment whether that's a good thing or bad thing.

B. Jaffee: Thank you.

G. Long: Promod, and then Janet.

P. Vohra: I'm going to say two things. First of all, in our efforts to be competitive in the market, we were often won by the private institutions that make critical changes more quickly than we could. We lagged behind and I think we were late in the market. So I think this is a good thing for us to do. We are speeding up or accelerating the curricular process. As far as the number of faculty are concerned, I'm glad there are less number of faculty members because there are a lot of productive faculty members who don't want to serve on a zillion committees. If the function is the same, and we're trying to avoid duplication, still maintaining the sanctity of a faculty-dictated process of curriculum development I think I'm fine with this.

G. Long: Kendall and Janet and back to Linda. I'm sorry.

L. Saborio: I was going to say that the 9 and 8 faculty members are now free to do research.

K. Thu: I was just going to add that I have served, like a lot of us, on a lot of committees that overlap. And the idea that we would actually reduce the number of committees that we're serving on is a welcome development and we're going to find out much more quickly if this curricular process can work because it's more streamlined. We'll find out.

B. Jaffee: My question has to do with this notion of accelerating the process because it's my understanding that changes go into the catalog one time a year. It's once a year. Unless you're accelerating that, how does streamlining these committees make anything go faster?

G. Long: Bill.

W. Pitney: I'll just comment on that. Right now while the catalog is constructed one time a year, I think it's important to recognize that the due dates for making catalog end up being in October at the college level because there's so many step to go up to the university level. And so by streamlining the process, I think that could buy us more time at the front end of the curricular process to address things and get that done. You could conceivably have some things that go into the college level maybe in November, or even January that might end up making it through the channels to make catalog, and I think that's a good thing.

And I think Promod's comment is well taken. Having shepherded some undergrad programs through a process here and more recently grad program through a process, in listening to my colleagues across the country who submitted their curricular proposals in the fall for a master's degree and, by golly, they're going to be admitting students next fall. And that is so nimble at other places. I just think we're going to do ourselves a good service by moving in this direction.

C. McCord: The other aspect is that it's true that going into the catalog is an important part of completing the process but there's a couple other things that often come after the faculty curricular process. Many items go to the Board of Trustees, many items go to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. The quicker we can get in those queues, especially the IBHE queue, the quicker we can get into that queue, the quicker we can get things back out of that queue again.

J. Hathaway: This may be redundant, but I don't think we're creating – we'll have people with more work, fewer people with more work. I can say from personal experience just trying to get something through for teacher certification, licensure, we ended up missing the deadlines just because of this very circuitous route that it has to take. So I think we're basically streamlining. That's the word of the day. We're cutting out all those additional steps and actually cut the work as well.

G. Long: Right. And I would acknowledge too that this represents a couple of years of discussion and planning and such. This proposal that we've got in front of us right now has been thought about and discussed by a variety of groups and individuals on campus and certainly from my perspective is a really important way of us increasing our efficiencies because we do need to become more competitive as it relates to our curricular process. Other questions, comments?

Unidentified: Call the question.

G. Long: Okay, like to call the question? All right, because this is a bylaws vote, we do need to use our clickers on this. So if you click 1, that's a vote in support of the change. 2 is opposed. And 3 is abstain. We good with this? 1 yes, 2 no, 3 abstain. Are we ready, Pat?

P. Erickson: We are ready and they are clicking in, that's fine. But let me correct the screen now. It's fine for them to proceed.

G. Long: Okay, you can go ahead and vote. [Pause while the new bylaw minimum vote requirement calculation is completed.] So based on our new bylaws threshold, we need 33 people to endorse this. So let's see what our vote is.

1 – yes – 46
2 – no – 2
3 – abstain – 2

G. Long: Yes! Good job. I would provide a particular thank you to all the people who participated on the committee working on this. Truly it has been a lot of work. I think this provide as great opportunity for us to move forward. Congratulations.

Unidentified: This would have passed under the old voting rules, too?

G. Long: Just barely, yes.

Unidentified: Worth noting.

G. Long: Yes, so this is great.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. [NIU Constitution, Article 2.9](#), Removal from University Council Membership Discussion and Fall 2016 Implementation – Page 25

G. Long: Under new business, on NIU Constitution Article 2.9, Removal from University Council Membership. That was a discussion that was initiated earlier, I think it was last month or the month before, the question being, you know, if you fail to attend the meetings, you know, should we keep your spot. And so there was a discussion in the steering committee because we have not historically done that. Pat did go through and identify about five people who would have met the criteria of missing enough meetings to no longer be continuing. We're not sharing those names, just for respect. But point is, that if we want to do this, what I would like to encourage us is to have a motion to endorse. I mean, this is not – it already exists. We have over the years chosen to ignore it. But if we want to invoke it, I would encourage us to do a motion to endorse with the idea being that if you miss two meetings, two consecutive meetings, that you would get a nice note – not a nasty-gram, but a nice note – from the University Council office saying: By the way, you're expected to attend and we haven't seen you; what's up? And you know, if they miss another meeting, then we contact their program or their dean or whatever and see what we can do as far as getting a replacement. So if you want to do that, yes?

