

Northwestern University
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
Guild Lounge and Videoconference
February 7, 2024

The Northwestern University Faculty Senate held its standing monthly meeting on February 7, 2024 in Scott Hall's Guild Lounge and over Zoom videoconference. President Regan Thomson called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. A quorum was present.

The president noted that the minutes from the January 10, 2024 meeting were approved electronically and entered into the record.

The president then began his [report](#).

The president addressed the Department of Education's investigation into Northwestern over a complaint that the school violated Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act. According to the Daily Northwestern, the complaint was filed by Zachary Maschall, the editor-in-chief for Campus Reform. The president said the important point is the complaint was not made by someone at Northwestern and appears to be a part of a concerted effort on the part of conservative groups to disrupt campuses across the country. The president added that he thought it might be valuable to have Emily Babb, Associate Vice President for Civil Rights and Title IX Compliance, to visit the Senate so faculty can learn more about the processes involved in complaints like these. He also noted that he reached out to the co-chairs on the recently formed committee looking into antisemitism and hate on campus.

The president said he is still trying to ensure the Senate has its annual luncheon with the Board of Trustees. He noted that there have been several changes in personnel within the Board's office, coupled to potential changes in operations based on the Board's internal review. He said he hoped the Board would continue to engage with the Senate, either with a luncheon or perhaps a different format. The president said the Board Chair, Peter Barris, is scheduled to attend the April meeting of the Faculty Senate.

The president then asked if there were any questions related to his report.

Senator Luís Amaral (Chemical and Biological Engineering) asked if the Board now has the report they put together, based on their internal review, which they promised to share with the Senate. The president said his recollection was that the Board would share the main changes they made, but not the report itself.

Senator Seth Lichter (Mechanical Engineering) asked the president why the Board might be reluctant to meet with the Senate. The president said he isn't sure there is a reluctance. He was merely acknowledging the lunch has not yet been scheduled. He added that he will get to the bottom of why that is.

The president then introduced Vice President and Chief Investment Officer Amy Falls.

Vice President Falls thanked the Senate for inviting her to speak once again. She shared numerous [slides](#) with the Senate, but she said she wanted to focus on three main points: how the endowment is structured and how it supports the University, what the Investment Office is trying to do better, and updating the Senate on the Advisory Committee on Investment Responsibility (ACIR).

Vice President Falls commented on what the endowment has achieved over the last 30 years. Notably, since 1991, when the endowment was at approximately \$956 million, there have been almost \$7 billion in donations, \$15.2 billion in appreciation, \$9.1 billion in spending, payout, and management fees, ending August 2023 at an approximate value of \$13.7 billion.

Vice President Falls spoke about the payout rate. In fiscal year 2023, the endowment provided \$675 million to Northwestern's budget. The endowment will provide \$762 million in FY2024 (\$63 million per month). She noted that support from the endowment has been steady over time.

Vice President Falls said that Northwestern adopted a new spending formula two years ago. She said the formula emphasizes budget stability and smooths market fluctuations more gradually than peer institutions. Current spending follows the 70/30 model, which means spending is calculated as 70% of the prior year's payout grossed up by Consumer Price Index inflation plus 1% plus 30% of the market value. This equation equals a 5.1% endowment payout on the average value of endowment assets during the year. She said she is a big fan of this policy and that it is, in her view, the most stable of all the spending models. She noted, however, that the one area it is vulnerable is during a period of high inflation and low market return, which, unfortunately, that is what has coincided recently.

Vice President Falls said the effective draw rate has been above 5% recently, but should start to stabilize. She said there is a cap at 6.5%. If the effective rate goes above that, she said the Board would have to start considering action, but the University is nowhere near that and the trends are going in the right direction. She noted that the goal is to generate investment returns that can cover an anticipated draw of 5% from the endowment plus cost growth around 3%. Thus, she said her office, at a bare minimum, works for an 8% return on average each year.

Vice President Falls then shared spending and inflation goals for all endowments over \$1 billion since 1977. During the 80s, all returns were well over 8%. Since the global financial crisis, she said there are very few ten-year periods that have generated an 8% average return.

Vice President Falls then focused on Northwestern's spending distributions compared to peer institutions. What's noteworthy is Northwestern's spending rivals that of their peers, but the gifts into the endowment are on the lower side. She said this is partially because the University has had other needs like capital projects.

