

1-25-2023

FS Transcript 2023-01-25

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "FS Transcript 2023-01-25" (2023). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 86.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate/86>

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 Faculty Senate Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

TRANSCRIPT

FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 3 p.m.

Altgeld Hall Auditorium, 2nd Floor

Northern Illinois University

DeKalb, Illinois

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Akst, Barrett, Berke, Bohanon, Books, Borre, Buck, Campbell, Chen, Cheyney, Chomentowski, Demir, Douglass, Duffin, Hartenhoff, Hu, Hunter, Jong, Kim, Konen, Liberty, Marsh, May, McConkie, McGowan, E. McKee, Mellon, Miguel, Montana, Mooberry, Naples, Nesterov, Nicholson, Palese, Puckett, Qin, Rejabi, Rogers, Rossetti, Saborío, Scanlon, Sharp, Sullivan, Vahabzadeh, Valentiner, Whedbee, Woods

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Allori, Clark, Duffrin, Gors, Ito, Johnson, Montgomery, Penkrot, Saiyed, Serowka, Shulman, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Vaezi

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Falkoff, Ferguson, Guess, Hughes, Lee-Gordon, C. McKee, Radasanu, Schatteman, Williams

OTHERS ABSENT: Cripe

I. CALL TO ORDER

I. Montana: Good afternoon, I call the meeting to order. Hello and welcome, everyone, to our first Faculty Senate meeting on this snowy Wednesday of January 25, 2023, a reminder that we are in northern Illinois.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

I. Montana: Per the Illinois Open Meetings Act's provisions, as a public body, Faculty Senate must have a quorum of a simple majority for a meeting to convene. Pat, do we have a quorum?

P. Erickson: We do have a quorum. I remind everyone to complete the attendance slip at your place and Ferald will collect those after the meeting for us; thank you, Ferald. And remember, even though you have a really loud and clear voice, if you want to make a comment or you want to ask a question, please go to one of the microphones so we can get that on the recording and so that people who are listening in a view-only status can hear what you're saying. Thanks.

I. Montana: Thank you, Pat.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

I. Montana: This brings us to item Roman numeral III, adoption of the agenda for today's January 25, 2023, Faculty Senate meeting. May I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda?

D. Valentiner: So moved.

I. Montana: Second? Okay, Sarah Marsh.

I. Montana: Any discussion regarding the agenda? Seeing no discussion, all in favor, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

I. Montana: Any opposed? Abstentions? The approval of the agenda for today's meeting has passed

IV. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 16, 2022, MINUTES

I. Montana: We shall now move to item IV, to approve the minutes of the meeting from November 16, 2022. Everyone should have the minutes in your agenda packet that Pat emailed to members, and the minutes can be seen on pages 4 through 6 of your agenda packet. We're going to take a minute or so for folks who might want to review it.

Well, I like silence on snowy days. Looks like I'm not seeing anything, and we will get moving. May I have a motion and a second to approve the minutes?

F. Bohanon: So moved.

V. Naples: Second.

I. Montana: Okay, any discussion, revisions? Hearing none, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

I. Montana: Any opposed? Abstentions? The minutes are approved, thank you, everyone.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

I. Montana: Item V. of the agenda is public comment. Pat, do we have any timely requests for public comment?

P. Erickson: No public comment today.

I. Montana: Thank you.

VI. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

I. Montana: We will move now to item VI., Faculty Senate president's announcements. We have a very packed agenda today, so I am going to move on to our main agenda item. But before I do that, I just want to take the opportunity to welcome everyone back to campus and also to draw your attention to a letter that has been signed and sent on behalf of the Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in support of our Asian-American and Pacific Islanders regarding the two tragedies that have occurred in California, namely in Monterey Park and Half Moon Bay. And I want to ask that we take a minute of silence in recognition of this tragedy. Thank you.

VII. PROVOST'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

I. Montana: We will now move to agenda item VII., provost's announcements. Provost Ingram is not able to join us today, but she did send me a couple of announcements that she asked me to convey on her behalf.

The first of these has to do with the search for vice provost for academic affairs, chaired by Vice President for Student Affairs Clint-Michael Reneau. And the search is kicking off as we speak. The position is not yet available in the employment system, but it will soon be listed. The provost asked me, not only to announce it, but also to urge faculty who would be interested in considering this position, so please give it a thought if you are interested.

Secondly, as many of you know, Dean Laurie Elish-Piper will be transitioning to the position of interim executive vice president and provost at the end of June. The search for acting dean in the College of Education, which is led by Dr. Paul Kassel, is also kicking off in preparation for this transition.

Provost Ingram wanted to make sure that the senate is informed about this development. Information on both searches, including committee members, is available on the executive vice president and provost's website in the "About" section. So, if any of you are interested in gaining more information about this, you can find that on the website.

And, finally, she also wanted me to bring to the attention of this body the recent discussion pertaining to AI, artificial intelligence, particularly revolving around the issue of [ChatGPT](#). She wants you to know that the academic leadership had a spirited discussion over this issue, and she expects that colleges and departments are also carrying on this discussion, as well, because this is something that really concerns the colleges and campuses across the country. How do we as faculty ascertain the student's creative work versus things that are being done on behalf of students through AI? The [Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning](#) created a [website related to this issue](#), so there is a Q&A-type website dedicated to this topic. If you are interested, you can find more information about ChatGPT there.

VIII. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. State Universities Retirement System Member Advisory Committee (SURSMAC) – Update
Peter Chomentowski – NIU academic representative
Liz Guess – NIU non-academic representative

I. Montana: With that, we will move to item VIII., items for Faculty Senate consideration, and we have three presentations to update this body today. The first of these is going to be presented by my colleague, Peter Chomentowski, and Liz Guess, pertaining to the State Universities Retirement System Member Advisory Committee, also known as SURSMAC.

P. Chomentowski: Good afternoon, how are you? Liz and I are going to talk about the State Universities Retirement System Member Advisory Committee. I am the NIU academic representative, and Liz is the non-academic representative. We want to give you a little information, as I'm going to give you an idea of what SURSMAC is, because I'm assuming some people don't know what SURSMAC is and what the history is. I'm going to talk about some of the activity that they actually do; and then from there, we're going to get into what we really wanted to present today – that there may be a possible dissolution of the SURSMAC committee. And SURS has brought this, and how to vote on it, and so Liz is going to present some information on that, and then talk more about what SURS is planning for the future if the SURSMAC committee is actually dissolved.

Just a little about the history. Basically, the Employees Advisory Committee was created in 1941, and it was originally created by the University of Illinois president. And it was basically made for specific recommendations from SURS to the Board of Trustees. Through the years, it has changed a little bit. In 1953, the EAC was expanded to include representatives of all institutions covered by SURS. And so we have, for example, two representatives from our university. And every other university has the same thing, and it is listed basically as the SURSMAC committee.

In 1967, the EAC was expanded to include a number of faculty and non-academic. So, like I said, I'm the academic representative, and Liz represents the non-academic. And in 1971, the EAC was expanded to include a retiree representative from the State Universities Annuitant Association, which is an association that's set up to basically advocate on behalf of faculty and staff of universities and colleges, community colleges also, both retired and current, even spouses and survivors of people who participate in the beneficiary program for the university retirement system. And in 1992, the EAC was finally changed to SURSMAC. And we have a committee that's run through Faculty Senate and that's what we're going to talk about today.

