

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, November 30, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, D. Baker, G. Baker, Barth, Bishop, Block, Boughton, Briscoe, Carlson, Chen, Chitwood, Chung, Cibrian, Collins, Cuautle, Doederlein, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Freeman, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hathaway, Hoffman (for Bond), Irwin (for Chakraborty), Jemison, Kassel, Khoury, Kreis, Long, Macdonald, McCord, McHone-Chase, Mogren, Naples, Newman, Nicholson, Olson, Pavkov, Penrod, Reynolds, Riley, Rodgers, Russell, Saborío, Siegesmund (for Staikidis), Sto Domingo, Thu, Torres (for Wilson), Towell, (for Rajagopalan), VanderSchee, Wang, Wyzard

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bond, Campbell, Chakraborty, Dannenmaier, Ghrayeb, LaGioia, Nobling, Rajagopalan, Staikidis, Tan, Wilson, Zaucha

OTHERS PRESENT: Birberick, Bryan, Coryell, Douglass, Edghill-Walden, Falkoff, Klaper, Klonoski, Phillips, Stang (for Weldy), Subramony

OTHERS ABSENT: Johns, Kaplan, Stoddard, Weldy

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: All right, here we go. Let's come to order. How's that? Now we're official. Well, welcome. Thanks for coming in on a cold afternoon. Call to order.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: First order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Do I have a motion.

W. Penrod: So moved.

D. Baker: Thank you, Bill. Second?

C. Doederlein: Second.

D. Baker: Doederlein, thank you. Any additions or edits? Hearing none, all in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you, we have an agenda.

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

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

T. Arado: So moved.

T. Bishop: Second.

D. Baker: Thank you, great. Any edits? All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Periodic Evaluation of the Ombudsperson per NIU Bylaws Article 20.4 –
Linda Saborío, Chair, University Affairs Committee

D. Baker: First order of business is an executive session, and I need a motion to go into executive session for the periodic evaluation of the ombudsperson. Do I have a motion.

S. Farrell: So moved.

D. Baker: Thank you. Do I have a second?

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

D. Baker: Thank you. Any discussion? All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you. The people who get to stay, I think, are the ones on the screen up here. And if you're not on the screen, you get to step out and have coffee. Alternates stay? Yes. And students stay if you're voting members, sure.

...

D. Baker: All in favor to come back into session?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed. Thank you.

V. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: So as we get started, I'm going to ask Provost Freeman to help us with a remembrance.

L. Freeman: Over the course of the last couple of weeks, few weeks, NIU lost a long-term, dedicated faculty member, Tom Sims from the Department of Biology. He fought a courageous battle against head and neck cancer, and Tom is someone who is just known for his kindness and for his commitment to NIU, for his dedication to all aspects of our mission. You may have read about him in the Northern Star. He was our connection to the international petunia genome project, and he led a number of students from his classes to participate in that phenomenal international effort. He served on many committees. I served with him on the Intellectual Property Committee. And, even to the end, he was such a scientist and a scholar. When he got the cancer diagnosis, he enrolled in an experimental protocol knowing that the drugs and the treatments he took were probably not going to save his life, but would benefit those who came after him. So the family is planning a memorial service after the first of the year. Dr. Bode, the chair of Biology, can provide more details to those who are interested, but I really felt that we owed it to Tom to take a moment of silence to remember him, so thank you for joining me in one.

D. Baker: Thank you, everybody. Thank you, Lisa.

- A. Higher Learning Commission and Faculty Qualifications Requirements – Carolinda Douglass, Vice Provost for Academic Planning & Development
Draft Faculty Credentials [Policy](#)
NIU Faculty Qualifications Policy [Presentation](#)

D. Baker: All right, let's move on to other business. We'll start with a report on the Higher Learning Commission, and then I'll give an update on some other budget issues. And we'll move into Program Prioritization after that. So today we've got Carolinda and Ritu here to help us with the Higher Learning Commission and the faculty accreditation requirements. Carolinda, it looks like you've got a mic in your hand.

C. Douglass: Is it on? Okay. Hi everybody, Carolinda Douglass. Thank you very much for having me here today. I just wanted to give you an information item, which is regarding the new NIU Faculty Qualifications Policy or the one that is actually in draft at this moment. The impetus for this is the Higher Learning Commission has a new set of guidelines that we need to adhere to by September 1, 2017 regarding how we hire and determine the qualifications of individuals who serve as instructional faculty for the students in our classrooms.

So back in March of this past year, the HLC put out some new guidelines. They've always had a requirement that we have qualified instructors in our classroom, of course. And that's something that we, obviously, want ourselves. But back in 2016, they put forth some new guidelines, and they basically let us know that we needed institutional policies, processes and capacities to monitor the qualifications of instructional faculty in an auditable way. We need to demonstrate that we have consistent procedures and that we have careful consideration for all instructional faculty, that is there's standardized processes and equitable hiring practices and that we can document those, and that there are guidelines that apply to all faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, including our part-time, adjunct, temporary and/or non-tenure track faculty. Again, the due date for this, for us to be in compliance and have auditable data is September 1, 2017.

So what does that mean for us? It means in part that by that date we need to carefully consider our needs and address our faculty development and process changes to meet compliance. The idea is not necessarily that somebody would be removed from a classroom, but that they might get some professional development to enable them to stay in the classroom. We need to consider HLC's expectations to work with those current faculty to come into compliance with these guidelines. We need to prepare for the implications of the guideline policy changes and explicitly address how peer reviewers might examine faculty qualifications. And we're concerned a lot with the peer reviewers because we have our next peer review, Higher Learning Commission review, in June of 2018. So these data will come online in 2017, September, and those will be auditable data that will definitely be looked at by Higher Learning Commission peer reviewers.

So a group was put together. Dr. Baker mentioned Ritu Subramony. She actually headed this group up. You can see the people who were involved. We had individuals involved in the policy aspects of it, individuals involved in the operational aspects of it, some additional capacity and support as well. What I'm going to talk about today is the policy. You all have a copy of the policy in front of you. And we did a lot of benchmarking with other institutions as well as other accrediting bodies to see how they had implemented this. For example, the southern region had already implemented this before the Higher Learning Commission did. So we looked at the way they did it and the way some of the institutions in that area did it.

Before we move on to this, I just want to point your direction to the policy, itself. Everybody should have a copy of it. Basically, it's pretty straight forward. It mimics exactly what we have been told by the Higher Learning Commission we need to do with some tailoring by the policy committee in terms of NIU's unique areas. So on page 2 of the policy, you'll see under Undergraduate Courses, that's letter B, it says if you teach an undergraduate course, you should have at least a master's degree or higher in that teaching field or in a closely related field. Or you have to have 18 credit hours at the graduate level in that field. All of this would be determined at the local level. So this isn't a top-down kind of review. This is basically at the local level. When you put somebody in the classroom, we need to know that that person has a degree that's higher, one level higher, than the level that they're teaching and/or a closely related level of degree and/or 18 hours of graduate credit within the area that they're teaching. At the undergraduate, that would be a master's. At the graduate level, that's on page 3, that would be at whatever the terminal degree is. So if the terminal degree, in fact, is a master's, then a person with a master's can teach a master's level class. But if the terminal degree is actually a Ph.D., the somebody teaching a master's would have to have a Ph.D.

Now you're probably wondering if that applies all of the time or if there might be exceptions, and yes there are exceptions. The Higher Learning Commission has something called "tested experience," and tested experience is basically an opportunity for us to show that there are certain qualifications that an individual has that go above and beyond the transcript that they have on their academic record. So, for example, there's an outstanding, nationally recognized cello player, we can certainly put that person in the classroom even if he or she doesn't have the level of scripted degree that we need. But in general, we follow a rule that does not have, that chose the transcript as the primary way that we put somebody in the classroom and then follow that with whatever tested experience exceptions that we have.

The policy that you have in front of you was drafted back in September, has been bounced by the deans, actually, a couple of times in September and then again in October, went to the Council of Deans one last time in October, sorry November 9. It has been to the Baccalaureate Council twice. It's been to the Graduate Council once. And now it's here for your review as well. Again this is policy that we have to enforce, we have to put into place, but we certainly are eager for any feedback that you have on it. And it will be ultimately taken to the chairs and directors meeting in December, and then put into the APPM.

I have a couple of people here with me, Anne Birberick and Marc Falkoff, who are also on the policy subgroup. And so we are more than willing to take any questions that you have at this point.