Vice President Falls commented on the fact that Northwestern has done a good job at managing volatility, but perhaps more than they need to. She said she has pushed for a little more risk to achieve those higher returns. Her office analyzed potential risk exposure amongst peers and Northwestern is in the moderate range. She said some peers are taking big risks and others are taking much lower risks. She made the case to the Board that investments need to be pushed a little.

Senator Lichter asked if the analysis the Investment Office was doing in terms of exposure was based on past data. Vice President Falls said the volatility versus gains analysis they have been doing is based on five-year forecasts. However, she said the forecasts are generally based on past behaviors, but not always.

Senator Amaral said that sometimes when looking at aggregate data it can disguise behaviors within the group. He said data is presented for Northwestern as if it were one thing, but it is in fact many things. For instance, he said, the medical school is a different entity from the University. He said the total endowment number has little meaning to him because he doesn't know how much these individual units are effecting the larger picture. Vice President Falls said she has a slide that she in fact took out, but would be happy to return to the deck, that features the unit holders for the endowment. She noted, for example, the Feinberg School of Medicine holds 18% of the units, which is the most. Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences owns about 10%, about \$1.4 billion, which does not compare well to say Williams College. Given that, she said that she believes Northwestern is under-resourced relative to other peer institutions. She said her job then is to outperform her peers. She also noted that the payout is the same across the schools despite varying levels in ownership, which is why they present the data this way. Senator Amaral asked for more clarification. He said returns are presented as a whole number, but there are different investment tables. Also, notably, he said it was his understanding that the Investment Office manages some investments and there are some investments they pay for a private equity firm to manage. He then asked what the proportions are for those investments and what the costs are associated with those. Vice President Falls said the Investment Office only manages the bonds. The rest is done by third-party managers.

Senator Ezra Getzler (Mathematics) asked about the use of the word inflation. He said in the newspaper inflation is related to consumer prices, but his understanding was that number wouldn't be related to Northwestern's income side of the ledger. Vice President Falls said this was an important topic. She said the number they use for their formulas is CPI (Consume Price Index) plus 1%. There is another price index called HEPI (Higher Education Price Index), which she said generally runs about 1% above CPI. With CPI, Vice President Falls said it can be broken into two categories, goods and people. She said, recently, goods have been deflating, but people have not been. Organizations like universities then tend to have higher cost growth.

Vice President Falls then transitioned to what the Investment Office is trying to do better. She shared data that compared 5-year performance in asset classes at Northwestern versus the benchmark figures. In most categories, Northwestern was below the benchmarks, and she wants to shift that trend. To do that, she said she wants to be very thoughtful about manager selection. She said she is eliminating managers who have a narrow investment focus because if their very small area of focus doesn't perform well then there is no room to change course. She said that in 2018 they had 135 active managers, a relatively high number. In 2022, they had 105. Her goal, she said, is to get the number of managers closer to 95. By doing this, Vice President Falls said that managers will have a greater percentage of the portfolio and therefore can have a larger effect on performance overall. She said they would not cut all small allocations because those types of managers tend to be younger and more diverse, and they want to invest in those types of firms, but they also do want to be more purposeful about how much they are investing in those firms relative to the entire portfolio.

Vice President Falls said the implication of that change is having managers with fewer stocks—the higher number of stocks a manager has, the generally worse their performance is compared to the index. The purpose of this is to concentrate funds, which will insure managers have higher conviction in their investments.

The president then opened the floor for questions.

Senator Amaral asked if prior decisions made by the Trustees led to some of the poor investment performances Northwestern is currently experiencing. Vice President Falls said the funds she eliminated are mutual fund managers with monthly liquidity, but because they offer that liquidity, they have to offer a diversified portfolio. She made the claim that this type of liquidity isn't worth it in the long run. She noted that she understood why investors prioritized these types of portfolios (higher liquidity) after the financial crisis. She said the decisions that were made all depended on what was trying to be accomplished. She said if you are trying to be safe, investing in more liquid and therefore more diversified portfolios was the right decision. But the tradeoff is the performance will be average. She said she wants to try to be a little less safe and in turn be less

average. She noted that reasonable people could say that is a bad decision, but she sees it as a part of Northwestern's evolution.