So, the activity of SURSMAC. From 2008 to 2012, there were 11 resolutions adopted by the SURSMAC committee. They mainly dealt with things like timely contributions, the need to protect health insurance benefits, the need for SURS staff, and also to amend Illinois' Constitution for graduated income tax. Not all these resolutions were recommended to SURS, and SURSMAC does not participate in the legislative or lobbying process. But SURSMAC works to present these concerns and work on resolutions with SURS; and then SURS works through their legislative board to make decisions.

Now, from 2012 to '22, there have been no resolutions that SURSMAC has been a part of. The only activity has been electing officers and revisiting bylaws. So, in 2014, SURSMAC stopped being an advisory group to the SURS Board of Trustees. With that, SURS basically voted to sever the relationship with the Open Meetings Act and fiduciary concerns; and SURSMAC, as revised by their bylaws, can share feedback. So, SURSMAC has been a reporting between SURS and SURSMAC. And basically, from the SURSMAC committee, then we can provide information to you of what's going on in these meetings. As of now, as I've been on SURSMAC, we meet once a semester. It's a Teams meeting and all the non-academic and academic representatives all join in with some of the executive board from SURS, and they represent things to us about legislative, financial things, future things upcoming. And then we can work with them and supply the information to the individuals of the universities that we represent.

Now, one of the things that's come up is the possible dissolution of the SURSMAC committee, and Liz will tell you about this.

L. Guess: Thank you, good afternoon. I just wanted to share a little information on this possibility of the dissolution of the committee. A year ago in the spring, the SURS executive director did contact the SURSMAC executive committee, of which I'm a member. And they really expressed their need to release their involvement from SURSMAC. SURSMAC is not an entity of SURS; as was mentioned, it's a group of individuals from each of the different universities and community colleges. So, SURS had said that they are no longer able to host the meetings; they can't provide information on their website; they really needed to make a separation from the SURSMAC committee, because SURSMAC isn't necessarily an entity of SURS. That information was shared with the executive committee, and then last summer the executive committee had several conversations just around the history of SURSMAC, what SURSMAC has done, and a lot around the inactivity from this committee in the past ten years.

And so, we looked at the original intent of the committee; we looked at the bylaws; we looked at past meeting notes and agenda items, and just realized that it's possible that SURSMAC has seen its vision. And a lot of what has happened with SURSMAC has really turned into information sharing. So, as was mentioned, what has really become of these meetings is that the SURS executive committee is presenting information on benefits, legislative, and investment updates, in turn that we can share with each of our universities and community colleges. And so, there hasn't been a lot of activity amongst the group, but more information sharing.

In the fall meeting, just this past semester, the executive committee did bring up the possibility of dissolving the SURSMAC committee to the entire group of membership. There was some lively discussion about it; I think there were a couple of retired faculty from the University of Illinois that really did express some concern, feeling that the SURSMAC was more of a watchdog group, and they felt concerns if the watchdog group disappeared. There was a lot of discussion around the Annuitants Association. We're obviously here today to talk about SURSMAC, but do want to mention the Annuitants Association, and I'll talk about that a little bit more in a minute.

The SURSMAC didn't really play a role in the legislative or lobbying process, and over time, there have been a lot of roles that the universities have developed. Most universities have at least a couple people in the position of government relations at the state and federal level. We have benefit groups, we have the university presidents groups, so any topic that is of interest to the SURSMAC committee definitely has a way to be expressed and communicated through the different universities and community colleges, and those groups can pull together, as necessary. But we weren't really finding that that activity was necessarily coming directly from the SURSMAC. So, SURSMAC, I think has turned into be more information sharing.

What we anticipate happening is that in the spring meeting, which will likely take place in March or April, that the SURSMAC constituent groups will be asked to vote on the dissolution of SURSMAC. So, we wanted to make sure that this was information that was shared with all of you in advance of that meeting.

Through this process, the SURS has committed to holding two stakeholder meetings. So, we definitely wanted to make sure that this information was shared. In the fall, they held this meeting in November, and they do record the session, and the session is available on the SURS website. They did send formal announcements on this session to several of the union groups in the state, and then also to SUAA and the SURSMAC membership. But it's important that everyone is aware, and we will be working to get this more publicized, that any member of the SURS can attend this session. The one that's coming in the spring is going to be held April 13, from 1 to 2 o'clock. It's a virtual session. Registration is required on the SURS website, but anybody is welcome to attend. So, for anyone who is looking for that information directly from the SURS, they're going to be covering topics like benefits and investment and a legislative update. That information will be available to employees at the time, and then they can also go back and view that if they're unable to make that meeting. Questions can be asked in advance. Questions can be asked during the session. And SURS has also made it very clear that anybody can contact SURS at any time to seek that information or to ask questions.

As I said, this wasn't necessarily intended to be a presentation on the Annuity Association, but we definitely want to comment on the role that the Annuity Association plays. They do take an active role in the legislative and lobbying process. They do definitely advocate on behalf of all retirees and active employees in the state to preserve those pension benefits through the State Universities Retirement System. So, this is definitely a way and a group that is still actively involved in any legislative activity that would have an impact to the SURS benefits.

That is all the information we had. We can take questions now, but also wanted to list our contact information should you have any follow-up questions after this.

D. Valentiner: I wonder if you can talk a little bit about how the SURS board is accountable to SURS members. What is the mechanism? One mechanism, I imagine, is that the SURS board might be appointed by the governor, and the governor is elected by the people. But, are there any other mechanisms by which the SURS board is accountable to the SURS members?

L. Guess: I don't know that I have a good answer other than what you've mentioned. I'd have to follow up and get back to you on a response to that question. I don't think that they're necessarily accountable to the SURSMAC committee. They did make that decision and vote on that change that the SURSMAC doesn't have a direct connection to the SURS board. They work through the executive director of SURS. So, that isn't something that I would see changing as a result of this committee. But I understand your question and would have to get back to you with a more in depth answer.

D. Valentiner: [inaudible] that there might be a watchdog function that some people were worried about losing. But what would be the route by which the SURSMAC could hold the SURS board accountable, other than I suppose they could just rally the troops at the institution. They could pass information back to the institution and then SURS members could make up thoughts or express their discontent. Is there any other mechanism by which the SURSMAC increased the accountability of the SURS board?

L. Guess: I would say any activity that takes place doesn't have to be worked through the SURSMAC. I had mentioned that there are the different benefit groups. The universities have the benefit group where all the benefit managers are connected. Similarly, we have a group with the payroll managers. The government relations at each of the universities works closely together. So, I feel that, not only the SURSMAC, but there are also these other groups amongst the state that connects the universities together. For example, new legislation comes up; our government relations is actively working with those of us at the university, with the other university government relations, pulling in university presidents as needed. So, I feel like there are other groups that are actively working on this outside of just the SURSMAC where they would be rallying the troops, so to speak, if there was anything that needed to take place. The other thing is definitely the Annuitants Association is an active group that is involved in the legislative and lobbying process. So, they would be another group that would be working if there is any sort of legislation that would be impacting the benefits of SURS members or retirees.