D. Baker: Anybody? Tom?

T. Pavkov: The topic has come up in our college since we have a lot of professional type programs. We have people teaching with professional doctorates, and I don't know how this policy will, I mean is there some clarification on how this policy would apply to those individuals?

C. Douglass: So is the question, for example, somebody with the DPT?

T. Pavkov: Yes.

C. Douglass: And they can teach somebody who's in a DPT program?

T. Pavkov: Yes.

C. Douglass: Yes, whatever the terminal degree is. So it doesn't have to be a Ph.D. Whatever the terminal degree is. Does that answer your question?

T. Pavkov: Yes, I believe.

K. Chung: And how many years can they teach that course without review.

C. Douglass: So when you say, "without review," do you mean without review, like a peer review?

K. Chung: No. You know, if they want to teach, then they would have to go through a review process in order to teach that course, right? So once they are qualified once, then they can teach that course for life?

C. Douglass: Correct. There's not, at this point, any requirement that we re-qualify people. Absolutely, I would assume that things like that would happen at the local level on a regular basis, when they decide a course has changed and that that's not appropriate. But there's no requirement of re-qualification by the Higher Learning Commission.

D. Baker: Others?

E. Mogren: I'm looking at this. I think the direct designations of qualifications are actually pretty

straight forward. I'm actually more interested in the exceptions. I note that there's a number of exceptions: documented high level of achievement, for example; substantial, regional and national recognition in a skill; deemed academically qualified; international reputation. The real problem is actually in defining who agrees to or who qualifies somebody under the exceptions. So, if you have a candidate that may or may not fill the direct qualifications, who gets to choose or decide who has a substantial enough reputation or who has an international reputation and so on? Is this going to be something that is going to be outside the hands of the department in determining these things, or who exactly is going to be determining the exceptions to this rule?

C. Douglass: So it will follow the model that, I think, we currently have, which is that at the most local level, primarily at the chairs' level, they will be making the determination of who to put in the classroom. And then that will be then signed off on by the dean and then moved up to the Office of the Provost where it's signed off. I do not expect that there would be problems at the Office of the Provost. There will be audits to make sure that all the materials are properly documented, but basically the determination is made at the local level with the approval of the dean.

E. Mogren: Okay, thank you.

D. Baker: Kendall?

K. Thu: I just have a minor comment, which is the last sentence on the last page: This policy will be reviewed on a regular basis. Could we change that to “, every 100 years”? But seriously, it should have some sort of time interval in there, I would think, so that we know what regular is.

C. Douglass: Agreed. And I would defer to Greg Long on that because he asked us to put that line in there. So if you have a suggestion for that, Greg, we're more than happy to put in how often the policy should be reviewed.

G. Long: Well, when we've talked about the idea of having a policy library and the idea that, once a policy is established, it shouldn't just exist forever, but there should be some periodic review. And so that was the suggestion as it related to this. And so there's been no formal discussion in terms of saying, is it a three-year or five-year cycle, but whatever the group feels like would be valuable, we can put it in right now. And if we feel the need to change it as it goes forward, that could happen in the future.

D. Baker: If you were to pick an appropriate cycle to review this, what would it be? Or HLC, what would they suggest?

C. Douglass: So, 2018, then the next time would be 2024. So before 2024, probably around 2020 would be nice. What's that, four years from now? Four years? Five years? I think it should be in alignment with whatever the rest of the policy reviews are. So it's a placeholder at this point. But whenever you're planning on doing that on a regular basis.

D. Baker: Kendall, could you live with a five-year review?

K. Thu: Absolutely, I can, except for myself.

D. Baker: Do we need a motion to edit it?

C. Douglass: So, just to be clear, the review isn't on the faculty, it's on the policy.

D. Baker: All right, so we'll take that under advisement, Carolinda, okay? We'll call it the Kendall Rule, the Thu Rule.

H. Khoury: Hi Carolinda. I'd like to ask about the policy regarding undergraduate teaching, the third one. It says, "a master's degree or higher in any discipline with at least 18 graduate credit hours in the teaching field or closely related." Is this policy currently active here at NIU, or is it new?

C. Douglass: I believe it's new, but I'm willing to be challenged on that. But this is basically language directly from the Higher Learning Commission, the 18-hour rule. But I don't know that for sure.

H. Khoury: Yeah, I noticed that 18 was repeated somewhere else too.

C. Douglass: Yeah, that's from the Higher Learning Commission.

H. Khoury: So it's new to NIU. Now, do you also know if this policy is in effect in community colleges, including some of our neighboring community colleges?

C. Douglass: Anybody who's HLC accredited, and many of the community colleges (though not all of them are) will have to abide by this policy, by the HLC policy by 2017, September 1. And the 18-hour credit rule is part of the HLC policy.

H. Khoury: What I mean to say is, currently if our community colleges in the area are adopting this policy, for example, what we're aspiring to at NIU is to go ahead and adopt the same policy, as well.

C. Douglass: Yes.

H. Khoury: And what was the rationale for it? I mean here the 18 graduate credit hours, would they suffice to make somebody qualified to teach undergraduate courses if the discipline, if that person did not have that expertise.

C. Douglass: I think I understand what you're asking, and my response, and I would refer to the policy people who are here as well if they want to add to this. But I believe this is a minimum and that, at the local level, a chair could decide that that was not enough. But this is a minimum and the threshold was set by the HLC requirement.

H. Khoury: So we have to adopt it? Do we have to adopt it?

C. Douglass: I think we have to adopt at least a minimum. Are you suggesting that we adopt a

higher level?

H. Houry: Yes, just a suggestion.

C. Douglass: Okay, so we are going to the chairs/directors meeting on December 14. Would that be a good opportunity for us to talk to them at that point to see if other individuals would like to see that? Okay, we can do that. Thank you.

D. Baker: Anybody else?

G. Chen: I have a follow-up question with the exceptions. According to the model that you had just mentioned, that if there is an exception, is it going to be determined by chair, dean and then to the provost. Wouldn't it be safer, because we cannot expect the department chair is the expert for everything, although that is in ??? as of the field of the department. But wouldn't it be safer that, if there is any exception, that the department chair can run this by the personnel committee of the department to make sure that we are safeguarding this exception if there is no search committee involved with the hiring. So my worry is if we go through this kind of ???, that I have no negative intention, but it is more like, okay, this can be determined solid by the decision of the chairs and deans. I don't think this is a safer way to do it. I also don't want to overburden our PC Committee members, so I am just offering my worry and my concern.

C. Douglass: Thank you. I think that we certainly can again bring that up at the department chair's meeting on December 14 for their input. I think a lot of these decisions are made relatively shortly before a class starts, and so it might be difficult to call the personnel committee together. And also that currently I don't think that happens. When somebody hires someone, they don't necessarily call the personnel committee. So that would be a change in practice, a big change in practice I think, which if the chairs and directors want to implement that, it would be their prerogative. I think we should bring that up at the December 14 meeting.

D. Baker: Thank you.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I'm going to add a little bit. I think Gary's question isn't that the normal conditions are free. It's when somebody's an exception to the list. In other words, if it's a normal situation where it fits within the rules, it's not a big deal, Carolinda. But I think if it's an exception where somebody may be say has almost all the requirements but not one bit, and it's putting a lot of burden on the chairs to take that responsibility and especially could end up causing strife inside the department.

C. Douglass: So would it be your suggestion, as well, that a personnel committee weigh in on this decision?

M. Haji-Sheikh: If it's an exception.

C. Douglass: Okay.

D. Baker: We've got a response.

G. Chen: I agree with what Mike has just suggested. Thank you.

D. Baker: Kendall.

K. Thu: I understand the point of view that we want chairs to consult with other bodies when they are not an expert in hiring a particular person, but I wouldn't want to operationalize a particular way of doing that. I think that any chair worth their salt is going to recognize their lack of expertise and is going to go to whatever go-to person in the department or outside is necessary. I'll also say that some of this is going to be shaped by the collective bargaining unit and it's also, you know, if chairs hire somebody that's not suited, you can bet your bottom dollar that the rest of the faculty in the department are going to be on their case.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I agree, but that was my point, was to try to stop some of the strife before it happens sometimes.