Unidentified: Would sending the designated alternates count for attendance?

G. Long: Yes, absolutely.

P. Vohra: And what if somebody has an excused absence?

G. Long: Excused absences do not matter.

P. Vohra: [inaudible]

G. Long: If there's that [sabbatical], then we would want the contact to our office and we would identify then a permanent alternate or a temporary alternate for that role.

J. Novak: I know there's a lot of excitement today about how many people are here, so that really is telling that this is an important issue. That must mean that in past we couldn't vote because there wasn't enough people. So I think people need to show up, and if they don't, they should be removed.

G. Long: Okay. Other discussion on this? Is there desire to make a motion to endorse this? Patricia?

P. Liberty-Baczek: I'm make a motion to endorse.

R. Scherer: Second.

G. Long: Okay. Any further discussion? Okay. All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed?

Unidentified: No.

G. Long: Abstain? Okay, so it appears that as we go forward, next year hopefully none of you will receive any notes from University Council office. That would be my great pleasure. And so with that I'll turn it back to President Baker who can lead us through the reports.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

D. Baker: Thank you. The first report is the FAC and IBHE, Paul Stoddard.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. The IBHE FAC met on March 18 at Parkland College, down in the Champaign area. Parkland is one of the community colleges in the state. They started off telling us about some of the innovations. They're trying to reach their students a little bit better. They're de-emphasizing lecture, for example, and trying to emphasize more student activity in class. They are putting students of different levels in the same classroom with the idea that those who are more advanced, who understand the material better can help those who are struggling more. And that actually serves as a teaching mechanism for both ends of that equation. They are looking at a comprehensive first year program including orientation and first year experience course, mentoring by faculty peers and so forth to really try to get their students involved and feel like they are a part of the community down there. And they are beginning to focus, I think, on courses – letting the students focus more on courses in their areas of interest, which is what students like and perspective employers like. We'll see how that all plays out. This is all rather new so they don't know how this is going to work yet, but it's an interesting idea to keep an eye on.

Most of the rest of the meeting was focused on the state of finances, or lack thereof, in the State of Illinois. We had varying degrees of pessimism and optimism as to where things are going. Parkland is actually considering what happens if there is no budget from the state. They get revenues from other sources as do we, and they're actually putting together a budget which includes zero state funding. There will be personnel reductions and other reductions, they will try to increase enrollment even as they're losing staff. They are planning on doing all this with attrition, at least for the time being. But it's scary times. And they say they will just shrink as much as they need to, if that's what happens in order to be able to offer what they can with the budget they have.

We heard from state Senator Scott Bennett, who covers the Champaign-Urbana area. He was, well, I guess glass half full/half empty, he figures there's a 50 percent chance that we would actually see an FY16 budget. He was asked, given that we've already spent \$32 billion in revenue that had been collected by the State for '16, even if we were to pass a budget for '16, what would the practical aspect of that be since there's no money to actually do anything more?

I bumped into Representative Pritchard last week and asked him about this, and his take was that we would probably end up seeing a joint '16-'17 budget where money from next year might be used this year to sort of bridge that gap. But they are interesting times that we live in. I think those were the main things. In the interest of time, and not to be too depressing, I'm going to leave it there and answer any questions if anybody has any.

D. Baker: Just a quick editorial comment on the cash flow issue. So when we had the temporary income tax that was put on, and it was put on because there was this big pile of unpaid bills similar

to what we've got now, right? And so the tax increase was put on and then it was kind of a cash flow issue. People were getting paid late because the revenue wasn't coming in and they worked that down over time. So is this could be an analogous situation where the budget would get passed, a tax increase would be put on, other cuts would be made and then they would work the deficit down over time even though we're in the budget now and we're in line to get revenues.

P. Stoddard: I think that's what they're looking at. I did forget to mention one of the things Lakeland's president mentioned was an Illinois Policy Institute article talking about pensions versus the budget, I think. Basically the IPI pointed out, or made the case, that Illinois' pension obligations exceed our operating budget and feels as a result that pension reform certainly has not gone away, that we will be looking at something down the road. What form that takes is still anybody's guess, but especially for those of us who have been around for a while, that's definitely something we want to be keeping an eye on.