H. Nicholson: I want to make a plug for the Annuitants Association. I'm on the membership committee, so it's part of my job. If you are a member of NIU Annuitants Association, you're automatically a member of the State Universities Annuitants Association, and those dues, which are only about \$3 a month, they contribute to some of those lobbying activities. So, as current employees, we really do have a benefit from SUAA. So, I would recommend looking into joining the organization.

L. Guess: Thank you, Holly.

D. Douglass: I did just check the website in relation to David's question about the membership. Not all members of their board of trustees are appointed by the governor. Six of them are elected by members. So, just food for thought. But then also my question more specifically was: Do you anticipate the dissolution of this committee being either negatively or positively impactful to faculty and staff at NIU, and if so, to what degree?

P. Chomentowski: I've been on the committee for two years. What I guess they've found is that a lot of same information that was being given to SURSMAC is available through the meetings that everyone can attend. And so, a lot of people were getting the information directly from the SURSMAC representatives, while you can log on and view the meetings yourself, the same meetings that we did with SURSMAC. From what I've taken from being on the committee is that the SURSMAC was more of passing the information along, which can actually be gained from going to their website. SURS has actually stated that, through the meetings which are open to everyone, as long as you register, you can go to the meeting and get the same benefit as the information that would come to us as the SURSMAC representatives. So, I don't think so. I don't know exactly, but that's the whole belief of SURS, is that all the same information, nothing is being delegated or changed.

D. Douglass: Can I ask a second question? Do the two of you intend to vote in favor of the dissolution as of now, given the information you have?

P. Chomentowski: This was brought to our attention at the November meeting; so, we're supposed to get more shared information. During the November meeting, they brought this up that this is coming. And so, at the spring meeting, we are supposed to be given information for all the representatives of SURSMAC to look at, to see whether or not we want to. I haven't received the information yet, so I don't know. But we brought this up, because someone wrote a letter to an editor that was concerned about this, someone that was a retired member. And that's what sort of started this where we wanted to present the information to you ahead of time before we were given the information. So, I don't know yet until we get the information.

C. Campbell: Actually, I was going to ask that unintended consequence – thank you for doing that. I was going to piggy-back on that, and I'm not that familiar with the SURSMAC, but I know from the presentation about the history of it, at one time there was a need for that. I'm just wondering, if such a need arises again, is there some sort of way, some sort of clause, where it could again be more involved with the SURS system? Once it's decoupled, is there any mechanism for that to happen? And something to think about as a safety net.

L. Guess: Yes, that's a great point. We obviously haven't gotten as far as the dissolution. I think one thing that I did mention that is important is that, what has evolved over time is a lot of the connections that we have with the other SURS employers. And so, I do feel confident that, if there was any activity that all of these groups would be able to get connected much more quickly than they possibly could have 80 years ago when the committee was in its inception. So, I think that's something that we can bring up in conversation in this next meeting with the ability to pull together. But, I think that just is happening much more naturally as events today are occurring. Like, we work very closely with other universities through the COVID pandemic and with new legislation that's coming, with anything that our government relations is working on. We're also working closely with the other universities and community colleges. So, I think there are a lot of connections within this group and in the universities and community colleges in general. But that's something we can definitely share, should it proceed with the dissolution, with how these groups can get connected on an as-needed basis.

I. Montana: Other questions? If not, the contact information is still there, so feel free to reach out to both of them, and I'm sure they will be happy to respond to your questions.

L. Guess: Yes, thank you for your time today.

P. Chomentowski: Thanks.

B. IT Security – presentation
Fred Williams, Senior Director of IT Infrastructure

I. Montana: Our next agenda item is item VIII.B. I just mentioned AI and ChatGTP. We're happy to have Fred Williams, who is senior director of Information Technology Infrastructure, who is here to share and update us on the work related to his division. So, the floor is all yours, Fred.

F. Williams: Thank you very much, and thank you for having me. I think this is the first time I've been to the Faculty Senate, and it's nice to meet some of you. In my presentation today I want to cover two different topics. One is why we really need information security today, and then some of the most common misconceptions about information security.

And why do we need it today? Well, there's kind of a general loose understanding of there's bad guys out there, there's hackers, and there's all this bad stuff that happens in cyberspace. But what you may not realize is that cyber crime is now the third largest economy in the world. Cyber hackers have striated into very specific niches. They have created their own economy. They have people that provide sites and services to perpetrate cybercrimes. There are people who specialize in each aspect of a cybercrime all the way from the beginning, which are called initial access brokers, down to the very end where they launder the money.

So, it's a big threat today and, in fact, if you're not familiar with what ransomware is, ransomware is a very particular type of cybercrime. There are many different types of cybercrime, but ransomware is likely our number one threat today. In 2021, there was a cyber security report that the average total cost for rectifying a ransomware attack, only in the education sector – the corporate and financial and others, they have different metrics – but for education, the average cost was \$2.73 million per incident. These things happen, and they happen close to home. NIU has seen a number of attempts of ransomware attacks as recently as last year, and we see Sycamore School District had an attack. DeKalb County had an attack. One of our vendors that we use had an attack right as we began to onboard them. And Lincoln College actually closed due to a ransomware attach. It became too expensive for them, and they had to close their doors.

Ransomware is not the only thing that we're concerned with. These are highlighted in red, the top threats that NIU faces today. And something you may not be aware of is the number of these threats work in concert together. So, they're not just one-offs, but a phishing attack could lead to a malware, which could lead to ransomware. So, there's a chain of events that happen here that is very complicated and something we need to be on guard for.

So, what is NIU doing and what is Information Security at NIU doing about this? Well, primarily, the number one attack vector that we see today is from phishing. Most malware, ransomware, identity theft, credit card theft, bitcoin theft, cyber currency theft, all start with phishing. So, we have, for the last four or five years, really embarked on a strong campaign to help educate our faculty and staff against the dangers and how to identify phishing. And we can see here in the metrics, it's working. Earlier in 2021, we had a phishing – I'm going to call it a failure rate, or phish-prone is what it's called, somebody is susceptible to seeing a phish and then, unfortunately, acting on it, clicking the link or giving the information or engaging with the bad actor. It was up to about 10 percent. And just over the last couple of years, we've got that down to five percent now. So, this has shown to be really effective for us. We have been doing some monthly campaigns with self-phishing, and what we've seen now, because our faculty and staff have become more capable of spotting these malicious phish and not responding or reporting them to us. Unfortunately, the bad actors have turned more toward our students. And so, we're seeing more students being targeted with phishing. And what we're doing now is we're putting together training specifically geared for our student body, and I'm hoping maybe with some contact here today or somebody else, I'd be able to engage in a way to launch that in a meaningful way for our students to help. Also have them be aware of the threats to them. The bad guys are after their student financial aid. They're after any student information, and what they can do is, they can take a compromised student account, turn around and leverage that, and turn that back against the university organization, in general, to then accelerate some of these other threats.

Just for some numbers. NIU transacts over 6.5 million emails per month. And of those, we positively identify in our office 150,000 malicious phishing emails. That's over one phishing email per person – faculty, staff and student – per week at NIU, and we're not even special.