D. Baker: Okay, any other comments? All right, thank you, Carolinda. Have fun at the chairs meeting.

All right under President's Announcements, I've got a Springfield and a budget update, a couple brief items I wanted to update you on. As you probably know, we're in veto session right now. The good news is that leadership is meeting with the governor. I guess the bad news is we don't have a budget yet. So all systems normal. But I think it's good news that they're talking. You know, last year that wasn't going on, and I think the last election got people's attention that the electorate's not very happy, and they want some solutions. We don't know what that's going to lead to, but there's tensions in the system, and you can kind of hear the logs in the log jam creaking a little bit now, so maybe we'll see something come here, maybe more likely in the lame duck session after the first of the year. We don't know. I mean, you keep your fingers crossed, but I think there's more creaking in the log jam now than there was a year ago, so that's good news.

A couple other pieces I wanted to mention. One is that you've probably read over the last few weeks that the University of Illinois put out a proposal that initially was thought to be kind of an innovative and bold proposal to make a compact with the state that, if the state gave us predictable funding at an adequate level for a five-year period, that the University of Illinois would do certain things. One of the things would be that half of their incoming class would be from Illinois. Ninety percent of our class is from Illinois. They would have certain retention, graduation rates, things like that. And it did get some play locally and even nationally, and there was some initial excitement over it. But now as the dust begins to settle a little bit, there is some apprehension we're monitoring. One of the apprehensions is that they've proposed multi-year funding and, unfortunately, in Illinois' state constitution and every other state in the union, one legislature can't obligate the next legislature. So we're doing one-year budgets under the constitutions. So its premise of a five-year plan is not good to start, it's on soft sand. But maybe there's a spiritual commitment if there's not a legal commitment. But spiritual commitments to higher education apparently are fairly fluid as we saw last year with our 71 percent budget cut. And there's also concern that, if they can't get a budget together for one year, how are they going to do it for five. Some of the staffers inside the statehouse have voiced their serious concerns about tying future general assemblies, but they do like

the idea of predictable budget. Another concern that we've heard emerge is that the University of Illinois' chapter so-to-speak, their obligation to the state, like having half of their students come from Illinois, wouldn't look the same at the other schools because we all have different missions and student bodies and research obligations and outreach obligations. So does that mean each school would have to write their own chapter? And when you start doing that, the schools start getting a little bit queasy about it. Do we really want the legislature negotiating with each school? And then do you want performance criteria in statute? We've never put higher ed performance criteria in statute. So what looked kind of interesting to begin with now, as the dust settles, people are going: We kind of like the long-term commitment to us, but the devil was in the details. So at least it got some talking going on, and we're going to continue to pursue that and monitor it and see if we can take this initial position and then make the case for sustainable funding at an adequate level.

Moving on to my second item, you may have seen that the Illinois Board of Higher Education last week allocated their emergency fund, and it was a \$20 million emergency fund. So at the end of the last budget cycle in the stop gap budget, \$20 million was given to the Illinois Board of Higher Education for schools in financial emergency. And my sense is they had a pretty good idea of who those schools were based on testimony last year. And they were essentially the schools that testified that they couldn't get through this academic year cash flow-wise without some emergency help. And so the legislature allocated that \$20 million to the community colleges and three universities. So the community college system got \$3 million, not a lot of money for 48 schools. That's a lot of community colleges in one state, by the way, just as an addendum. And \$17 million was distributed across three public universities: Chicago State, Eastern and Western, Western getting the biggest piece and Chicago State the smallest, relatively proportional to their size and relatively proportional to their fiscal emergency. So that \$20 million has been allocated. So I guess the good news is, and the bad news is, we didn't get any, that we weren't in the emergency category, but we didn't get any money. So while we're going to work like heck over the coming legislative session, I think the higher education community continues to work. In fact, there is a meeting of the presidents and chancellors that I'm not in right now that's on the phone. I've got someone representing me. We meet every week and that is going on on a phone conference right now to talk about these very issues and how we move forward.

Any questions on either one of those pieces?

Another budget piece that I understand came out in the Faculty Senate recently was about equipment replacement and who pays for that. Provost Freeman, could you speak about that a little bit?

L. Freeman: So Dr. Long asked me to clarify basically what does a faculty member do when they have a piece of equipment that's important or critical for either instructional or research purposes and it's no longer functioning, to get the request for repair or replacement processed in the most expeditious fashion. And I'm glad that we have deans from many of the colleges here today. They may want to comment. I believe what I'm going to say is the process that's been established in almost all of the colleges, but they may want to enhance my comments, and I would certainly welcome that from them.

When a piece of equipment is in disrepair, the faculty member or the staff member, if there's a staff member overseeing an instructional laboratory, starts with the department chair. The department chair is generally aware of whether or not that piece of equipment is insured, if there's a special fund for fixing it, maybe what the history of the equipment is. Certainly the chair knows the proportion of how the piece of equipment is used for instruction vs. research. And that chair usually has a contact in the dean's office of the college. In most cases, it's an associate dean. In some cases, it may be a staff member. And through those conversations and clarifications of the use of the piece of equipment, whether it's more cost effective to repair or replace the piece of equipment given where it sits, in what's contemporary in the classroom or in research, the dean will come forward and, if it's a research piece of equipment, generally both the provost and the vice president for research will be involved in the discussion. If it's a purely instructional piece of equipment, the Provost's Office will be involved in the discussion. And through those conversations, a plan will be made to repair or replace the piece of equipment as appropriate. And that's generally how things work. If we need to go to our own Facilities and Administration Department, which reports to Vice President Phillips, and if we need to engage them in the repair process or expedite a repair because we have a critical need based on a grant funding deadline or a classroom, the Provost's Office is the appropriate agency to go to facilities and administration. And the same would be for Procurement. If we needed to do an emergency procurement based on time-sensitive instructional need, the Provost's Office would be the one to take that request forward. And we get phone calls like this from deans and, by the time the deans call us, there's usually been a pretty good conversation that's taken place between the dean and the department chair and the faculty who are involved. So I'll stop there and I'll offer any of the deans to comment on the process in their colleges to see if I've executed this accurately.

C. McCord: Just to concur and only amplify a couple of small points. We sometimes have research faculty who go directly to the vice president for research rather than through department chair, college, etc., and so I just wanted to underline, as the provost indicated, department chair to college office to appropriate offices is the right channel, with only one exception, which I'm sure the provost would immediately agree with. If there are immediate emergent issues, of course, chain of command is: call the police; call the plumber; call whoever you need to in an emergent situation, those are different. But when we're just talking about, okay, I just need to work through the normal process, then yes, moving up through that process is appropriate.

L. Freeman: And we don't create the layers to create barricades. We actually can get more done by working through the layers because of the facility we have with the processes and the funding pools. You have a question?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yes, I think it originated with me. My question was essentially, when you have unique equipment in different buildings that are part of the facilities of the building, not part of the academic normal branch, in other words, vacuum pumps, compressors, things that are built into the building that aren't just air conditioning, water, drains, toilets. Some of the scientific buildings have these types of equipment. And then the scientific groups, or engineering groups depend on that equipment at some point, because we don't have to buy additional hardware. Then when they fail, recently we've been told that over the years that, as things have been failing, we've been pushed off whatever was built by the state, what do you call it, the building group, the CDB equipment.

L. Freeman: Capital Development Board.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yes, Capital Development Board. That now after some certain amount of time, Facilities is telling some of us in these groups, and not just in engineering, but in other places, that it's now up to us to come up with money to fix it because they're unique, they're not just air conditioning, drain water.

L. Freeman: I can tell you that that hasn't been my experience. We had the failure of the HVAC system in the Psych-Computer Science Building where we house valuable research animals. It was an extremely expensive repair. The vice president for research was involved immediately, as was the provost's office in making sure that we were in compliance and that we didn't impede research. That HVAC system is most certainly built into the building. It's a very special need. We don't have HVAC like that anywhere else, but we certainly didn't tell the PI that they needed to crawl in the ducts and fix the system.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well, I'm not talking hypothetically, guys. I didn't want to talk specifically about my case, because this being University Council, but there are two vacuum pumps that were part of the building and which now Facilities has told me I have to repair. And then eventually I got the dean's office to come up with the money, because I look at it as part of the wing of the building. I don't look at it as unique equipment. And it's actually in the facilities block of the building for that wing. So I'm just saying that that seems to be, I'm getting all sorts of mixed messages on my end. But I've also heard other rumblings in the background from other parts of LA&S and some others. I'm not going to speak for them. So I want, I want, I would like, all I asked Greg was to have a list of equipment that somewhere we as PIs or researchers or lab managers, know that we have to come up with extra funds to maintain. I mean if it's going to be that way, I at least need to know a couple years out, okay? Not get caught by surprise September, in the middle of the semester, where I can't use the lab because I don't have a vacuum pump.