Senator Therese McGuire (Strategy Department) wanted to know Vice President Falls' current thoughts on the Advisory Committee on Investment Responsibility (ACIR). Vice President Falls said last summer President Schill and Provost Hagerty asked the Investment Office to take over resourcing the committee. ACIR was established in 2016, she said, and it was meant to be a forum to debate non-economic considerations related to Northwestern's investments. Most peer institutions have such forums, she said. Early on, she said the committee didn't have resources put to staffing. She said she looked at best practices and this summer put together a new proposal for the Board whereby the Investment Office will fund the ACIR. One of the most important changes she said is going to be term length for members. She said one-year terms are not effective. She said they will request faculty serve two three-year terms. She said they also want to revamp the website and employ some best practices in terms of education and transparency. She also said the ACIR should be neutral, a place for the advocates to come, but not necessarily serve on, which was the case before. She said they put the proposal in front of the Board's Investment Committee the day before and would like to get candidates this spring.

The president said it would be great if there could be Senate representation on the ACIR. Vice President Falls said the Senate would likely recommend faculty for the two seats. With proper staffing, she said the administrative burden will come off the faculty, but the duration of the commitment will be longer.

Senator Rebecca Zorach (Art History) asked what the process might be for anything discussed in the ACIR translating to substantial change in investment policies. Vice President Falls said any change on investment practices has to be a Board decision. The most ACIR can do is make a strong recommendation to the Board of Trustees. However, she did say the Board has many views, and in general, there was a lot of openness and discussion when it came to the recent [fossil fuel investment guidelines](#). Regardless, she said ACIR will be organized, stable, and hold regular meetings again, which is a good start.

The president then thanked Vice President Falls for joining the Senate.

Senator Jacqueline Babb (Medill), chair of the Educational Affairs Committee, led a discussion on CTECs (a link to those slides is above in the president's report and the discussion questions can be found [here](#)). She said the primary reason for this discussion was to gather the Faculty Senate's feedback on the latest draft of CTEC questions and she emphasized that these questions are still a work in progress.

Senator Babb revisited the purpose of CTECs, which is to gather data about the student experience. She said that while they are not pedagogical experts, their feedback is valuable for instructors, for students to consider what classes to take, and for administrators as they weigh promotion, tenure, and contract decisions. She said, because each group has different needs, the goal is to bridge all of those needs with an instrument that is as unbiased as possible.

Senator Babb then went through the timeline for CTEC revision. It began in 2018 with a [Senate resolution](#). That resolution asked for the following: "In order to ensure that CTECs optimally serve the several purposes of course evaluation, the Senate proposes that the University should review the CTECs and suggest revisions for improvement. This process should involve stakeholders across the university, including the Senate, and take into account current research on implicit biases in teaching evaluations. The review should also consider best practices in administering the questionnaire, and revised CTECs should aim to offer a reliable and fair source of feedback on pedagogy and professionalism. Specifically, we propose that, where appropriate, the questions be reformulated to better reflect learning objectives and student experience." Senator Babb said a Provost-appointed committee (members included faculty, staff, and students) was put together in 2018 to address the Senate's concerns. From 2018-2020, they conducted interviews, research, and proposed questions. That group took a pause during Covid. A workgroup then took over following the pandemic and used the recommendations the committee made to come up with an instrument that is currently being tested and revised. Drafts were tested in spring 2023—a cognitive interview-style survey was sent to over 600 undergrads. The Associated Student Government was engaged on the drafts. The workgroup also met with associate deans and faculty groups to preview plans and gather input.

Senator Lichter briefly asked about bias. Senator Babb said that studies show women and people of color do worse on teaching evaluations than other groups.

Senator Babb then shared the draft instrument. First, she shared the Formative Statement:

Avoid bias: Studies show that student evaluations of teaching are often influenced by unconscious biases about the race and gender of the instructor (e.g., Kreitzer & Sweet-Cushman, 2022;

https://search.library.northwestern.edu/permalink/01NWU_INST/p285fv/cdi_proquest_journals_2709203488). Please keep your own biases in mind as you respond.

It's confidential: Only in cases where we are concerned about your well-being or someone else's will Northwestern access your identifying information.

Keep it constructive: CTEC serves different audiences and needs: students, instructors, graduate teachers, and department and school administrators. Bear all these audiences in mind as you respond and keep your feedback constructive.