All right, so why else do we need information security. It's not just about the cyber threats. There are a lot of good people who need additional help with regulations, and this is just a subset of the regulations and break down of the areas they cover that are important to NIU. Compliance with these are very important for the university, research, privacy, federal – there's more in here than we can really cover. But it is important for information security to know that it's not just about protecting from bad guys. It's also about trying to do the right thing by a lot of these regulations. And if you've listened to the news, there's been a significant investment and tightening of cyber security regulations and privacy regulations and all of that. And all of that needs to happen at NIU to stay compliant so that we can continue to function.

Number one misconception about information security is that information security and cyber security are the same thing. I could have added a couple more in here. Privacy typically gets comingled with these terms. So does compliance, it gets comingled with these terms. But really, the breakdown looks like this. Information security is the set of practices, policies, controls, that affect data no matter where it exists. So, that's in the physical realm; it's in the cyber realm; it's on this table; it's back at your home; it's in your office; it's wherever you take it and wherever you access it from – whatever device it's on – it spreads across the whole gambit of how data is used, consumed, accessed, viewed.

Cyber security really is the focus on the digital, electrical devices, access, network, systems. So, they're a little bit separate. The focus, though, is similar. Information security is really about

protecting three things that we're going to get into in just a little bit. And that is confidentiality, availability and integrity. Some things in the physical realm that are a threat to data are not necessarily a threat in the digital realm – things like fire. If you have paper files, and they're in an office that catches fire, you may not have a back-up of those, it could be a real risk.

When I talk about the scope of where everything is, it's not just information security or cyber security. It's really information security AND cyber security. They really have to work together, because so much of what we do with data and information is interconnected by how we use it through electronic communications. So, here we have shared information with business partners. Our business partners are part of the information security process. Everything in our organization is green, everything that's at home when you work remote or work anywhere. And then, lastly, if you're out at a café or you're traveling, NIU is a tremendously global organization. The last time I looked, NIU visited over 80 countries a year. And we've got students from all over. So, the information security and cyber security risks span all of that, spans globally.

Misconception number two: Information security is only IT's problem. Or, it's only my problem, maybe. I know a lot of people think that, but it's not really. It's important that we all know that, in order to protect the information, it's everywhere it's at and it involves everybody that touches it and uses it. So, when you think about information security, you think about who participates in information security practices, it's all of us. All of us are involved in the process one way or another. How we handle it on our own system, how we protect our system, what we do with paper documents – do we shred them, do we just leave them open – all of that stuff.

Also, there's a really fascinating – I really like this, it's a great paradigm for information security that breaks it down to something, I think, somewhat simple. A lot of times people think about cyber security, information security, that it's all about the technology, it's all about things you've seen in hacker movies. But really, it breaks down into three key parts: It's our people, it's our process, and then it's our technology. And it's where those three intersect that we really have success.

The last misconception that I've found about information security is that it's the CISO's job, or it's Information Security's job, or it's IT's job, to prevent all the bad things. We can't prevent people from doing bad things as much as we can prevent the sun from setting tonight. But what we can do and what we have done is we always try to implement best practices, policies, multiple layers of business processes and controls so that we minimize the potential for an attack to be successful, and we minimize the potential of the impact of there's anything that gets through one or two layers.

This is an aspirational slide. Where we're really going, because I figured I wanted to talk about where we're going. Information Security cannot function in a vacuum. Information Security is moving toward a risk-based management framework, and that risk discussion has to be part of all sorts of business operations and business discussions. And so, this is really more of an inspirational slide of where I'd like to see the information security program evolve in terms of risk-informed information security.

Thank you very much. If there's any time for questions, I'll open it to questions.

I. Montana: Thank you very, very much. We will take a couple of questions.

S. Marsh: I don't have a question; I just wanted to say I really appreciate the banner that says, "This is external, think before you click," because it really makes me think before I click.

F. Williams: Oh, thank you very much, I appreciate that.

I. Montana: Any other questions?

F. Williams: Well, if there are no other questions, thank you for having me, and I hope I shared some information that was useful to you. Thank you.

- C. Baccalaureate Council – presentation
Omar Ghrayeb, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Amanda Ferguson, Dept. of Management, Baccalaureate Council assistant chair

I. Montana: We will move to item VIII.C., which is going to be a presentation on the Baccalaureate Council by Amanda Ferguson, Department of Management and Baccalaureate Council assistant chair, and Alicia Schatteman, director of the Center for Non-Profit and NGO Studies, and assistant chair of the General Education Committee. The floor is yours, thank you.

A. Ferguson: Thank you. I'm Amanda Ferguson. I'm an associate professor in the management department and currently co-chair of the Baccalaureate Council. Thank you for having us. And Alicia Schatteman is going to be speaking about the General Education Committee. We appreciate the opportunity to tell you a little bit more about the work that we do on these important committees and to answer any questions that you might have.

I thought what we would do is talk about who is on the committee and what representation that we have, some of the duties of the committee and where you can find out more information. First, we'll go through the membership composition and then also the duties and what we do in terms of undergraduate education. It broadly has representation from a lot of different stakeholders at NIU on this council. We have faculty members; we have students; we have administrators and staff – members that are all very important members of this committee. So, it's a larger committee, but it's an important committee for the work that is done.

In terms of faculty representation, we have faculty from each undergraduate degree-granting college, plus the University Libraries. And then sometimes the number of faculty per college depends on the number of undergraduate programs, credit hours and things like that. So, currently, we have 16 faculty representing colleges, some with more, some with less. For example, we have two from the College of Business, and there are more from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, due to the nature of the types of programs and the number of students and credit hours that there are. We also have one representing University Libraries. Each faculty term is three years, and every year a co-chair is selected. So, this year, I was selected to be the assistant chair, or the faculty chair, along with Omar Ghrayeb, who is the chair of the committee.

In terms of students, we strive to have one undergraduate student from each college, selected by the Student Advisory Committee of the college. If the Student Advisory Committee doesn't recommend a student or doesn't identify a student, then the Baccalaureate Council members will recommend a

student to have broad representation. We also want one student to be a minority or non-traditional student. And what's important about the student representation on the committee, I think, is that they are full voting members, and they are really important to the work that we do, because they have a voice about how undergraduate curriculum changes or policies or programs, they have excellent questions and points about the student perspective about some of those proposed changes that we can take into account. And then they can also be full voting members whenever we look at those types of changes.

We have administration representation so that the current chair of the committee is the vice provost for undergraduate education, Omar. He votes to break ties, but otherwise he's ex officio. We have a member who is a voting member from the advising unit, and we also have other nonvoting members who are crucial to the work of the committee in terms of their perspectives, based on their specific units. For example, director of admissions; we have educational licensure represented; and people from Registration and Records who attend. And these people are particularly helpful in providing perspective on specific questions that arise in the committee in terms of curricular changes that might be proposed or how those might be implemented, things like that. And so, they serve an important function on the committee.