L. Freeman: Now that we have a clearer understanding of the question that was asked, I'll certainly confer with Vice President Blazey and the faculty advisory group to him, and we'll try to answer your question more specifically.

D. Baker: Thanks, anything else on that?

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Program Prioritization update – Lisa Freeman, Provost

D. Baker: All right great. Let's move on to the rest of my President's Report, and I'll blend that then into the Program Prioritization update from Provost Freeman if she wants to say anything else about it. So this week we did release the Program Prioritization report. A significant amount of work, I'm guessing that you haven't read all 800 pages yet. But I think just the fact that it's that big of a document shows that we took this very seriously. We took very seriously the work of everybody's that's come before us. The task force recommendations were deeply looked at. The vice presidents looked at those and made assessments of them, and I made decisions about those coming out of them. Provost Freeman worked closely with the Academic Affairs group, and

actually her document is the sizeable, the majority of the message that came out. So there's a report on the administrative programs and one on the academic action plan, responds to the academic task force recommendations. I think you can see that we've made a lot of substantive progress. And it's really helping us to align our limited resources with our mission. This is the first time this institution, probably the first time a public in the state has taken on this level of work, and I really want to thank all the faculty and staff who participated – and students – who participated in this process. It was a big lift, a very big lift. And there's much to be proud of in this work, and a lot more strategic work for us to do as we go forward. But you can see the progress we've made. In not all cases are final decisions made. There's a number of places where there are deadlines for the next step to get to the final decision.

This is part of our operations system now. This is the way we're going to move forward. When we align resources and our mission, we need to think about what's most strategic, what's the highest use of the resources that we have? And that's going to take some analysis and then ultimately the application of that to a decision moving forward.

There's a series of action steps identified and then a number of reports due in the coming weeks and months. I'll report back in full on those in May on the progress we've made on those to keep you updated. And there will be interim updates as significant steps are taken along the way.

There are a number of notable things that went on. We've invested in a number of departments. I think Provost Freeman's previously reported that more than 60 academic faculty hires were approved in priority areas, so I think that's a positive investment and a step forward.

We're all interested in enrollment and particularly on how do we do a better job on the recruitment side. So one of the big structural shifts we've made is aligning our recruiting activities with our marketing activities, something that kind of sounds logical on the face of it, but something we've had in different divisions that's created a less efficient system than we've had in the past. So I appreciate the hard work that's gone into that beginning of blending and integration of those two.

Our Financial Aid and Scholarship offices merged, and over the last year, I want to commend a task force led by Rebecca Babel and Anne Hardy that's looked very hard at our financial aid. They discovered we really didn't have a catalog of financial aid, which made it difficult for those of us giving financial aid to know what was available and for students to know what was available. It kind of makes sense, you ought to have a catalog of that stuff. I don't know if you've heard or not, but we found over 750 fund sources for financial aid and \$113 million if you count PELL, MAP, waivers and local financial aid. That's a lot of money not to have coordinated, isn't it. So we've invested in a program called Academic Works that's going to catalog all that and allow transparency into it from all sides. And then that will allow us then to allocate the money to the students that's going to maximize their success. So how do we get the right amount of money to the right students to help them come and stay and be successful. I think those are important steps so we're not under- or over-rewarding students or allocating those resources. I think those are all things that are going to help us over time.

There have been a number of groups that have worked on data issues for us. Four groups being combined now into an institutional effectiveness team so that instead of four pods, we've got one

integrated pod of people working on that. Many universities have an undergraduate college or a university college. We've decided that would be important to pull those pieces for us and it helps us really operationalize our NIU PLUS general education curriculum that's come into place, integrating not only the academic pieces, but the co-curricular pieces. Very excited about that.

The cultural centers have been moved under the Chief Diversity Officer. I see Vernese Edghill-Walden here. I think that's a positive step so we don't have them separated into different divisions. And there's going to be an ability to work on the common ground across those, I think, in a more integrated way.

We're also eliminating charge-backs in many areas. I think that's a positive step so we don't have to go through the transactions costs of being billed for every little thing like WIFI or whatever. I know Brett's excited about that. Now we've got to get the money in his budget to cover that, but I appreciate Brett leaning forward and wanting to do that. And we want to take the hassles out of the system where we can, and I think that's one example.

So those are just a few examples. We could go on with 450 more since there are 450+ programs, but those are some of the decisions. Just wanted to highlight those and thank everybody that worked on this. I know Lisa didn't sleep quite a few nights putting together her part. Her deans and other academic leaders worked enormous hours on that section, and our communications staff, Lisa Minor in particular, did tremendous work, and I want to thank her for editing and helping focus our energies. And then Chris McCord, I see in the back, and Matt Streb as well, really helped us keep track of all of these programs and move forward on it. So, Chris, you did amazing work for keeping track and bringing forward the spirit of the task force as well to keep us on track.

Anything you want to add, Lisa? Okay, questions? Kendall?

K. Thu: Well congratulations on the tomes. I've had concerns from the outset about the way in which we've structured the administrative side and then the academic side. And in some cases, we sort of force fed programs into each of those categories. But the process, itself, did not allow for members of either of those two task forces to compare what they're doing with what's going on in the other task force, even though decisions that are made on both sides are going to impact both sides. I know now that in President Baker's cover note that you're going to have an executive group that's going to look at academic programs side-by-side with administrative programs and make decisions about resource allocation. I'm concerned about where the faculty voice is going to be in that process, and I don't see a place for us having a voice in that process. Correct me if I'm wrong.

D. Baker: Yeah, so Kendall's referring to the Executive Budget Committee, and Al Phillips and Lisa Freeman co-chair that committee, so you've got the two sides there. And then the Resource, Space and Budget Committee and APC [Academic Planning Council] are represented there as well. Lisa, you want to follow up on that?

L. Freeman: Yeah, I'm going to try to answer this in multiple parts. And then maybe when I'm finished sort of what I think is going to be at this point a three-part answer, you can come back. I first want to say that the Executive Budget Committee is not a group that was assembled specifically for Program Prioritization. It's a subset of the cabinet with expertise that's fairly

representative of the campus in addition to Al and I and the staff from our offices who help staff it. It has Jerry Blazey, the vice president for research. It has Brett Coryell, the vice president over DoIT. And it has Mike Mann from state relations. And so we have a variety of viewpoints that look at requests that are presented to the EBC. So the things that come to the EBC for a budget allocation or reallocation or a prioritization of unfunded requests, those requests – we don't have the template perfected yet – but there's a template that we're perfecting. So those will come from the units that are making the requests. And things that are referred to the EBC from the Program Prioritization process are the things that will have been referred to enhanced resources. And this is separate from the academic personnel process. So for the academic personnel process, you saw the 60 authorized searches, but the biggest investment we make in academic programs as defined for Program Prioritization is actually faculty hiring. I'm not saying that's the only one, I'm just saying it's more than 70 percent of the investment. That process is managed by the Provost's Office. A lot of the curricular things that will come out of Program Prioritization will go through our normal shared governance processes because we have infrastructure for doing that.