Make a report: CTEC responses are not the best place to report behavior that needs prompt attention. Instead, use the options on this page (some are anonymous) to make an official report: <https://www.northwestern.edu/communitystandards/resources/reporting-a-concern/>

The preceding is a draft of what students will see before they complete the instrument. Senator Babb went on to provide the current draft set of questions:

1. Throughout the course, the instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.
2. Estimate the number of hours on average per week you spent on this course outside of class meetings
3. To what extent did the instructor create an inclusive and respectful environment?
4. How effective were the following course components in supporting your learning: course materials (including course website), assignments, tests/quizzes, lectures/seminars, labs, discussion sections, Support outside the classroom including tutoring, office hours, etc.
5. What about the course and/or the instructor's approach most enhanced or hindered your learning? Please use concrete examples (qualitative).

Senator Babb said the first four questions are on the Likert Scale (Rate 1-5) and the last question is qualitative. She said students can contribute to these questions based on their experience in a class. She also acknowledged an instrument of this type is imperfect. But she added that there are many other ways teaching and learning can be assessed.

Senator Babb said in winter 2024 the administrative workgroup will continue to collaborate with instructors, schools, the Faculty Senate, and departments for the initial pilot. In spring 2024, the pilot will continue and be refined as needed. Senator Babb emphasized that Registrar Jaci Casazza has not set a time limit on this process—the goal is to get the best CTEC instrument possible.

Senator Barbara Newman (English) said she is a member of the Senate's Educational Affairs Committee and has done a lot of her own research on CTECs. She said she was able to gather the membership list for the original CTEC Committee (constituted in 2018) and the membership of the most recent workgroup. She said she also consulted with four former members of the original committee. The original committee, she said, consisted of eighteen members, ten of whom were faculty members representing five schools. She added that there was a rotating group of students from Associated Student Government and there were eight administrators. She said that committee did not devise an instrument and they did not reach a consensus. When Covid hit, the committee halted and when the committee was reconvened, none of the original faculty members were asked to serve. Instead, Senator Newman said a new workgroup was appointed, comprised of seven administrators—three from the Registrar's Office, two from the Provost's Office, and two from the Searle Center. She said no faculty or students created the draft instrument the Senate was considering. She also noted, since the original committee was formed, there was turnover in the Provost's Office—Jonathan Holloway left and Kathleen Hagerty was appointed Provost. There was likewise turnover in the directorship at the Searle Center. The students graduated and several faculty from the original committee left Northwestern, leaving only three original members to serve on the new workgroup. She said it is very important to keep in mind that no faculty and no students created this new draft. That process bothered her, she said, let alone the questions the new workgroup came up with.

Senator Babb thanked Senator Newman for her comments. She said her history was correct. She did note that the workgroup was guided by the original committee's findings, which did include faculty

on it. Senator Babb also said the workgroup has asked her to join their committee to ensure faculty representation moving forward.

Senator Judy Rosenbaum (Pritzker Law School) mentioned the five schools that were represented on the original CTEC committee, and that the students were undergraduates. From her perspective, as a law school representative, she wondered if the questions posed in the draft would be suitable for any of the professional schools. Senator Babb said that Senator Rosenbaum brought up an important point. That is, students and the types of instruction varies widely across the schools. She said such feedback can be brought to the new CTEC committee. She also said departments and instructors can customize their CTECs by adding questions to the standard five draft questions that would go to every student. She said the Searle Center is willing to assist departments and instructors in developing customized questions. This can be done with the current and new instrument.

The Senate then broke out into small groups to discuss the following questions:

1. As student advocates, what is your feedback on the instrument?
2. As a course instructor, what is your feedback on the instrument?
3. As a representative of an academic department, what is your feedback on the instrument?
4. Think big: what is something different/supplement to CTEC that would expertly evaluate teaching and learning that would meet the needs of merit, promotion, and tenure decision-makers?
5. Is there anything else you want the CTEC workgroup to know?

The Senate returned to the floor. Senator Babb asked a couple of groups to share what they discussed.

Senator June McKoy (NTE, Feinberg Medical School) said her group thought CTECs should be mandatory. She said that it appears a lot of value is being attached to CTECs and if only self-selecting students complete them then it could put faculty at a disadvantage.

Senator Ian Hurd (Political Science) said there was a lot of discussion at his table about the variation across schools and the hope that the designers of the instrument build out some capacity to reflect that.