D. Baker: Good point. Thanks for bringing that up as well. Any other questions?

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Greg Long, Dan Gebo, Rebecca Shortridge,
Leanne VandeCreek, Steve Builta, Holly Nicholson

C. Academic Policy Committee, Chris McCord, Chair

1. Approve [Five-Year Review](#) of Student Evaluation of Instruction
Academic Policies & Procedures Manual, Section II, Item 14 – Pages 26-31

G. Long: Let's move on to Chris, then. Chris, you have a report from the Academic Policy Committee?

C. McCord: Thank you. The Academic Policy Committee is charged with periodic review of university's policy statement on the student evaluation of instruction. This is a policy statement that is situated in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual rather than as a bylaw so it does not require two thirds vote to make changes to it. The Academic Policy Committee reviewed the document and made tweaks to it, little bits of sanding and polishing around the edges rather than any substantial reconstruction. We cleaned up the language a bit here and there. Its a document that sort of, you could tell it was a document that had been edited incrementally and you could see where things had been inserted with maybe not all the grace that was possible. So we tried to just sort of clean up the language a bit. We tried to declutter it a bit. And particularly we took away some very specific instructions that nobody followed anyway. And I think the one thing I'll point to as something moving toward a more substantial statement was the statement about which NIU courses should be evaluated, again was a little cluttered. And basically decluttered it by saying: Any NIU course with an enrollment of at least five students should be evaluated. Period. Other courses can be evaluated if people choose to, but any course that has an enrollment of at least five should be evaluated. And we took out all the variations on that theme. That's the closest we came to a really substantive change and the rest were really polishing it up a bit here and there.

D. Baker: Any questions for Chris?

C. McCord: I would like to move the approval of this revision of the language for the student evaluation of instruction.

A. Hanley: Second.

D. Baker: Any further discussion on this? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you. Abstain? Guess that's a no, so you don't need that. All right, thank you, Chris. Congratulations, thanks for your good work on that. Anything else, Chris?

C. McCord: No, that's all.

D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Mark Riley, Chair

1. Approve [2016 Budget Guidance Letter](#) – Pages 32-35

D. Baker: Mark, do you have a report from Research, Space and Budget?

M. Riley: Yes. So every year the Resources, Space and Budget Committee puts a letter together that consists of budget guidance that attempts to communicate to the administration what the Resources, Space and Budget Committee feels the priorities are going into the next fiscal year. This is, of course, a difficult time to write such a letter or give such advice. So in our letter, we first recognize the current financial situation. And in that paragraph there's an error that's been pointed out to me today. We talk about a \$91 million shortfall from the lack of an appropriation and a \$20 million approximate shortfall due to lack of MAP grants and somehow our letter concludes that that leaves a \$113 hole in that budget. As much as we'd like to shrink the hole to \$113, that should be \$113 million, not \$113, and there should be a million following that. So that will be corrected.

Moving on, we talk about really two broad scenarios: one where we move forward without a state appropriation and where one where we move forward with a state appropriation. And I think you know, in the without a state appropriation, it's difficult to recommend too much in the way of new initiatives or anything like that. So we stress the importance in that scenario of keeping faculty and staff informed. I think that's gone on so far, and I think that's important in any environment but particularly in this environment.

In the more optimistic scenario where we move forward if the state appropriation does eventually come through, we recognize the importance of some sort of pay increase for staff and faculty. That's not happened for a while. We recognize the importance of capital projects, of focusing on student retention and recruitment. I think all three of those items are interconnected. We don't really talk about that in the letter. But I think they certainly are.

So those would be the things we would view as priorities. And we briefly addressed the Program Prioritization process and the faculty involvement there at some sort of level. So that's what the letter focuses on. And welcome any questions or comments.

D. Baker: Anybody? Okay, thank you.

M. Riley: I was rooting for \$113.

D. Baker: I guess we do need a motion to approve, is that right?

M. Riley: I would say yes. I'll move to approve.

D. Baker: Second?

D. Domke: Second.

D. Baker: Any discussion? All those in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Abstain? Thank you. Congratulations.

E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Therese Arado, Chair – no report

F. University Affairs Committee – Linda Saborio, Chair

1. Approve [2025-26 academic calendar](#) – Pages 36-38

D. Baker: All right, let's move onto the next report, the University Affairs Committee. Linda, you want to talk to us about calendar?

L. Saborio: The University Affairs Committee was given the rather difficult task of reviewing the proposed 2025-26 academic calendar per the guidelines. And so we reviewed it and approved it. That's my report.

D. Baker: You're very efficient.

L. Saborio: I move that it be approved by University Council.

A. Hanley: I'll second.

D. Baker: Any discussion?

J. Novak: I have a question. Spring recess, March 8 through 15? That's the earliest I can ever remember it being. I know it's not going to be spring-like weather. If you have money, you go away so you can enjoy the weather. But otherwise usually it involves the week of St. Patrick's at least. Why is it falling so early?