The other types of investments that need to be made in programs will be considered as an allocation mechanism by the Executive Budget Committee. The process that will come in for those hasn't been worked out. And, in fact, we're planning to work that out in close consultation with the shared governance committees, the Academic Planning Council and the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, which if you read our shared governance documents actually sort of charge that committee, those two committees. Sarah McHone-Chase is currently the chair of the RSB Committee and Marc Falkoff is the faculty leader of the APC, I'm the ex officio chair, with commenting on our process to make sure that we're not losing the opportunity for all voices to be heard. So I sort of think through the coordination and communication and feedback from the RSB and APC – and I can give you a very meaningful example of their feedback. We met with them for the first time in the course of the past month or so and reflected with them on the guidelines that were constructed for faculty hiring. We talked about the fact that we're developing this instrument for the requests to come forward that are unfunded requests from Program Prioritization to the Executive Budget Committee, told them we would keep them in the loop and continue to work on that document template with them. And then they said, well, why don't we have similar guidelines that we do for faculty for the staff requests. And, as you know, staff requests come in more on a rolling basis, faculty hiring is seasonal. And so because of the faculty seasonal timeline coming out of not just the task force reports being issued, but an intense feedback period followed by the action plan development over the summer, we really were a little behind in faculty hiring. So we took the time and effort that we had and put it into the faculty hiring process so we wouldn't lose the opportunity to have people on the ground in '18. And now we're addressing those other things, but even though when the folks who look at hiring requests – and three of them are sitting here – informally do the same kinds of considerations about Program Prioritization category and compliance and risk and life safety and academic excellence and university reputation, we don't have the same rubric and we don't ask people to fill that out. And when Marc and Sarah said that, we were like, oh yeah, of course, we should be doing that immediately, and we're working on that. So I think there's room for faculty voices in the way the requests are formatted as they come to the Executive Budget Committee. The Executive Budget Committee allocates, we'll do it in a transparent fashion, but that is the function of the Budget Committee. I guess I would say that you don't sit on the committee, and I know nobody who's a faculty member actually considers either the vice president for research or the provost as true faculty, but I will say, when we're in that room and

we're arguing, the fact that we're of the faculty and we're SPS with rank and that we defend the academic mission of the university is really obvious. And so I think that overall if you read all of our comments in Program Prioritization and you listen to what the president just said about reorganizing and moving things together, and basically what we're trying to do is reduce redundancy and increase efficiency, the overall goal of that is to take the scant resources that we have – and nobody here things we have enough resources – and move them away from transaction costs and from administrivia and into the core academic mission. I mean that is the lens with which we come at Program Prioritization, and that is the lens of the EBC.

The other place where I think the Executive Budget Committee can be really helpful is when we know how much money we have in a single budget year or a multi-budget year, we'll be able to come back and consult with deans and chairs and faculty and the APC and the RSB representatives when we have sometimes a tough choice to make about do we do three things now or do we do one thing over a number of years. And you know, we are collaborative. We have shared governance, and we want to do what's best for the university. But we also have an opportunity to say: Hey, Catherine Squires, director for advancement, or college-level development officer, we only have money to do half of this, part of this, which of this is a better philanthropic target. And do we have an opportunity to do something around that? And so what the Executive Budget Committee does is really the administrative function of resource allocation, financial modeling. And that's an administrator function, but we do it honoring our shared governance. We do it honoring the academic mission of the university at the forefront. And we do it in a collaborative way when decisions have to be made, and choices are being made.

K. Thu: I appreciate that, Lisa, and I'm not trying to impugn other motivations for members of the committee, that's not what I'm about. It was the language in President Baker's cover letter where now that we have both task forces' reports, we're going to have to pull them together in a way that you're going to have to make decisions about one side that are going to affect the other. So I'm not talking about specific requests on the academic side. I'm talking about the global process by which administrative programs are going to have to be yeah, nay; academic programs, yeah, nay. And that decision is going to be based upon, not just the academic side. It's also going to be based upon what happens from the administrative side.

L. Freeman: I'm going to let President Baker talk in a second, but I'm going to say one more thing. And that is, if you look at the criteria that we used to evaluate administrative programs and academic programs, academic excellence, the mission, core mission, of the university, the university's reputation and the impact of students, the impact on faculty are criteria for both. And in, you know, those are getting zeroes sometimes in the administrative program ranking. So I do think the criteria are developed to honor that, but I'm going to let the president talk about the paragraph in his report.

D. Baker: No, I think, Kendall, you bring up a good idea. This is like any portfolio you're trying to look at and you've got different categories in the portfolio, and you've got to figure out what the Pareto optimal frontier is and where you want to be on it. And I think we understand we're a research university, and we have to look through that lens and figure out what's right to fulfill our mission. That's the whole point of this, is to link our budget with our mission. And it's taken on a good spirit. It's been very collaborative to this point. I think there's a lot of stuff on the table you

don't usually see on the table. And we've got good people and a good process. We're going through it the first time so we're learning. We're going to make mistakes and screw up. We can back up and shift and make changes. I was thinking about the portfolio and examples while you were talking about that, and our instinct is typically let's keep the core solid, the academic core of the institution solid. But then there are some times when you say, like Al will come into my office and he'll give me a quiz and he'll say, "When was the last time we built a boiler at NIU." And I'll say, "Oh, I don't know, 1980." And he'll say "1963 was the last time we built a boiler, that's our new one." So I say, "Is that a problem?" And he says, "Yeah, that's a problem, only if you want to be warm in the winter." So sometimes you have to make decisions like that where there are just core facilities issues or whatever, the roof is leaking in Grant Hall and students are getting wet. That's probably not a good thing. So, you know, we've got to just balance all those. But I think they're taken in good spirit and trying to do the right thing for the institution. And this is all going to be public so you can watch it too. If you don't like the stuff, I'm sure we'll hear from you.

K. Thu: Well, and I will say that I appreciated the fact that you agreed with the administrative task force's report about the president's budget needed to be reduced a bit. Thank you.

D. Baker: Well it's been reduced a lot since I've been here. Eliminated a couple vice presidencies and reduced the budget in my office significantly over the last three years. Holly?

H. Nicholson: I appreciate everything that was said here, but I feel like I wouldn't be doing my job to my constituents if I didn't point out that the two chairs from the RSB and from the APC are actually both faculty. And so staff really have no shared governance input in any of this. It seems like the shared governance aspect is heavily leaning toward the academic side. And so I just wanted to point out, you know, there's a lot of things in the report, such as out-sourcing possibilities that will really affect staff. So if there's any way for staff to have a voice, we would really appreciate that. Thank you.

L. Freeman: Isn't the RSB made up of faculty, staff and students?

G. Long: There's two staff members on RSB, so the majority of people on Resource, Space and Budget are faculty and administrators.

A. Phillips: Just as the provost indicated at these meetings she represents research and the faculty, I also represent the administration and the other side of the street, so-to-speak. But I will also say we were remarking today that from the very first meeting today until the end of the day, there was no break. And the provost and I were in every single meeting together today. These are conversations that we have every single day. We're very aware of those issues, and we make sure that everyone is represented at the table, and certainly are looking out for everyone's interest.

L. Freeman: But I do think shared governance has an opportunity to look at committee composition if, you know, that's the will of the university community, there's a mechanism to do that.

D. Baker: Yeah. Point well made, though, Holly. I appreciate that. We need to have that representation too. Others? Lisa, do you want to say anything else about it or are we good? Okay.

All right, let's move on. Thanks.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. [Proposed amendment](#) to NIU Bylaws Article 15.9
Committee on Multicultural Curriculum Transformation – Pages 3-6
FIRST READING – Vernese Edghill-Walden, Chief Diversity Officer

D. Baker: Is Vernese still here? Hi Vernese. The next item is the proposed amendment to the NIU Bylaws Article 15.9, Committee on Multicultural Curriculum Transformation. It's all yours. Do you want to come up here? Yeah, why don't you come up. Yeah, this is a first reading so we're not taking a vote. Actually, Vernese, why don't you come sit in my chair, or do you want to just sit there. Okay, can you see her okay there?

V. Edghill-Walden: Good afternoon. So I'm here before you today to talk about the proposed restructuring of the Committee on Multicultural Curriculum Transformation, which is the CMCT Committee. This committee was established more than 20 years ago, and its charge was to create a multicultural transformation institute. After many years, we have had several faculty go through this institute, but we know now that there has been a need to kind of re-focus the committee and to really shift the focus from the multicultural institute to really aligning what the committee's charge would be or should be with our current diversity equity and inclusion goals, which also aligns with our diversity and inclusion task force report recommendations.

And so this proposal has a few recommendations to it, and one is that we would like to combine the ADPAC Committee, which has been the Academic Diversity Program Advisory Council, and the CMCT Committee, combine them together so that we don't have multiple committees with similar missions. We would combine those two committees into one. We would re-establish or restructure the composition of that committee to really focus on three primary areas. And one is on academic equity. The second is on increasing more faculty and student research opportunities for diverse student populations and working with diversity centers. And then the third is to really make sure that we are continually working to sustain the human diversity requirement, which was actually approved a month ago.

So this committee is working on these areas now. The committee has changed its composition, and it has also changed its duties to really reflect those three areas. We are also making sure that the – in the past the chair has been the center directors, and the center directors have asked that they not necessarily be the primary chair of the committee, and so that chair would be me, and then the academic diversity center directors would co-chair this committee.