Okay, so what do we do? Anything that has to do with undergraduate curriculum policy, academic standards, that sort of thing, will come to the Baccalaureate Council. So, if there are new programs of undergraduate study, if there are proposed changes to academic standards or admission or retention requirements, all of those things will come through the Baccalaureate Council. They often initiate at lower levels, but not always, so just an overview of the curricular approval procedure. Typically, not always, but typically, changes to curriculum in terms of courses, programs, certificates, things like that, will happen at the department level and be approved by the department curriculum committee. That will then go to the college curriculum committee and will be approved there. Then it will come to the catalog editor. And the catalog editor organizes that information and puts it through to an agenda for the Baccalaureate Council or the GEC [General Education Committee], which Alicia will talk about in a minute. And then the Baccalaureate Council members, first the executive committee of the Baccalaureate Council and the catalog editor, will go through the proposed agenda and changes and prepare the agenda materials for the council. And then the entire council gets visibility to that agenda and those materials and goes through that.

What I thought would be helpful to point out here is a couple of different aspects of philosophy for the Baccalaureate Council. The Baccalaureate Council is not necessarily in the business of questioning what individual departments and colleges want to do for students. So, we would not, for example, on the council, if a new course is proposed, we would not say, "Are you sure that your students really need that course?" We assume that the departments and colleges are the experts in what their students need. However, we do have some certain processes that ensure that we're not duplicating resources or that we are making sure that student impact or student needs are being taken into account from a bigger picture point of view. So, for example, if a department wants to propose a new course, we ask that they look into duplication to make sure that another unit on campus doesn't already offer a similar course so that we wouldn't be duplicating resources and/or, if a new course or a proposed change to a course suddenly requires students to meet some sort of standards that they hadn't had to meet before, like suddenly they need to have C or better in a prerequisite course in order to enroll for this course, we want to make sure that they have gone

through due diligence to explain the rationale for that change in standards so that we're making sure that it's comprehensive and well thought through. So, that's more of our role, is to make sure to provide that bigger picture view for cross-college impact and for impact on standards.

The other philosophy that is relatively recent in the last couple of years is that, back in the day when we only had a paper catalog, we had to adhere to strict deadlines and still do for many things in terms of changes to programs or majors and minors or courses and things like that, because some of these changes are quite big. For example, if a new minor is proposed, it's not just up to the department committee, the college and the Baccalaureate Council, but it also has to go beyond us to other bodies, and it takes some time. So, there are deadlines in place to make sure that all of those proposed changes can go through those different bodies or different committees. But in the age where we have an online catalog, there are other changes that are relatively minor. Say, a department wants to change the description of their course to make it more in line with how it's currently being taught. Or, there's an update in the field, and so they're going to be delivering content that's more updated with current practice. This is a minor change and doesn't necessarily have to go through all of these different committees. And so for that reason, we have instituted an expedited process for curricular items that are more minor in nature that don't have cross-college impact and for which the departments and colleges can approve those, and those can be put into place in the online catalog more quickly. That's a recent change in the last couple of years that has, hopefully, enabled the departments and colleges to be more flexible and adaptive and quick with their changes, whereas some changes do take some more time and some more oversight.

If you are interested in the meetings and records, we meet on the first Thursday of every month at 12:30. And the minutes are distributed to the president of Faculty Senate, executive vice president and provost, deans of the degree-granting colleges for undergraduate degrees and the dean of University Libraries. So, you would have visibility to those minutes.

I'm going to turn it over to Alicia next, and then I'll stick around to answer questions.

A. Schatteman: Thank you, Amanda. I was sitting on the Baccalaureate Council; I'm a representative from the Department of Public Administration, and now I'm the chair of the General Education Committee. It's a standing committee of the BC. We have faculty representation, who are voting; a student representative, who is also voting; and some ex officio members.

In terms of the GEC, we have three members who are chosen by the faculty of the BC, which is how I ended up on the GEC. One faculty representative appointed by the curriculum committee, three faculty representatives from CLAS, and then you'll see from humanities, social sciences and other. And the terms staggered, renewable for three-year terms. In terms of the student representation, we have three students who are nominated by the SAC, as Amanda had said, and they also serve one-year renewable terms. On the administration, we have an advising representative, again, really important to the GEC, the vice provost; and then one designee of the provost from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

We conduct our business very similar to the BC. Primarily, we monitor and evaluate university general education programs. We recommend policies and procedures, make suggestions sometimes to colleges and departments to improve general education, and then we also approve addition or

removal of courses from the general education. We oversee improvement and design – and some of the things we’re doing now, I’ll talk about that – and report that work back to the BC. So, anything we do in the GEC, we goes back to the BC; they see it and then they approve it. So, that’s the advisory role that we play. And we meet the third Thursday of the month.

In terms of the shared governance – and we can probably tag team this a little bit, because this isn’t just the GEC – students, faculty, staff, administration, all participate in the curricular process. Once approved by the college curricular committee, those expedited items that Amanda mentioned do come before the BC or the GEC, depending on if it has a general education component. And then it moves on. So, one of the charts that Carol put together for us is so that you can see, when you want to create or amend or add to, what the process is. And as Amanda said, it does start at the department and then moves on from there. Depending on how much new is coming before us, it can go all the way up to IBHE if you’re proposing a brand new degree program. So, that’s the guide that we use. You’ll see individual courses, often that’s just a department or college if you’re just making small amendments. As you add a certificate or a minor, you can see that it kind of goes up from there.

One of the things that we’ve been working on for the last year in the GEC, and probably, if you’re a chair, you’ll see this, but certainly if you’re faculty, you’ll be discussing it. Our general education is really core to NIU and one of the things we’re very proud of. But we have not done a good job in terms of assessing the general education courses as a whole and against our baccalaureate learning outcomes. So, over the last year, the GEC and then going to the BC, has identified all the general education courses. If you’ve been around here for a little while, ten-plus years, there was a time where everyone was creating general education courses, and now we have a lot of them. And then resources and student enrollment started to shrink, and all of a sudden, we have the reverse happening. So, in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, where the bulk of the general education courses live, we have a lot of general education courses that are on the books, but maybe not as many that are taught. So, that was our first look: How many are actually taught? And then how many align with the knowledge domains that we have in general education. So, that was the work that we did last year to identify those knowledge domains, go through and identify which student learning outcomes. So, we in the Center for Nonprofit and NGO Studies, we have one general education course. It was submitted before I became director, and it was kind of like a check-box. Yeah, we do critical thinking; yeah, we do culture and society, thank you. And it was approved as a general education course. But we’ve never actually assessed to what extent that course delivers on those student learning outcomes.

So, as in the first part, which we did last year, identifying the knowledge domains, we’re going to ask the chairs between the next couple of weeks and the middle of March to say, yes, we still want to be in that knowledge domain; here are the student learning outcomes we’re committed to assessing, we’re not going to assess it yet. We need an assessment plan for that.

We have student learning outcome rubric that are online and probably need some re-tweaking, but you can go look at them, they’re there. So, that assessment piece will be next year. This year is just, yes, we still want it to be general education; yes, it still fits or does not fit into that knowledge domain. So, we’ll be gathering that information between now and March.

And we're happy to take questions. You have our contact information.

F. Bohanon: Felicia Bohanon, SPS Council. How many students are on the BC?

A. Ferguson: I believe now, currently, we have two, is that correct, Carol? There are four, okay. We would like to have up to seven. It's sometimes hard for us to recruit.

F. Bohanon: I bring up that question, because you indicated that you must have one minority student and then one non-traditional student. And those are very different populations, so I just want to bring that up as a concern.