D. Baker: Did we start earlier?

L. Saborio: We started a little earlier because of Martin Luther King Day and also we end a little earlier, April 30.

D. Baker: Did you hear that, John?

J. Novak: No, I did not.

L. Saborio: It has to do with where Martin Luther King Day falls. We started a little earlier in the semester and end a little earlier, April 30. This year, we end May 3, I think.

J. Novak: I'd like to begin a new thought that may over the next few years we can consider putting spring break in spring. I think it would be really nice to be out, not that we have spring weather at all this year, at any point.

L. Saborio: In May?

J. Novak: I feel like my spring breaks have always been a drag in DeKalb. And I think that there's no need to divide that semester perfectly in half because we don't do that in the previous semester. And other schools have spring break much the later, actually in the season of spring.

D. Baker: Maybe it's anticipating global warming.

G. Long: As a quick note, on the fourth line, they're operating under the guidelines that exist of spring break does incur the ninth week after the beginning of classes. We have this structure for it but if we want to discuss changing that, that's certainly something that could be done in the future. But right now you're just endorsing a process that we've already got set up as far as structure goes.

L. Saborio: My difficult task just got even more difficult.

P. Vohra: I wanted to bring to the attention of the committee that approved this, we were given a task as the subcommittee of the University Council about three years ago to explore the possibility of having a fall break just like we have spring break. And the rationale was that most of the students leave either on Tuesday or Monday of the Thanksgiving week so the attendance is low. And they asked us to explore the possibility if we could extend the semester by two or three days that we could afford a fall break just like we have a spring break. We just discussed and presented the idea. I don't know where it would go. But I think if that's worth bringing it again for discussion. I just wanted to bring it to the attention of the committee, that was a discussion that took place about two years ago.

D. Baker: All right, any other comments? Do we need a motion to approve? I think we had a motion and we had a second. Are you ready for the question? All right, all those in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Abstain? Congratulations, you have a calendar.

G. Student Association – report
Giuseppe LaGioia, Student Association
Dillon Domke, Speaker of the Senate

D. Baker: Let's move onto the Student Association report. And first I'd like to congratulate newly elected student leaders, Christine Wang. Congratulations for taking on the speaker's job. And Giuseppe LaGioia, congratulations to you and your leadership team, Rachel Jacob, Brian Robinson, Rachel is vice president, Brian is treasurer and student trustee, Matt Holmes. Congratulations to your team.

D. Baker: I will turn it to Giuseppe LaGioia, you want to start us?

G. LaGioia: Obviously this past month has been very busy with elections and things like that. The new leadership is in and we're working on hopefully getting things mapped out for the summer as well as the upcoming fall semester. Things going on right now there is a lobbying event going on on the 13th, that I'm sure Dillon will touch more on as well as the academic and administrative task forces.

D. Baker: Dillon, I think it's over to you.

D. Domke: So he mentioned some of the things that we are working on. I would like to, as outgoing speaker of the senate, congratulate my predecessor, Christine, and Giuseppe LaGioia, as well. And we do have a lot of things going on in Student Association right now. Just one of the things that you guys hopefully will be seeing in all of your departments very soon, we've been going around to some of them already. Agreeing to permanent initiative that I have been speaking about that we worked on with the different members of the different councils and things like that focusing on reducing printing in the classrooms. So you guys will be seeing our group coming around for that hopefully in the department meetings very soon. As Giuseppe LaGioia mentioned, we just selected the student task forces for the Program Prioritization process. There will be 12 of them on each one. We are having an academic and administrative task force that they will actually begin training for those task forces next week. Those trainings will encompass three weeks. The first week will discuss kind of the process, what the process means, and what has been done up until this point. The second week of training will focus on all the metrics, weightings and criteria. And the third week will focus kind of on the reports and how to read the reports of the task force and what the different buckets mean. So once the reports come out from the regular task forces, the student task forces will be able to give their review.

As mentioned as well, we've been, throughout the semester, very active in Springfield. This past week on Monday we had two senators in Springfield as well. Senator Tim Bradner, and Senator Matt Holt, who's behind me here somewhere. They went down with letters that we sent around the state and we had 21 different universities sign on to. We presented and handed hard copies of those letters to members of Governor Rauner's staff, Speaker Madigan's and a handful of other key players in the budget stalemate right now. So we had a presence down there this past week.