This committee, I think, has a new charge and is really excited about doing the work that we are moving on in terms of academic diversity, equity and inclusion. Are there any questions? Any feedback?

D. Baker: Clearly perfect. Or people haven't read it and they'll get to you next time. If you haven't read it and you have concerns before the next meeting, could you get them to Vernese so, if there's something we need to address and we're ready to vote next time, she's prepared so we can be ready

to vote next time. That'd be great.

V. Edghill-Walden: Thank you.

D. Baker: Thank you, Vernese for your hard work on this, and the center directors.

B. [Resolution](#) regarding accommodations for students with disabilities – Pages 7-10

D. Baker: All right, moving on to New Business Item B., I'm going to turn it over to Greg for the resolution, Greg?

G. Long: We have a resolution regarding accommodations for students with disabilities that's described on pages 7 through 10. We need a motion to accept the resolution.

C. Doederlein: So moved.

G. Long: Doederlein. Second?

V. Collins: Second.

G. Long: Collins? Okay. And so we'll have discussion at this point. Prior to having discussion, though, I would like to introduce two colleagues who have done a tremendous job over the years representing disability on campus in different ways. Katy Whitelaw in the back is the new, she's been at NIU for a long time, she's now our technology accessibility officer. It's a part-time position, but it's the first one we've had in that regard so that's really positive. And then sitting next to her is Deb Miller. Deb is the director of the Disability Resource Center. I asked them both to come to be part of this discussion, because, also to let you know, in terms of the Disability Resource Center, they have had six directors in the last ten years. So, you know, if some of you aren't familiar with Deb or curious about the Disability Resource Center, recognize that six directors over ten years does not create any continuity and certainly even within the office, there are different philosophies about how things should and should not be run. And I know that Deb's work is very much on target with what we'd look at in terms of compliance and supporting student civil rights and the work that needs to be done, because really, truly, the issues that for students with disabilities do boil down to civil rights. We don't oftentimes think about them that way. We think about them as a medical issue, but the students on campus who have disabilities are here because they met the qualifications to be students. There's no charity, there's no "oh we'll be nice to them because they have a disability." If they're here, they have the qualifications, and so it's our job as a university, as any other university, to insure that those students have a civil right to access their educational materials.

So about a month ago, it came to my attention in talking to several individuals that there were some particular concerns with regard to staffing and resources at the Disability Resource Center. I followed up with Deb, and you'll note, if you want to read it, it's on pages 7 through 9, our description of different issues that have been identified. And I – a tip of the hat to Deb as well from the standpoint of being willing to acknowledge and share this with us as a group, because I was chair of the Disability Commission from 2006 through 2014, so I have a very long personal history with this, family issues as well with this. And many of the things that are brought up as concerns

right now have been concerns for a number of years.

So once we got information from Deb, went back to the Steering Committees of the Faculty Senate and University Council, brought this to their attention. They recommended that these issues be brought to these respective bodies with the likelihood of creating a resolution. The resolution that you see on the back page here is the resolution in its entirety, plus two things, that the Faculty Senate passed at their meeting two weeks ago. So we had a discussion, they passed the resolution. In the interim, had an opportunity to go to the Presidential Commission on Persons with Disabilities' monthly meeting and so shared the resolution with them as well. They endorsed it in its entirety and then added two additional paragraphs, and they're the last two that are on this list that say, "Whereas, technology accessibility (per the NIU technology access policy) is crucial for student recruitment, retention and success." And they also added, "Whereas, student services should be provided in a centrally located space that is accessible without the need for an elevator."

So would open it for general discussion, questions, concerns, anything specific for Deb or Katy, just open it up. Kendall.

K. Thu: I feel guilty speaking so much. We're all supportive of this. I just wonder about this as a process going forward, if we're going to have other entities come to the senate – and that may be fine. I'm just wondering whether this is sort of a proxy budgeting process. I'm certainly in favor of the DRC and all the services they provide to our students. My question is one of process and whether or not this will set a precedent for other entities coming to UC and the senate for similar kinds of requests.

G. Long: In response to that, I can't tell you. I mean, we started with the Art Annex resolution in Faculty Senate two months ago. That created some difference. The discussion of this has also started to create some difference. And so at some level you can certainly, you could make the argument this is a way around. On the other hand, I can also tell you that with six directors in ten years, Deb had no involvement in writing the Program Prioritization, and so you have people coming in an environment where they weren't involved in the budgeting process that should have led to some of these things. And also I can say from a very personal level, I have tried the route of going through the channels as one should, for the last ten years, 15 years, as it relates to disability and accommodations, and those things going through typical routes have oftentimes not met with a lot of success. And so the idea of bringing it here is not meant to say, "I want you to all endorse some allocation of money to the Disability Resource Center," but I think there is necessity of letting people know there is an issue, there are problems, and as a university we have an obligation to figure out how to address this. So my goal is not to ask for a specific sum of money on their behalf, but it is to alert you, as the membership of University Council, as well as the administration, that this is a situation that, if left unchecked, will continue to put us at significant risk, you know, because we have certain obligations both from a technology access, from a physical access, from accommodations within the classroom. And we have a number of areas within that that are not up to speed.

D. Baker: Kendall, I appreciate your comment. I think that kind of reinforces why we would have a Program Prioritization process is to look at the portfolio of things across the institution, and this is one of the areas that was recommended for enhancement. Through that process, I think the case was

made in spite of the turnover in position that significant resources were needed to move it forward. So it'll go to the Executive Budget Council now to see where it goes in the ranking process. I did check with John Heckmann this week, who is in charge of our facilities, works for AI. And I know he's actively looking at options for space as well. So the pieces are moving. I wouldn't argue to vote for or against this, I just say that the Program Prioritization process is working on this particular issue and appreciate the work that the center does. It's important work. And besides the morale obligations, there's some compliance issues that we need to deal with as well.

W. Penrod: I'd like to make one little comment on this. I don't see where it really fits in as much with the Prioritization as what we'd like to think. I mean this is mandated through Section 504 of the Rehab Act of 1973 and through the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. That kind of trumps, pardon the pun, the notion of Prioritization. However, I would like to also point out that I've been very, very pleased with our DRC in the modification of our materials that are sent over there, the administrations of our tests. Some of these things that we present every day at the graduate level are very complicated and visual, and they converted to tactile haptic, and they do a very good job of it. So I think it goes beyond – just my opinion, sir – but I think it goes beyond the scope of Prioritization.

D. Baker: I think we're on common ground. I would just note that – there you are, get around your head there – that compliance with the law is one of the pieces you look at in Program Prioritization. Are we out of compliance? Well, it needs to be a high priority. So I think that's how it fits into the Program Prioritization process. I think there's an overlap in our interests there.

G. Long: Any other comments, questions? Okay, call for a vote, okay? All in favor of the resolution as written, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Abstentions? Okay, we'll pass this forward. Thank you.

IX. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – no report
- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Cathy Doederlein, Greg Long, Holly Nicholson,
Rebecca Shortridge, Kendall Thu, Leanne VandeCreek
- C. Academic Policy Committee – no report
- D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – report

D. Baker: Thank you. Let's go on to the Reports From Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. The first one I think that we have is from the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, Sarah?

S. McHone-Chase: Thank you. I haven't really reported this calendar year, so I'll make this brief.

We met on November 4, and we talked about faculty hires for Fiscal Year '18. We had a report about our five-year capital plan. We talked very briefly about athletic fees. And we're going to be meeting this coming Friday where we'll start putting together our annual budget guidance report. Are there any questions? Comments? Okay, thank you.

D. Baker: Very efficient. Well done.

E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Therese Arado, Chair – report

D. Baker: Rules, Governance and Elections, Therese?

T. Arado: Just a kind of similar update of briefness, here. We are still working on gathering things for the policy library. A call has now gone out for various divisions to submit the policies in a timely fashion, and that includes ones that we may not been able to find going out on the Web that might be written somewhere, and getting those into the office so they can be categorized and start to make them accessible.

D. Baker: Any questions? Comments? Thank you.

F. University Affairs Committee – Linda Saborío, Chair – no report

G. Student Association – report
Giuseppe LaGioia, President
Christine Wang, Speaker of the Senate

D. Baker: I think the next one we have is from the Student Association. I don't see Giuseppe, oh you're going to do it, okay.