A. Ferguson: Thank you, that's an excellent point, I believe. Thank you for raising that. I believe the language is that one student should be a minority student or a non-traditional student, but you're right, they could be very different students, and perhaps

F. Bohanon: You might want to reconsider.

A. Ferguson: We might want to reconsider, yes.

F. Bohanon: And then the other thing I noted that you mentioned that there was representation from educational services and programs as recommended by the provost. ESP doesn't exist; are you talking about CHANCE, because educational services and programs doesn't exist.

A. Ferguson: That's interesting. We do have a CHANCE person on the committee, who represents the CHANCE program.

F. Bohanon: [inaudible]

A. Ferguson: So, that should be changed, I guess, in terms of our listing on our PowerPoint, not necessarily – is it listed that way in the bylaws, Carol? So, we should make that amendment to the bylaws.

F. Bohanon: Yes, that's been more than ten years ago.

A. Ferguson: Thank you for pointing that out.

F. Bohanon: I was just wondering.

A. Ferguson: It's a great question. We do have that representation; it's just not accurate. The bylaws are there for a long time, and then when you go back and look at them, and you go, wait, that needs to change, so thank you. Any other questions?

J. Akst: Hi, I'm Jason Akst; I teach journalism and ER. Thanks for the presentation. I submitted what would be a minor correction to a course description – minor, but important, because the way it's described makes it seem really outdated, so I revised it, and it went through the process about a

year-and-a-half ago or so. And no one ever seems to know where that's at. Is there some way to audit the process to find out that it happened, is it going to happen, you get the idea.

A. Ferguson: The catalog editor will answer that.

C. McKee: Hi, I'm Carol McFarland McKee. I'm the catalog editor and curriculum coordinator. Once all the changes are put in, I work with the college curriculum administrators and send them the list of changes for them to also verify that they are in the catalog as anticipated. And Registration and Records also goes through and looks everything, because they have to take the same stuff that goes into the catalog and put it into MyNIU, so students can take the courses. They are not connected systems. So, if something is missing, please let me know, and I can go back and try and track it down. We've had a couple of those that have happened. We had one agenda in December that was 165 pages, so things can get lost. We do our best to try and track everything, and I have a tracking system, but it's a manual tracking system in a spreadsheet. But that's how we're tracking them and trying to make sure everything gets in. I'm sorry that you had something that needs to be in. If it's an expedited change, we can still get it in for the 2023-24 catalog. The deadline, technically, is January 31 for those; but if it's not something that's going to have a negative impact for students, such as adding a PRQ with a grade requirement, then those are easier to make. Does that answer your question?

J. Akst: Yes, thanks.

I. Montana: Next question? Seeing no other questions, please join me in thanking Amanda and Alicia.

A. Ferguson: Thank you.

A. Schatteman: Thank you.

I. Montana: I also want to mention that the minutes, which Amanda mentioned, can always be accessed through the Informational Items on this agenda.

IX. FS-UC RULES, GOVERNANCE AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE – report
Lori Hartenhoff, FS/RGE Liaison/Spokesperson

- A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award – call for nominations
Submit written letters of nomination to Faculty Senate President Ismael Montana
no later than noon Wednesday, Feb. 15.

I. Montana: Our next agenda item is item IX, and we have only one item, which is the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award call for nominations, and we have Lori Hartenhoff, Faculty Senate Rules, Governance and Elections Committee liaison, who is going to present on this item and walk us through that process.

L. Hartenhoff: Thank you, good afternoon, everyone. I would like to call your attention to page 7 of the agenda packet. And there it lists the past recipients and the information about this award. The annual award recognizes an NIU faculty member for special service to the NIU faculty. Nominees do not need to be members of the Faculty Senate. And we encourage you to submit a written letter of nomination, identifying reasons why your nominee should receive this award, to the Office of Faculty Senate no later than noon on Wednesday, Feb. 15. Letters can be delivered in hard copy or sent via email to Pat Erickson. The letters will be included in the February 22 meeting agenda packet, and the Faculty Senate will vote on the recipients, and they will be honored at the March 29 meeting. Thank you.

I. Montana: Thank you. Any questions for Lori? Great.

X. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws,
Article 4.6.3.1, Honors Committee, Student Membership
FIRST READING
Omar Ghrayeb, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Andrea Radasanu, Assistant Vice Provost, University Honors Program

I. Montana: So, we will move to our next agenda item X., which is new business. We have two agenda items here. X.A. is a proposed amendment for a first reading to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 4.6.3.1. And I have the pleasure now to invite Andrea Radasanu, Assistant Vice Provost, University Honors Program, to introduce and present this amendment.

A. Radasanu: Hi everybody, nice to see you this afternoon. I'll let you know the genesis of this very quickly and also the vote from our committee. As you're probably aware, the University Honors Program participates in shared governance through the University Honors Committee, which reports to the Baccalaureate Council. So, it serves as a sort of semi-curricular committee and certainly votes on all policy changes.

This is the first bylaw change, I think, in a long time, because I've been with the program for four years, and I have had to be taught by Carol and others how bylaw changes happen. I'll think again before doing that. We also, happily, have student representation on the Honors Committee. We have faculty representation, and we have student representations. We also have ex officio, but only faculty and students vote. We have faculty representation from across colleges, much like what was described by Alicia and Amanda for their committees.

We have five students; so, the change that we're wanting and the change that you see before you is that, rather than have all five students elected by the general honors population, we would like for that to be four and then the fifth student to be appointed from, ideally, the lead honors fellow, we have a population of honors leaders. They act as peer advisors and mentors. They have really, really good, strong program knowledge. So, it would be the same amount of student representation, except that there would be a link between the student leadership population in the program and the Honors Committee, which there wasn't before. And I think the main reason for this, honestly, and I think the rationale is up there, is just to strengthen the student voice on the committee and to make sure

that committees feel empowered. Often it's been noted by various faculty on the Honors Committee that students stay quiet, they don't necessarily participate a great deal, that they could be helped by having one among them who sort of, "Well, no I actually just saw a student the other day who couldn't complete that requirement for these reasons" and speak really confidently about student policies.

So, that's the basic point and rationale. Happy to take questions.

I. Montana: Any questions? Please join me in thanking Andrea.

- B. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws,
Article 1, Membership of the Faculty Senate
FIRST READING
Ismael Montana, Faculty Senate President

I. Montana: So, we move to agenda item X.B., and this is the proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 1, Membership of the Faculty Senate. This amendment is proposed in order to restore language that was inadvertently removed during the 2019-20 Reimagining Shared Governance. This proposed language restores the definition of tenure-track faculty who are eligible to elect, and to be elected, to serve on Faculty Senate, excluding those faculty serving in selected administrative roles from eligibility. The proposed language also restores alignment with NIU Constitution, Article 7.3, which describes the right of the faculty to organize a Faculty Senate.

The information about this can be found on page 9 through 10, and if there are questions, we'll take those now. Thank you.

XI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – report
Linda Saborío, NIU representative to FAC-IBHE

I. Montana: We'll move on to agenda item XI., reports from councils, boards and standing committees. And we will start with Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and Linda will provide us with the report.