Next week we are organizing a rather large trip to Springfield. We do have a bus reserved for Wednesday the 13th. We will be leaving at 6 a.m. from the student center. And we'll be traveling down to Springfield. There is a march that students at the University of Illinois Springfield are

organizing. The march will go from the old state capitol to the state capitol, and that will be in the morning. And then in the afternoon we'll be leading a kind of lobbying day for the students that join us. So if you know any students that might want to be a part of that, we will have an RSVP form available on Huskielink, that's our kind of student involvement website, starting hopefully tomorrow. We're just working on formatting some of the forms that we need, liability things and such. And we'll have that up hopefully early tomorrow. But it will be a great opportunity for students to interact with their legislators. Hopefully I think we have about 20 or 25 students interested in going right now. We did get it to be an Honors Engagement event and a Business Passport event so we're really hoping that we could get at least 50 or 60 students to go down there. And we're going to divvy up lawmakers and make sure that people who are living in a certain area are going to speak with their lawmakers. So hopefully, you know, as President Baker said, there's a lot of motion going on in Springfield. Hopefully if we can get 60 or 70 students down there to get in the faces of lawmakers, that might be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

D. Baker: Any questions for Dillon? Christine, any wisdom from you as you take over?

C. Wang: I have to say I'm incredibly honored to be elected. I'm really looking forward to working with anyone who would like to work with me and the administrators. It's going to be a tough job filling Dillon's shoes, it really is. And so I'm looking forward to it.

D. Baker: Congratulations and I understand you're the first woman elected to this position.

C. Wang: I am.

D. Baker: Outstanding. And I'd like to thank Dillon as well Nate and the rest of the S.A. leadership. You've done a great job this we year. You've really done amazing work on campus and also in Springfield. So we very much appreciate your leadership in helping the institution move forward.

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

D. Baker: Operating Staff Council. Holly, do you have a report?

H. Nicholson: I do, thank you. I'm a little afraid to use this. It's our election season now. I just wanted to remind everybody if you know any operating staff who enjoy serving in shared governance, we're accepting candidate data sheets until Friday. And that's at go.niu.edu/osc. Also I have some good news. We have a dependent scholarship that we give out every year, and we're going to honor our recipients tomorrow. They are Olivia Monteiro, Laura Berg and Aaron Boyle. So we're very excited for them. They will each receive \$1,000 to be spread over two semesters. And then finally, we have our Operating Staff Award that we give out every year. We have four awardees this year. We have Ruperto Herrera, from the Division of IT, Lynne Meyer from Foreign Languages and Literatures, Brenda Hart from the Department of Marketing in the College of Business, and Lise Schlosser, External Programming. Congratulations to all of them.

D. Baker: Should we give them a round of applause? Any questions for Holly? Thank you.

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Steve Builta, President – report

D. Baker: Steve?

S. Builta: Thank you. Just like with operating staff, elections for SPS Council is actually in process at the moment. Elections for SPS Council president as well as representatives throughout the campus are going on now. Voting actually closes on Friday, we anticipate having the results available at our SPS Council meeting on Thursday. In general, we were able to develop a pretty good slate of candidates from across campus. Unfortunately, we're receiving reports from across campus that SPS members are actually sometimes being actively discouraged from participating in shared governance here at NIU. This is unfortunate as shared governance stands at the center of where this institution operates and frankly lack of participation ultimately impacts the success of the system. SPS Council has drafted and will be seeking the support of operating staff in a joint statement supporting the importance of participation of both SPS and operating staff members in the shared governance system on campus.

Finally, SPS Council is in the process of developing its periodic campus survey. The instrument would be distributed to SPS employees in the fall rather than the spring as it normally is. And it's used to kind of get a sense of morale, job satisfaction and other issues of concern to our members and it will be used to assist us in establishes the direction of the council moving forward.

D. Baker: Thanks, Steve. It's discouraging to hear that people are being disabused from serving. So, on behalf of the administration, I would like to encourage that participation for service.

S. Builta: Thank you.

D. Baker: Any questions for Steve? Okay, thank you.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. [Program Prioritization Update](#)

PPTF Chairs: George Slotsve, Alan Clemens, Michelle Pickett, Matt Streb

D. Baker: Well, we're on to the comments and questions section. Today we have a special treat for us. Program Prioritization Task Force chairs are with us. We have Michelle Pickett, Matt Streb, Alan Clemens and George Slotsve. They're here to give us an updated report. So what I'd like to suggest is let them give the report, write your questions down so they can get through that. Then we can come back and really go through the series of questions. But I want to allow them to kind of give us the playing field so we can come back and have the big picture. So is who's starting today? Matt?

M. Streb: Thanks, President Baker. Everybody hear me okay? Usually people have trouble hearing me so that's surprising. Better? Thank you very much for having us. We wanted to come in and give you kind of an idea what we've been doing for the last many, many Fridays, how we spend our Friday afternoons and come in and answer any questions you have. There's a lot of questions right now about what the task forces are doing and what are we going to give our reports on and all that type of thing.