A. Sto. Domingo: Hello everyone. My name is Adolfo Sto. Domingo, but most people call me Iggy. I'm the director of organizational development in the Student Association. So, Giuseppe's not here, so he asked me to give his report. So pretty much, obviously, we are wrapping up the semester. The one thing we have planned for next semester is the Spring Involvement Fair. I am personally working on it with Vice President Rachel Jacob and also with SILD. So just to give you guys a date and all that, it'll be on Thursday, January 26, from 2 to 4 p.m. The purpose of this is just so we can get transfer students involved right off the bat if they do decide to come next semester, as well as those freshmen who wanted in the first semester to establish themselves and now for them to get involved. That will be early, within the first few weeks of next semester.

One thing that we are going to be bringing back next semester is the No Shame Campaign. Last year President Nathan Lupstein first brought it to this campus. It was a fantastic campaign that he and his administration conducted. So if you don't know what the No Shame Campaign is, it's really a campaign to eliminate the negative stigma about seeking counseling with kind of like regarding any aspect of mental health, anxiety, stress, depression, anything like that. So since it was very successful last year, we want to mimic that this year and have a week-long of events. Giuseppe will provide more information as he starts to plan this campaign.

Additionally, Giuseppe will be working closely with Rose Henson in regard to various programs for next semester. Other than that, that's about it. Any questions, I can relate to him or you can contact him directly. Thank you.

D. Baker: Christine?

C. Wang: So I do have a couple things to touch on. The first thing is that we have been working very significantly on the budget situation, going down to Springfield, we've gone down and lobbied several times. And then I also do want to talk a little bit about the budget and MAP grant rally that happened on November 3. Firstly, I want to thank everyone who came out, who encouraged their students, who said something to their students, who talked about, everything like that. Thank you so much. We really appreciate it. We had a turnout of about 100, 150 people I think at the max, which was really great. We had three reps who showed up, which was Rep. Kelly Burke, Rep. Pritchard, and Rep. Guzzardi, who all came. And they actually all spoke and stayed around afterwards to talk to students and actually some faculty and administrators who were there as well. And we have five schools that showed up. We had Augustana, College of DuPage, Kishwaukee, Governors State, and Elgin Community College, which was a great turnout for the budget crisis that's going on. And we had a lot of administration and faculty who were there as well. I saw a lot of familiar faces at that budget rally. And I also want to thank all the MAP recipients who told their stories. They were powerful. We had a single mother who came up and talked about her struggle for finishing her own education, as well as looking forward to the future and going into law school. We had the DeKalb County Board chairman who came and spoke, Mark Pietrowski, and he talked about how it was affecting DeKalb County. Mayor Rey came and spoke as well, and Linnea Laszkowski from Safe Passage spoke about the impact of no funding and the impact that it has on the women and children who use Safe Passage as a shelter. So it was great representation from everyone and, again, thank you everyone who showed up and stuck around and everything like that.

In regards to the lobby days that were happening, we brought down eight students on November 15 and we talked to legislators. It was interesting. Some of them were – the most common argument I've been hearing is that we think it's a travesty that there's no budget, higher education is very important. Now the differing factor for everyone was that they all had different ideas of how that should be accomplished. The biggest argument is that "my hands are tied. It's all up to the leadership" perspective. "Well I can't do anything, so." Then my question, my point to that was, "Why are you in your office?" So that's something that we hammered home for them saying that's not acceptable that you feel like you can't do anything, do something. You represent us for some reason. You know, do your job, essentially. And so that was an interesting one. They all have different ideas. We have both Democrats and Republicans who had different ideas of how to accomplish that. It was good to come down and have them hear our stories, and again, we had varying responses, but they were all really receptive to what we had to say.

A couple other things that we dealt with as well this time going into more local-level. We've been meeting regularly with the City of DeKalb for the Student Affairs leaders, which has been really helpful in trying to get the community going, which is really awesome. And then I just want to really briefly turn it over to Stephanie Torres to talk very quickly about IBHE Exec. And then I have some more things to talk about.

S. Torres: Good afternoon everyone. Actually, President Baker mentioned what I was going to speak about. Don't worry, though. If I have to add anything, it would just be that there was an application process that all universities were – it was basically open to all universities to apply. Three of those applied, which were Western, Governors State and Eastern Illinois. As he mentioned, there are \$20 million. Actually, those \$20 million were allocated to IBHE in the beginning with the stop gap one and two budgets. Now that those \$20 million are gone, we don't really have any more emergency funds to hand out to the universities or the community colleges. The way that those funds were allocated were based on a three-month average of payroll and operating costs. The next board meeting will be December 13, if I'm not mistaken, and that's where we will vote on how those \$3 million allocated to the community colleges will be distributed. Thank you.

C. Wang: Thanks, Stephanie. I'm going to keep the rest of my report brief. I know it's been a longer meeting, but we have been very, very busy this week or this month, so I do want to talk about other stuff as well. So we also met with the Asian American Resource Center, and we actually were able to pass a resolution to support a center, a better center for them. They've been facing a lot of issues such as there's no easy way for people with disabilities to enter their facilities. It's small. Their water doesn't work, or isn't drinkable, it's not potable, that kind of stuff. So we passed a resolution that, hopefully, will be coming to the University Council and Faculty Senate soon. And that was really great that they approached us for help.

We also had a couple statements that went out regarding the Ohio State University tragedy that happened two days ago. So we released that in Student Association in general, not just the senate. And we had a culture fest on the 18th, which was to celebrate our students of different cultures, and that was a really awesome time. That was set up by some of our own senators, which was really awesome.

And then looking forward to the next semester, we are going to continue lobbying for the state and also moving into federal, the federal level as well, with PELL grants. We've been working closely Anna Quider, who is our lobbyist for the federal level, and she's provided us with a lot of ideas.

And then finally we want to get students engaged. So I think something we learned this election is that silence is dangerous. Teaching students to speak up when they see hate or discrimination is important, to get them engaged and fired up enough to say something for that. And an important distinction for students to understand, and I think some may not have learned yet, is that engaging in discussion shows us how to love one another, how to coexist who doesn't exactly share the same ideologies. And I just want to quickly end with a charge to all of you as educators, as fellow students, that we need to encourage our students to engage in civil discussions and to engage in their communities. Are there any questions or anything? Cool. Thank you.

D. Baker: She had a lot of idle time so this week she also went to Springfield and you got back, what, yesterday, a couple days there? So appreciate you down there, and it doesn't sound like much changed from your first report to this week. Christine noted some issues around diversity. I visited all of the cultural centers and the International Programs offices after the election, and I know there was a lot of angst in a lot of those centers. And my sense was people were rallying to support each other. The faculty, staff and students were all rallying. I appreciated that. And we're kind of going

through the stages of anger, denial, acceptance. Depending on which center I was at, they were at a different stage in the process. But one thing we did talk about in all of the centers was: What's next? And Christine suggested we need to speak up, and I encouraged them to think about becoming politically active. You know, it's great to raise your voice, but it's another thing to raise your hand and say, "I'm going to run for an office." If you want to have an impact locally, you can do that. I know that last school board election, I think there were three seats that had nobody run for them. So if you put your name on the ballot, you might get elected. That makes a big impact on this community. Our school system – that's a cornerstone for the community. City Council elections are coming up in March. The mayor's race is open in March. These are big deals in the local community. So, maybe it's time. I know Proudly DeKalb, you know #Proudly DeKalb. I believe I saw in the newspaper December 10 they're going to hold an information seminar for people interested in running for office and talk about what you would do if you wanted to run for office. So if you are interested in that kind of thing, you might check out #Proudly DeKalb and see if there's a meeting you want to go to to talk about that.

One other thing I want to note about Christine in particular. The week before Thanksgiving week, the Foundation held their annual Red and Black dinner, which in the past has been a donor recognition event thanking donors for supporting the university. This year Catherine Squires pivoted that and made it a fundraising activity. So we thanked donors, but we also raised money. And the goal this year was to raise \$200,000. We raised \$350,000, so not bad for the first time moving it to that new format. And there's always a little apprehension about, are we going to upset donors. It turns out donors are donors because they care about the place and they want to help students. And in that kind of environment, they were very excited to help. One of the reasons they were very excited was there was a keynote speech given by Christine Wang. And you know she's inspirational, and she was in that meeting, and she talked lovingly about her two parents who emigrated from Taiwan who made tremendous sacrifices in their personal lives to help she and her brothers who have turned out to be very successful. So it was a moving evening, and Christine did a great job, and I think it helped get the room ready to raise their paddles and donate a lot of money. So I just want to say I'm proud of her work to date and her performance then. You've got a great future in fundraising if you don't want to do something else in life. And, by the way, what are you going to do this summer, Christine?