L. Saborío: I actually have a question about the last proposed bylaw change. So, we don't exclude chairs?

P. Erickson: No.

L. Saborío: Oh, I did not know that, okay. Good afternoon, I'm going to report out today on the December FAC meeting, which was held at Prairie State College. Our January meeting last week, we were scheduled to convene at UIC, and they were on strike, so we did not cancel our meeting – I know, good for them, you have to – we stood in solidarity with our colleagues and did not want to cross any picket lines. So, we moved the meeting to the Chicago Teachers Union building, and we actually had a great conversation with the UPI president, John Miller, there. I'll report out on what

happened at that meeting in February, because we had to move it within two days' time; it was quite interesting.

At Prairie State, we did have a presentation by the president, Michael Anthony. Just to be mindful of your time, I'm not going to read my 13 pages of notes that are single spaced and probably in 10-point font, just kidding. Is anybody still awake? Are you all doing okay? Okay, good.

He did discuss some of the post-pandemic challenges with Prairie State, including changing student needs, such as the course modality, decreasing enrollment and something that many of us are facing, which is determining which programs are sustainable and which are not. It seems like he does involve faculty in these discussions and also takes into consideration what the area employers want. He said that they're looking at workforce development, and that's a big part of their conversation at Prairie State. The question was asked about, from the community college perspective, what do you want the four-year institutions to know or be thinking about. And he said we're not really competing; we're partnering and adding value. The reasons are varied for students who choose to attend a community college or a two-year institution, such as financial, sometimes they are place-bound, are not sure what they want to do. And so, they have to find a better way to partner with the four-year institution and then serve also the needs of those who are not looking to go on to a four-year institution.

There was a question about dual credit, it's a rather contentious subject on the FAC in case you didn't notice. When it comes to talking about dual credit – he actually tried to avoid the question, I think. He said, "I stay away from that." But anyway, high school teacher taught dual credit courses can lead to reductions in staff at the community colleges, and we know this. So, it feels very competitive. But from a growth mindset, the more that's happening [inaudible] the better. He said, how do we engage students in new programs here. It is hard to do with a declining population of high school students. And many faculty are concerned that they are outsourcing their classes to the high schools.

We had a guest presentation. We had several, actually. I won't read them all, don't worry. From Rebecca Buckle, on Prairie State's dental hygiene program, I have pages of notes on that. If you want more, please let me know. Anybody interested in the dental hygiene program?

And we had a guest presentation on Prairie State's African and African American Studies Program. Great presentation. Lots of notes. If you want to know anything about that, please email me.

Jennifer Delaney, who is our rep on the IBHE, the faculty rep, again shared her perspectives on the Illinois Commission on Equitable Public University Funding, which the full commission meeting was on December 12. She still remains concerned about the use of adequacy as a conceptual frame, and she said we don't have property tax-based public universities, which sometimes leads to creating artificial constructs to create buckets, and it moves us away from this data and makes things definitely more complicated. She said the formula is becoming very convoluted and complicated. This is concerning for setting up a statewide funding model. It's one step away from price-controls, because tuition is one of the few levers in economic downturns and when state funding is cut. Also, the model is about institutional costs, which fosters state level micromanagement. There are other ways of conceptualizing adequacy, such as, she said, looking at

average funding for high school students and offering no less funding for higher ed. Very interesting, right?

The president of Louisiana's higher ed system proposed an enrollment-based funding model with little performance-based funding if an institution was serving more vulnerable populations, and I think that's an important point to make. Those discussions will continue and, as we all know, Simón Weffer is the faculty rep on that commission.

Let's see, I'm going to skip ahead. You're so quiet today, what's going on. What did you do to them? We had Jackie Moreno, Illinois Student Assistance Commission College Access Initiatives managing director. That's a really long title. I wonder what her card must look like. Now chief service officer, and we had Eduardo Brambila from ISAC, Capacity Management Managing Director, give us another talk. Great talk. They described programs that help first generation students connect to college, such as the Near Mentoring offered in each of Illinois community college districts through [ISAC Corps](#). [Illinois GEAR UP](#) for middle school students, the [First Generation Scholars Network](#) for students before and during their first year in college. And then she also described questions to prompt that whole course design in social capital building that faculty can develop with first-generation students in mind. Great presentation, if you want more information on that.

For our working group reports, higher education funding, the working group is trying to discern its direction now that performance-based funding is by the wayside. They are preparing a short document listing items they think essential in any funding formula, like the institutional mission, equity, periodic review, etc. So, they're going to revise their list.

Equity working group is continuing to collect examples of university equity plans. I sent them ours. In fact, I sent them several websites. They're going to provide suggestions for improvement in the plans, and they are also collecting and curating resources for DEI. And they plan to present at the March IBHE meeting again. It's a very active group.

The student faculty mental health working group have initial data from a trial survey with the FAC members, and they're trying to put together a PowerPoint summary for this group and potentially planning to pursue IRB approval for a larger survey.

The early college online remote learning group is working on a paper with a description of potential benefits and costs of taking early college coursework and brought it to the FAC for consideration at the January meeting. We had a really robust discussion about that.

Prior learning assessment – Rather than a position paper, they're preparing a short white paper aiming for a deadline of March or April.

And student debt and affordability – we're floundering but we're working. We met with Senator Laura Murphy, and legislators are waiting to resubmit the [AIM HIGH](#). The bills won't advance until there are answers about student loan forgiveness. So, they're all just kind of waiting in flux there. Potential students today would be discouraged from student loan forgiveness getting such a lukewarm reception from people, and this might affect us even more than it already has. We told

Senator Murphy that we will try to synthesize our info and send it to her, because we did a little bit of research on programs in other states.

In the private caucus, we talked about cyber security, interesting, right, since we had a presentation about that here today. Paul reported that, in their experience at the privates, faculty aren't obligated to keep their scholarship only on university filing systems. The question of what is protected by FERPA and what is university property is a murky issue. What can I take with me if I move to another university? He said it's good to get some clarity. University lawyers tend to play it safe, so listen to them, but not too closely. [laughter] In general, our schools don't have written policies about these questions – that was response. I don't know, does NIU have any policies about this? I think I asked the policy librarian, and they said no.

The community college caucus reported that many of their schools have gone to two-factor authorization, but not all. Some have mandated cyber security training; some have monthly training, using informative four-minute videos. Some schools require uploads to be done only on university systems. Some of us have contractual information that says that, when we develop materials for an online course, it is ours. For others, it becomes the property of the school. It's very complicated, isn't it. Don't ask these questions. For some, it can be shared from faculty member to faculty member. Some of us are required to back up everything on the drive our school uses, others don't. Some faculty members are doing it or not, regardless.

From the public caucus, Dan reported that data had been shared from RAMP, that's the Resource Allocation Management Program, regarding the budget for each public university. This data might be useful for questions such as how COVID money has been used. And it's available for everybody to view.

And we talked about academic freedom issues with dual credit courses, and whether or not they're going to be able to discuss certain issues with high school students in the classroom. That's a good point, right?

That concludes my report today. Our next meeting is going to be held virtually. Pat knows how I feel about those zoom meetings that are all day long, from 9 to 2:30 on zoom. And in March, we're going to be at Chicago State. Any questions for me?