I think everybody knows we have two task force, the academic task force, co-chaired by George Slotsve and Alan Clemens. And we have the administrative task force chaired by Michelle Pickett and myself. There are 21 task force members on each task force representing a cross-section of the university. I see several in the room today. If you're interested in who the 42 members are, you can go online to the Program Prioritization website. We're listed there. I think it's important to understand the charge that the task forces have been given. And I think it's really important that we understand that this is a resource reallocation exercise. It's not a budget cutting exercise per se. And I think because of what's going on in Springfield right now and the fact that we don't have a budget, people often conflate the two. What we've been asked to do is to identify those programs that are high performing programs, that are really important to the institution so, when resources become available in the future, we're able to know where we want our priorities to be. That's something that this university has not done since I have been here, and I've been here more than ten years. I think that's an important exercise for us to go into. It's a difficult thing to do, know doubt, but I think it's really important. What's really important to understand too is that in some places where they do Program Prioritization, the task forces have been charged with saying you're going to go find us \$50 million to give back; we need \$50 million in savings. We've not been given any sort of number whatsoever, okay? From our point of view a budget, a program with a budget of \$10,000 is treated exactly the same as a program with a budget of \$10 million. I want to make that very clear. It's not a budget cutting exercise, it's a resource allocation exercise.

I guess the first thing you have to understand is what a definition of a program is. There's a definition. This was not the definition created by the task forces, these were created by people before we got involved in the process. It's really important that you understand that we are not looking at departments, we're looking at programs. And there are 223 academic programs. And those are generally things like B.A. programs, B.S., Ph.D.s, stand-alone minors, certificate programs. There are 236 administrative programs, and that's everything from the heating plant to the Bursar, cross country team; University Council is a program. We were reviewing a narrative with University Council, all of our shared governance groups together. For the question and answer session, keep that in mind as you ask your questions. That's what a definition of a program is.

We've been asked to take those programs, evaluate those programs and place those programs in five different categories. Again, these are the categories that were given to the task force, not necessarily our categories: candidate for enhanced resources, continue with no changes in resources, continue with reduced resources, requires transformation, and subject to additional review – candidate for phase out. Most I think are fairly straight forward. We know what continue with no change in resources means. The one that I think some people don't quite understand is: What does it mean to require a transformation? That could mean a couple different things. That could be a program that is really important to the institution, but a program that's not performing well. So either we need to give that program more resources, or we need to tell that program you need to change the way you're conducting business.

One of the great things about the task force I think is that we're getting a 30,000 foot view of the institution. We're really able to get into all the different areas of the institution and we're able to see where we have a lot of redundancies, where we're having overlap, do things differently. We might take a topic and say you've got four different units that are essentially doing the same thing. We need to transform that topic, those units.

So those are our five categories that we're putting programs into. And we've been asked to put those programs roughly about 20 percent in each category. We understand that that's an arbitrary number. The one thing I want to make very clear is that both task forces aren't sitting there and saying we need to get to 20 percent in all five categories. The most important thing is that we are evaluating the programs fairly based on where we really believe that they should go. I will tell you, though that it's really important that we're somewhere around that 20 percent because, if we can get back and the task force report said we're going to sustain or enhance 90 percent of the institution, we've just wasted everybody's time and money. That is not a valuable report. It forces us to make difficult decisions and we're making those difficult decisions. They're not going to be necessarily 20, 20, 20, 20. But I can tell you when it's all said and done, it's going to be essentially in the range of about 20 percent of programs. Next slide.

You you've got these categories, but how do you decide to put these programs in different categories? Dillon mentioned there are different criteria the task forces were given. These were criteria, again, not developed by the task force, these were developed by the Program Prioritization Coordinating Committee with feedback from the university as a whole. Many of you probably remember there was a survey sent out many months ago that gave you an opportunity to say what are the things that we should be looking at, what should we be evaluating. You can see what the academic task force criteria are. I don't know how many of you were actually program narrative authors, but these are essentially what the program narrative authors were supposed to look at. If you really want to know a little more detail, you can go online and see the actual questions that the narrative authors were asked to answer. So, that's the Academic Task Force: quality of faculty, quality of students, you can read what those are. Next slide.

You can see what the Administrative Task Force criteria to consider are. There are eight on the academic side. There are only five on the administrative side. If you go to the next slide, When we sat down and really started to really dig deeply into this process, the task force realized that, if you look at those criteria, those criteria are asking us to look at two different things. They're asking us to understand the importance of the program to NIU, and they're also asking us to evaluate the quality of the program. So if you look at the academic criteria for instance – faculty quality and outcome, student quality and outcomes, financial efficiency, contribution and diversity – those are all related to the performance of a program. A program that has very research active faculty, that's graduating their students, that's doing so relatively efficiently, that's very diverse – that's going to be a strong performing program.