C. Wang: Actually, I will be interning in Washington, D.C. for Capitol Hill. So I'm very excited, very humbled for this opportunity. It's not set in stone, but it looks like I will be interning for Rep. Cheri Bustos, which is really awesome. I'm very, again, excited for this opportunity. [applause]

D. Baker: Outstanding. All right thanks.

H. Operating Staff Council – Holly Nicholson, President – no report

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

D. Baker: All right, top that, Cathy.

C. Doederlein: Yeah, it's always great to go after somebody who gets a round of applause for her report.

D. Baker: Yeah, yeah, go Cathy.

C. Doederlein: I expect no applause for any of this. The SPS Presidential Award, the deadline for nominations for that is tomorrow so, hopefully, you'll all scrambling last minute doing your final nomination letters for that. We really appreciate that recognition piece that we're able to give to members of the Supportive Professional Staff, and we appreciate your efforts in nominating folks. We will be doing our – every other year, we do a survey of SPS employees. We'll be sending that out the second week of the spring semester, and once we get the relevant feedback from that, anything that seems relevant to share with this group, I will definitely bring forward. But that will likely be toward the end of the spring semester.

And then one update that I'm sure people have heard about via email and other things, but an issue impacting not just Supportive Professional Staff, but also Operating Staff has been the potential need to implement – or we thought definite need to implement – the Fair Labor Standards Act new overtime rule. And so HR and the university cabinet and all the necessary parties were really hard working diligently toward that end goal, which would have gone into effect tomorrow, but that has now been postponed due to some court rulings. So at this point, we are not going forward with implementation because no one is. But I know in the spring semester, when and if that comes back up to the top, that will be a factor for several staff members from Operating Staff and Supportive Professional Staff, so anticipate potentially seeing or hearing things of concern from there. But thankfully, all of the work that's already been done, I'm sure, won't change, it will just be a matter of when and if it's implemented. [applause]

D. Baker: Wow, we've set a trend now, haven't we? Holly, are you sure you don't want to give a report?

X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. United Faculty Alliance update – Virginia Naples, UFA President

D. Baker: All right, I think the last report is from Virginia.

V. Naples: Hi. I don't know if I'll get a round of applause for what I have to say. As the president of the United Faculty Alliance, I participated last night in a very serious conference call with many of the other tenure-track faculty and other union representatives across Illinois. The issue I would like to bring to everyone's attention affects all of the employees of the state. And this is the fact that AFSCME, that has been negotiating with the governor and the legislature about benefits, has come to a stalled inability to agree. And Gov. Rauner has decided he is going to implement his own plan for changing the healthcare policies for state employees. I understand there are about 350,000 state employees that are going to be involved, so it is not only the tenure-track and tenured faculty, but all of the other faculty and staff and administrators of this university. And at present, the healthcare pays for about 75 percent on average of costs across the board, whether it's prescription or doctor visits or other things like that, and the individual may end up paying about 25 percent. The governor's proposal suggests that the amount paid by the state will be reduced to 60 percent or less over time, and may be even less. This is about equivalent to what is the Obamacare bronze level

plan is what I understand, although I don't know all the details. Supposedly, you can retain the present insurance, but the premiums are likely at least to double. Deductibles will go up, and then what they refer to as the stop-loss high level where you stop having to pay additional things over a certain point is also expected to increase rather dramatically. So the number that was mentioned was at least \$12,000 would be the stop-loss level, and I believe that's for a family. But overall, the amount of increase in cost of healthcare could be between the \$3,000 to \$5,000 range or higher for a family. This not only affects active employed faculty and staff and administrators; it also affects retirees. Retiree benefits may not actually be changed, but the retirees who have dependents on the healthcare plan would be subject to the increases in costs. And so that would increase their premium costs and deductible costs and other things as well.

There is supposed to be a new "low-cost option" and that is maybe what is equivalent to the bronze Obamacare policy. But that is going to involve a few additional premium increases and a dramatic cut in benefits. There was discussion that there would be somewhat of a mid-level policy between low policy and the present policy, but we have no details on that, and none may be very well forthcoming.

This actually translates into a very large salary cut because people have to have healthcare, and they are not going to be able to put off a lot of kinds of healthcare issues. There were specific questions raised for people who have chronic ailments, things like heart disease, diabetes, back pain issues and things of that nature, where people are going to be needing medications and treatments on an ongoing basis. So this is a serious crisis. One of the other points that was raised was that, in the past the Central Management Services has provided the healthcare plans to the universities as if this is a requirement. The discussion was that is not law and that there may very well be something that we can do to object to the governor's plan to modify it or to prevent it from being implemented as he sees it. The comments were that reducing our healthcare plan will make us have the poorest quality healthcare plan for state employees for all of the 50 states.

The other thing that frightened me as well was that we were talking about people who want to retire who would like to keep their present level of benefits while they are being employed would be offered the opportunity to keep those benefits without a cost increase with the fact that they would then forfeit benefits for healthcare after they retired. There was quite a bit of discussion about this, and the idea was this was probably illegal, but it is something that may have to be adjudicated through the courts first.

One of the things that the consensus at the end was that, if the university employees as well as other state employees are vociferous enough in objecting to this, that we might be able to get some modification. And this is a fight all of us are in and are facing a serious problem if we don't do something right away, as well as into the future. So I'm sorry to give a very bad report, but I'm someone who really wants to know what the situation is going to be and not be patted on the head and be told that everything is going to be fine, don't worry about it.

D. Baker: Any questions for Virginia?

V. Naples: I will be providing updates as information comes along.

M. Falkoff: Are there plans to challenge Rauner's approach in court at least in order to buy us some time for perhaps a legislative fix, although my understanding is that the General Assembly was unable to head this off when they had the opportunity, you know more about this than I do.

V. Naples: Thank you for the question, that's a very good point. There is some effort being made by various attorneys and groups that are representing the various unions, including AFCSME trying to head off the implementation of this. We don't know exactly when they are going to try to do this. At one point, it was mentioned that the healthcare costs would be going up by January. I don't know if that's exactly presently the timetable or not. It's a very concerning issue.

M. Falkoff: And also, my understanding as well is that universities don't need to just follow a law, although they have in the past. I'm speaking as if I know anything about this. It's mostly a fog to me, but I agree with you, this is tremendously important. I'm not even sure what that means, how that works, who do we lobby to have someone do something about this. I don't know if you have any thoughts about that. As far as the – and I'll just offer my opinion about the idea of the constitutionality of trading away benefits that would accrue to you on retirement seems to me a settled question and clearly would be unconstitutional. That said, of course, any time something goes up in front of the Illinois Supreme Court, you can't tell exactly what's going to happen. But so far, that's very clearly unconstitutional.

V. Naples: That was my feeling too. I don't have any special knowledge of law so I couldn't say whether that was seemingly legal or not. It just seemed wrong to me. But my anticipation is that our present legislature and governor are going to do whatever they think they can do to push the envelope. They are not just looking at the issues with state employees or universities, but they are trying to look at the entire budget crisis for the state of Illinois. I don't think anybody would say there isn't a budget crisis of something going on, but as Christine and other people have said, there are many proposed ideas to fix these problems, and none of them have come forward yet. I will say that, as president of the faculty union here for tenured and tenure-track faculty, that we are going to be as active as possible to try to get attention for this issue and to support all of our constituents, to try to get better improvements for our healthcare into the future.

D. Baker: All right, let's keep our eyes peeled on it. Everybody's working to try to rectify it, but you're right, it's part of the big chess match that's underway right now.

V. Naples: We just have to get people's attention to the critical nature of the value of higher education in the state of Illinois.

D. Baker: And this just isn't a higher ed issue, it's a statewide employee issue.

V. Naples: It is a statewide issue, yes.

XI. INFORMATION ITEMS

D. Baker: All right, I want to point you at the information items. I want you to read all A through P minutes, and are there any other issues to bring to the table today?

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- C. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- 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

XII. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Hearing none, do I hear a motion to retire for the day?

Unidentified: So moved.

D. Baker: So moved, second? All in favor.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.