Senator Newman said her table felt the current form is much longer and more thorough than the new draft. She said they broached the idea that every school should develop its own instrument to evaluate teaching, even every division in the Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences. One senator at her table said the Likert responses were being misused i.e. that it was on an agree to disagree scale. One member thought the first question was problematic because the expectation should be made at the outset and not throughout the course. One member thought the new form would hide bias behind the numbers, not eliminate it. Senator Newman said she personally thought the new survey would be useless for awarding teaching prizes and promotion and tenure decisions because it is not specific enough. She said that the new committee, as a point of doctrine, said that students cannot evaluate pedagogy, which Senator Newman believes is a contested point. Some faculty think students can evaluate pedagogy, and some students on the original committee thought they could.

Senator Taco Terpstra (Classics) said his table was wondering what was happening with course evaluations amongst peer institutions. Senator Babb said she has been looking at schools through her work as chair of the Educational Affairs Committee and she has found that are surveying student experience, and are finding other ways to assess learning and teaching excellence.

Senator Amaral said the original committee examined a lot of reports from other institutions revising their course evaluations. As a member of that committee, he said he was frustrated with the limitations of the current model, which is sending one survey at the end of the course, revealing information that would have been helpful in week two instead of week ten in the quarter. Therefore, he said, if the faculty are hamstrung by policies and cannot make radical, helpful changes, then faculty are stuck with the model being proposed. Senator Babb said maybe faculty don't have to be stuck with this model, that as the representative body of the faculty, the Senate can propose additional surveys and break away from the emphasis on CTECs.

Senator Faisal Akkwai (School of Professional Studies) said perhaps the evaluation should be a weekly system instead of a quarterly system. This way the survey could be like an assignment instead of one big ask at the end of the quarter.

Senator Getzler said there are essentially two kinds of courses, the ones students have to take and the one students want to take. He said the student spending twenty hours a week on a course they

have to take might inform the instructor about inadequate support or tools for the class, but a student in a course they want to take, spending that much time could be the best thing for them. He said his main issue with the questions is they seem a little adversarial, as if taking a class is an unpleasant experience. He said he would like to be a bit more excitement for learning in the questions.

The Senate then heard a standing committee report from Joe Ferrie (Economics), chair of the Salary and Benefits Committee (slides are linked in the president's report above).

Senator Ferrie said the Salary and Benefits Committee has met twice this academic year, most recently on January 24, 2024. He then shared a brief rundown of each of the items the committee discussed in those two meetings.

Senator Ferrie said the committee discussed use of the intercampus shuttle by spouses and partners of faculty. He said spouses and partners are allowed to use the **intracampus** shuttle. However, the website language is ambiguous regarding the **intercampus** shuttle. Nonetheless, he said the Transportation Office says spouses and partners cannot ride the intercampus shuttle. He said the Salary and Benefits Committee will clarify this point.

Senator Ferrie said a study by an outside consulting firm is currently being conducted on behalf of the Provost's Office to help Northwestern review caregiving programs that support faculty, staff, and student caregivers of both children and adult/senior dependents. He said several members of the Faculty Senate are providing feedback. He said that in terms of existing resources for caregiving support, staff and faculty can access discounted tuition and/or priority enrollment at a number of area preschools and all four dedicated partner centers offer preschool programs eligible for sliding scale assistance. Senator Ferrie said faculty still have questions about availability and proximity, and will hopefully be an outcome of the study. He said faculty can contact Lesley Lundeen with caregiving questions.

Senator Ferrie said there is a new Director of Benefits at Northwestern, Joseph Park. He replaced Anne Fish, who stepped down after many years of dedicated service. Senator Ferrie said Director Park is coming from the private sector. He said he brings a different perspective on HR benefits

than those who have spent their careers primarily in higher education. Senator Ferrie thought that might be a benefit to Northwestern given that, in his view, HR in the private sector has been more proactive and creative about using benefits to lure workers back in after the pandemic. Senator Ferrie added that it is a good time to get ideas in front Director Park seeing as he is new to the University, and that he is happy to pass those along on behalf of the Faculty Senate and his committee. Director Park likewise he said is more than willing to use the committee as a two-way conduit, both hearing faculty concerns and transmitting HR information out to the broader faculty.