We were also asked to look at things, though: You can have a strong performing program that may not be important to the institution at all. Therefore we don't necessarily want our resources dedicated to that program. So things like the internal and external demand of the program, the importance of the mission, the potential that the program has, those are the things that the academic task force is looking at when they're evaluating the program. Next slide.

You'll see what the Administrative Task Force is looking at is very similar: program performance, the quality of the program, the productivity of the program, the efficiency of the program. On the other side, importance to NIU, the importance to the mission, what type of demand is there for the program. And on our side, we have something called opportunity analysis and really opportunity analysis can come under either one of these categories, because you could have the opportunity to really improve the quality of a program by maybe adding just a little bit in the way of resources.

Likewise, you could go ahead and you could really improve the demand of a program because there's great opportunity there.

So when we sit down and discuss these programs, these are the things that we're looking at. If you go to next slide, we have met every Friday since the first Friday in January. We've met anywhere from about four hour to eight hours every Friday. The average task force member is spending between 15 to 30 hours a week on this process; they are taking it extremely seriously. And we have really, really robust discussion and debate when we get into our meetings. I can't highlight that enough how seriously the 42 members have taken this. There's a lot of prep work for these meetings. People are reading the narratives, reading it in great detail so when we get in, we're able to have good indepth discussions about the programs. Next slide.

You'll see how the task forces decide how to actually put a program into the category. We talked about the criteria. Well, how do we actually decide once we've looked at the criteria? Do we want to put it enhanced, put it in sustain, or whatever. And here we've taken slightly different approaches. The Academic Task Force decided they were going to read every narrative, all 223 narratives, and it would take 17 votes to put a program into one of the categories. The Administrative Task Force took a slightly different approach. We decided initially we would randomly assign 11 people to read each narrative. The reason we chose that is that we wanted to make sure we had the ability to read those narratives closely, understand what those narratives were. And we thought that splitting up the narrative reading would do that. What I can tell you is at the end of the process we ended up reading just about all 236 narratives, all of us have. But what happens here is if nine of our narrative readers reach consensus on a category, that program is placed in the category. If no initial consensus is achieved, then what happens is all 21 of us read that program narrative, and at a later date we come back and we discuss the program again and it requires 18 of us to agree that a program should be in a certain category.

And there's two things that I want to highlight here. The first is that every program has been evaluated and discussed at least twice and most have been discussed many more times than that. The second thing that I think is really important to say is those are awfully high thresholds, 17 out of 21, 18 out of 21. When we first started this process, we said we are not going to agree on any, there's no way we will be able to get 18 people to agree on one category. I can tell you it happens regularly. I think that's something that's really important to understand.

If you go to the next slide, what we want to talk about quickly is the next steps. Our task force reports will be released on or about May 2. I can tell you we are on time and we will meet that deadline. Once May 2 comes around, the reports will be released publicly. All of the roughly 500 program narratives will be released publicly as well. So my colleagues can look at what was written in political science or whatever the case might be. And then the senior leadership is in the process right now of getting feedback mechanisms. So I know the student task force will have opportunity to respond to the task force report. I don't know if the UC will have a formal response. And just every person on campus will have that opportunity through the Program Prioritization Task Force to go in and say here's what we any about the task force report.

We want to make it very clear that our report is simply advisory. We are not making any decisions. That is well above the four of our pay grade, that's above our colleagues' pay grade. We are simply saying we've had a chance to look at all the narratives, all the programs on this campus and, based

on that look and based on those evaluations, here are the programs we're saying are the most important, are the least important, whatever.

The next step that you'll have is a town hall meeting on April 27. And there I believe Provost Freeman will be able to talk about: Well, once the task force reports have been handed in, released publicly and you've all had a chance can to comment on those reports, what's the next step? How do we actually implement the program prioritization?