I. Montana: Thank you very much.

- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
Felicia Bohanon, Holly Nicholson, Ismael Montana
Katy Jaekel, Karen Whedbee, Brad Cripe

I. Montana: Okay, we'll move to agenda item XI.B., University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. Members of this committee include Felicia Bohanon, Holly Nicholson, Katy Jaekel, Karen Whedbee, Brad Cripe and myself. And I see that Felicia, Karen and Holly are here. If you have any report or anything you would like to share, please feel free. Otherwise, I'm happy to run through some highlights from the Board of Trustees meeting of December 8, which was their last meeting.

The agenda for this meeting revolved around a few action items and information presentations. One of the highlights from that meeting, for me, was the huge presence of the United Faculty Alliance, UFA members at the Board of Trustees meeting, due to the impasse between the union and the administration over the current and ongoing negotiations. Union president, Dr. Kerry Ferris, gave an impassioned presentation and asked the trustees to urge the administration to come back, at the time, to the negotiation table. Fast forward to now, the impasse continues, and it is my sincere hope that progress will be made so that we can avert this lingering impasse. I think my colleague, Linda, just mentioned a strike at UIC that nearly derailed the IBHE advisory council members' meeting. So, we hope that progress will be made to this effect.

Another main item of business was President Freeman's formal presentation of her 2023 university goals and her request of the trustees to approve these goals, which they did unanimously. The president, I want to say, is very determined, working with shared governance, to implementing these goals, including many of which pertain to shared leadership, shared governance and the tenure and promotion review process that she's working very closely with the Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee.

The president also requested the trustees' approval of three other action items, namely honorary doctorate recommendation for two candidates, one of whose name was forwarded for the Board of Trustees' approval. And that was Her Royal Highness Princess Gusti Kanjeng of Indonesia. And as I speak, I believe NIU has a robust collaboration with academic institutions in Indonesia.

The president also requested the board's approval of the appointment of Dr. Laurie Elish-Piper as interim executive vice president and provost, effective July 1, and the board approved that request.

Full reports and minutes of the Board of Trustees meetings can be accessed under the informational items that you have in your packet.

C. Social Justice Committee – report
David Valentiner, Chair

I. Montana: With that, I'll move to agenda item XI.C., and invite David Valentiner, chair of the Social Justice Committee, to provide any report he might wish.

D. Valentiner: Hi, I'm David Valentiner. I'm the chair of the Social Justice Committee. I wanted to thank those of you who responded to the question that we put out last meeting. I see that, here on the agenda, that the Operating Staff has a couple of questions that they're asking. I think that's a great practice. We had a question last time, asking for concerns related to DEI issues, and some people responded. I just wanted to thank you for that.

And I'm going to try to keep it short, because we're running so late. Just a brief update on some of the activities. We have Xiaodan Hu, who is leading the academic affairs work, and they're in the process, they have over the next four to six weeks, scheduled meetings in which they're taking their findings and recommendations regarding changes to tenure and promotion policies, back to the colleges to present those findings and recommendations and to stimulate more conversation.

They're hoping to present some final recommendations at the end of this academic year, including perhaps some recommendations for the Faculty Senate.

The institutional racism work group has been working with the administration to try to create alignment between the presidential goals, particularly those related to DEI issues and the work of the Social Justice Committee. We have a sense that they're lifting up our recommendations and trying to use those recommendations as a way of bringing about some institutional change and change of policy. There isn't really a great roadmap for doing that type of work, so there are some things that are straightforward, but there are some things that we're just figuring out as we go, including the way in which we try to work between Faculty Senate and the ADEI. The Academic Diversity, Equity and Inclusion group, led by Dr. Vernese Edghill-Walden, is rolling out the shared equity leadership model, and so we're trying to figure out what that is and get onboard and support that.

I'll give more updates in the future.

I. Montana: Thank you. Questions for David?

C. Campbell: Cynthia Campbell, Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment. How many people responded about the DEI issues?

D. Valentiner: I think I got two emails with information. There may be a third. But I think that a lot of the information that we got was people wanted to give it anonymously through their faculty senators. And one of the comments was a request for creating a mechanism for anonymous input, which we're in the process of discussing. I have some reservations about anonymous surveys, because of the lack of accountability, and there are all sorts of complexities associated with it. But I do think that we should try to create some mechanism by which people can express their views with some sense of safety, with some confidentiality. So, that's one of the topics that we're taking up, of how to move that forward. Was there a particular thought that you had?

C. Campbell: Yes, I was thinking about to sort of cast a wider net, if there could be some way to, like you just said, create and send out some sort of survey so people would feel safe to respond candidly. And also, thinking about those who may be untenured feeling a little apprehensive about sharing whatever their perspective is. Being new and fear of retribution or consequences.

D. Valentiner: That certainly echoes one of the suggestions that we did get and that we're currently considering. And so, maybe at the next Faculty Senate Social Justice Committee meeting, we might make some progress on that. One possibility is to have it somehow proctored by a third party, who would then preserve the confidentiality and de-identify things, to bring forward those concerns. One of the problems with anonymous portals or comment boxes is that it can be a mechanism of harassment; it can be a mechanism of saying bad things about certain people; it can be a mechanism of making threats. There's no accountability when it's totally anonymous. So, I like the idea of having some confidentiality in there.

C. Campbell: Thank you.

I. Montana: Other questions for David?

D. Valentiner: Thank you.

- D. Student Government Association – report
Dallas Douglass, Speaker of the Senate

I. Montana: We move to agenda item XI.D., Student Government Association. Dallas was here, but he had to leave.

- E. Operating Staff Council – report
Holly Nicholson, President
Natasha Johnson, OSC/FS representative

1. What are some good strategies for advocacy for our constituents?
2. What are some effective tactics for keeping our constituents informed?

I. Montana: Operating Staff Council report. I don't see Holly. She was here, but she also needed to leave. And Natasha is also not here. But they did provide questions that you should feel free, if you'd like to reach out and send them your thoughts.

- F. Supportive Professional Staff Council – report
Felicia Bohanon, President
Andrew Rogers, SPSC/FS representative

I. Montana: This brings us to item XI.F., and that is Supportive Professional Staff Council. Felicia is here, and the floor is yours.

F. Bohanon: We are celebrating our tenth year of offering the Supportive Professional Staff Dependent Scholarship. We were able, this year, to increase the one scholarship that we offer to either a child or grandchild of an SPS employee, increase that amount from \$1,000 to \$1,250. And then starting last year, we were able to begin offering a second award, which is offered to a student who has been significantly positively impacted by an SPS employee. And so, we were able to increase that amount from \$500 to \$750. And that scholarship, the due date has been extended to February 28. And we are also moving forward with a campaign to endow that scholarship, so we will be diligently reaching out to increase funds over the coming years. But, we're just very excited about being able to increase those amounts this year. Thank you.

I. Montana: Thank you. Any questions for Felicia?

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. FS 2022-23 dates: Jan 25, Feb 22, Mar 29, Apr 26

I. Montana: This takes us to agenda item XII., informational items that are, indeed, informational as the title suggests. You can always visit this, including some of the presentations we had today, Baccalaureate Council, Academic Planning Council, Board of Trustees, and the like. Their minutes can always be accessed here.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

I. Montana: With that, we come to the last agenda item, and that is adjournment, and I would like to entertain a motion to adjourn.

F. Bohanon: So moved.

V. Naples: Second.

I. Montana: All in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

I. Montana: Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.