Senator Ferrie then discussed the “Premier” tier health plan in BlueCross BlueShield Illinois PPO. He said the BCBSIL PPO plan has three tiers, but according to Nichols Kaster (NK), a Minneapolis-based law firm, the “Premier” plan is—under no circumstances—a better deal than the other two tiers. The “Premier” tier is “dominated” by the other tiers, in HR lingo. He said this means there is no range of spending and no set of circumstance that will give faculty a better option by enrolling in the “Premier” tier. He said that if it were a retirement plan, it would be illegal to offer a “dominated” option as it runs counter to the institution’s fiduciary responsibility to plan participants. He added that NK is exploring whether the same principle can be established in a health plan context, and is seeking plaintiffs for a potential class action suit. He said that it is not clear if a lawsuit will be necessary for Northwestern to eliminate the top tier, but the University has yet to drop the “Premier” plan despite knowing it is a “dominated” one.

The president asked if Senator Ferrie had raised this concern with the new Director of Benefits. Senator Ferrie said he had a discussion with Director Park the prior week. He said Director Park was unaware of both the “dominated” plan and that there was a law firm looking into it.

Senator Ferrie said the committee has discussed the retirement plan contribution suspension. He provided a brief timeline of events: Suspension of Northwestern’s contribution to the retirement plan was announced in May 2020 (right at the beginning of the pandemic) and ran from June 11 to December 31, 2020. Contributions resumed in January 2021. He noted that Northwestern realized a surplus of \$124 million in Spring 2021. Around the same time, Senator Ferrie said peer institutions (e.g. University of Chicago, Johns Hopkins University) paid back payments previously withheld, but Northwestern did not. He said University of Chicago returned funds, withheld in 2020, in 2021. In May 2020, the Provost’s Office reported that Northwestern’s plan does not allow retroactive

payments, and still maintains this is the case. Senator Ferrie said that may be true, and it is a moot point regardless because nothing can force them to return the money. In lieu of returning the retirement contributions, the University announced a bonus in August 2021 (3% for salaries below \$100,000; 2% for over). President Schapiro, also in May 2020, promised two years of 3% raises, but did not commit to that being a “repayment.” As far as number go, Senator Ferrie said at least \$10 million was withheld, although the administration would not reveal the exact figure. He then shared his own simulations that calculated the financial losses. Based on his data, he said nothing the university has given faculty—raises and bonuses—has made faculty whole financially.

Senator Sara Solla (Physiology) asked what the annual amount the university spends on faculty salaries. The president said the [report](#) from Chief Financial Officer Mandy Distel and Provost Hagerty has data on faculty salaries.

Senator Ferrie said the bottom line is the raises and bonuses have not been enough. Considering that, he offered a path forward for faculty. He said Northwestern was within its rights to withhold contributions and deciding to not return contributions. Given that, he said he doesn’t see a way to get that money back. But he said what the Senate can do is plan for the future. Through a process of negotiation and discussion, make clear how this process could have been better from the faculty’s perspective, and request that the Board establish clear guidelines and benchmarks if such an event would ever necessitate the suspension of benefits again. He said it would also be worth considering having someone outside the University to examine faculty benefits to see if they are vulnerable to expropriation. He said it would be worth having such information even if there is nothing faculty can do about it broadly, they could at least plan for it on an individual basis.

Senator Amaral said the closest thing to contract between the University and faculty is the Faculty Handbook. He asked if language can be added to that Handbook to ensure benefits are permanent. Senator Ferrie said no. He said any forward-facing benefits language on the HR website and in the Faculty Handbook is not legally binding. He said the legally binding document, in context of the pension plan, is something called the “plan document,” which is 58 pages of dense legalese. He said faculty should, at the very least, know what is in that document.

Senator Ferrie then briefly shared information about a new option for the retirement plan, the “mega backdoor Roth.” He said after tax contributions can be made into the regular NU retirement plan and roll them over into the Roth at Northwestern or in a personal Roth account. This allows faculty to get around the annual limit an individual can put away (more information is contained in the slides).

The president asked if there was any new business.

Senator Amaral expressed concern about the two students at Northwestern under legal threat for creating a prank Daily Northwestern. He said one was arrested inside a classroom. He said this was really troubling and that the Senate should do something about it.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jared Spitz

Secretary to the Faculty Senate