The last thing I would say very quickly, is that you are looking at four people who were initially skeptics of this process. If you had told me a year ago I was going to be before the University Council giving a talk on Program Prioritization, I would have told you, you were nuts. What I think is really important to understand is that we've seen some things that probably need to be changed the next time we do this. We've seen processes that need to be fixed, a it certainly hasn't been perfect. But the one thing that I would say is that I am extremely proud of the processes that we have put in place. I'm extremely proud of the work that the task force members have done. We have been asked to serve as trustees for the university. We've been asked to put our own personal biases aside and look at what is in the best interest of the institution. I can tell you, I haven't been obviously in the academic task force meetings but I've certainly talked to George and Alan enough of what's going on, and certainly in the Administrative Task Force meetings, that's what people have done. They've really taken this process seriously. Almost everybody has been at every meeting, four or five hour meetings once a week. When they haven't been able to be there, we have had people Skype in. They've done their homework. They've taken the process really seriously. And I will tell you that I am not going to agree personally with every single categorization of all 236 programs that we have in our task force report, but what I can tell you is that I'm going to agree with that final report that comes out. That I believe very strongly and that we have a very clear message is about what is important to the university and what is not. And so I understand there's a great deal of angst in the community about this process. We feel that angst every single Friday when we meet. But the thing that I would encourage you to do is look at those reports. I can guarantee you're not going to agree with all 236 categorizations as well or all 233. But when you have the opportunity for that feedback, look at those reports, every program is going to have a statement about why the program was put into the category it was. We'll have broad statements about topics in general as well. Look at those reports, read those reports and make sure you're providing feedback because it's really important.

So unless my colleagues have anything else they want to add, I'm happy to open it up to any questions. George?

D. Baker: Did you guys have anything? All right, write down your questions, ready? Who's first? Do you get this when you lecture in class?

M. Streb: I get is Donald Trump going to win?

D. Baker: What do you tell them? Anybody? Lisa, do you want to say anything -- can what is the town hall coming up?

L. Freeman: Town hall is April 27.

D. Baker: And it will be downstairs?

L. Freeman: I don't know that. I know in the afternoon I believe 1:00 or 1:30 start.

D. Baker: Okay, we'll get the publicity out about that so you all can come.

Unidentified: When do you think you will have a location for the town hall meeting?

D. Baker: Lisa is looking it up now to see if it's already posted. We'll get it into the minutes and out to all of you. There will be a lot of publicity.

L. Freeman: 1:30 to 3:30.

D. Baker: Trying to find out where.

Unidentified: Thank you.

D. Baker: Guessing it's in the Sandberg downstairs, but it might be somewhere else. I think this is a really pretty impressive body of work. And we owe our colleagues

M. Streb: You haven't seen where we put the Office of the President yet.

D. Baker: Needs improvement or defund.

D. Baker: It's an impressive, in spite of that comment, it's a very impressive body of work, and we owe them a debt of gratitude for the amazing number of hours and good work that they put in on it. And I think you guys did really develop a culture around this for what's right for the institution and how do we move forward. So thank you. The first time through. It's a difficult task in good times, but in these challenging times, even more difficult. And probably even more important. So thank you very much for doing this. Really appreciate your work and looking forward to reading all 460 whatever there are of them.

D. Baker: All right, anything else? Paul.

P. Bauer: With the new undergraduate committee structure we just approved, I think the deans received notice about committee vacancies for next year, customarily probably the first of April we need these filled. But I suspect some of these committees won't exist or I'm guessing we may need a new email sent to us about vacancies. So I don't know where that goes or who it comes from.

G. Long: Pat will work with the provost's office and will deal with that.

D. Baker: Thank, Paul. Other comments from the floor on any topics?

S. Nissenbaum: I just want to make everyone aware that in a couple weeks we're going to have NIU's very first Earth Week. You might see in Northern Star. But I'm a director of environmental affairs, Student Association, and together with all the different organizations who are environmentally minded on campus we got together last Sunday and had a very inspirational and

motivational discussion where we planned out ways that we could collaborate but then also put together a list of events for two weeks from now. So it will be the 18th through the 23rd. But these events include talks on climate change with indigenous peoples around the world, a possible panel discussion on environmental justice and racism. We're going to have in Montgomery a live bat show. If anyone's interested in live bats, that's kind of cool. And the list goes on. We should have those up on the Student Association. I'd like to invite everyone here to come out to some of those events as they are happening.

D. Baker: Thanks for that. Kendall?

K. Thu: Speaking of environmental issue, I wonder if we could get recycle bins on this floor so we don't put plastic cups in the landfill.

S. Nissebaum: Unfortunately, those cups are a number 6 plastic and do not get recycled.

K. Thu: Even better.

D. Baker: Others? We did have our first Diversity Dialogue two weeks ago now. Fred Lawrence came from Yale and Mark Cordes from the College of Law. I thought that was an outstanding dialogue. We've got another one coming up on faith issues. And we'll have that announcement out shortly. So I appreciate Vernese Edghill-Walden's work to put the dialogues together. That's a good start on that series. And appreciate all the committees that she's work being with to do that. Any other comments, announcements? Questions?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- I. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- K. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- M. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- O. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- P. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- Q. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- R. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- S. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: All right, do I have a motion to adjourn?

Unidentified: So moved.

D. Baker: Second? All in favor. Abstain?

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.