

Minutes of the  
**NIU Board of Trustees**  
**Of Northern Illinois University**  
**Special Meeting**  
July 21, 2016

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 1:48 p.m. by Chair Marc Strauss in the Board of Trustees Room 315 Altgeld Hall. Recording Secretary Vicky Rippberger conducted a roll call. Members present were Trustee Robert Boey, John Butler, Wheeler Coleman, Matthew Holmes, Robert Marshall, Tim Struthers, and Board Chair Marc Strauss. Members absent were Trustee Cherilyn Murer. Also present were General Counsel Jerry Blakemore, Board Liaison Mike Mann, President Doug Baker, Executive Vice President and Provost Lisa Freeman, Vice President Al Phillips, and UAC Representative Greg Long.

**2. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM AND APPROPRIATE NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING**

General Counsel Blakemore indicated the appropriate notification of the meeting has been provided pursuant to the Illinois Open Meetings Act. Mr. Blakemore also advised that a quorum was present.

**3. MEETING AGENDA APPROVAL**

Chair Strauss asked for a motion to approve the meeting agenda. Trustee Marshall so moved and Trustee Holmes seconded. The motion was approved.

**4. CHAIR'S COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

No additional comments or announcements were made.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Strauss confirmed with General Council Blakemore there were two requests for public comment.

Speaker Bessie Chronopolis: You each have a copy of this two page handout. It's dated July 21st and basically the first three paragraphs are addressed to you so please take a moment or two, perhaps not now necessarily but later, to read through what I have here which is a copy from an article in a blog that I think you might find interesting and at the end of that, as indicated in my short note to you, is a comment that I made on that blog. The information that was stated here in this article is quite disturbing because it deals with some negative actions on the part of past and present NIU administrators involving certain zoning regulations with the City of DeKalb. As a matter of fact anything that is negative that comes out of the university is of great interest to me and to many others because, as I've stated before when I've met with you, NIU and the City of DeKalb are very important entities and we need to look at situations that are brought to our attention very diligently to make sure that only appropriate behavior and procedures and interactions are taking place. I'm urging you to take the time to study through this, talk amongst yourselves and at least promise me that you'll be diligent in looking through this. I know many of you personally over the years and you know where I'm coming from. All I'm interested in is best practices and transparency. It's as simple as that. Thank you very much. Any questions? You can call me any time you want.

Speaker Virginia Naples: I have spoken before this body before about sex discrimination on salaries and, because there was not a very long amount of time available, I just thought I'd come back and give you an update and a brand new installment. I very much appreciate the opportunity to speak. This is my

university and my university Board of Trustees and administrators and I'd like to have you be well informed about what is going on. There is some things that I have presented the last time. I gave you the pink and blue spreadsheet and talked about the entire College of Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty and, what is to most people's view, a very clear case of sex discrimination - pink for girls, blue for boys. I kept the pink theme here but I didn't do the blue because it was a little bit too busy. I have a much greater detailed analysis here of Biological Sciences. If you just want to follow through with this, what I'm doing is for the first column. I have changed people's names to letters, but the letters are consistent across. The pink ones are the females; this is from the inception of their hiring at NIU to 2010. Now we all know that faculty have a variety of responsibilities and those responsibilities typically are divided into teaching, research, and service. That is ostensibly what everyone is to be evaluated upon whether it's an annual or a bi-annual evaluation. In practice, there is lip service given to teaching unless there's something extraordinary about it or there's a specific contract for an individual to be primarily teaching or a teaching only appointment, but for the average professor who is engaging in those three kinds of activities, teaching is not counted very much if at all in the evaluations, in practice although not on paper. The professional public service component likewise is looked at and perhaps debated and discusses, but pretty much ignored as well. What it comes down to, what faculty are evaluated upon in reality, is number of research publications in peer review journals. There is also variably some credit given for grantsmanship, but this is not consistent. It is not consistent within my department, which is what I know the most about, from year to year. I know from talking with other collaborators and colleagues across campus it is not consistent within their departments or across departments by any means. What I'm looking at here is in 2010 I'm comparing the number of publications, which if you look at the first column number A, this is a person who at that point in 2010 had 86 peer reviewed publications. The FP is for full professor, and that person is Person A and you can see as you go across where their salaries are and what I did was I compared the ranking for research which is what the evaluation is dependent upon and the salary. You can see it doesn't correlate for any of the women. Now in all honesty, when I did the arrows the other way, about 50% of the males had a higher research score than their salary would indicate in the rank order, but also 50% of them were also lower; so it was about half and half. But 100% of the women's salaries are way down with the exception of, if you look at number Z or Z, number 26, this was an individual who had, and of course because I have direct history of the department, this was an individual who had severe health problems and ultimately died as a result of complication of health problems, it had probably affected her entire adult life and was just not capable of dealing with the issues. Then I looked at a comparison in 2014 and again you can see that the salaries are going down. The arrow is going down, again you get kind of a mix with the males, but with all the females they are going down with the exception of the last two who are the brand new assistant professors. Most of the other people have been in rank for a very long period of time. If you go down a little bit below, if we could go to the next thing on the screen, just pull up from 2008 down, that is the female means compared to the males means for Biological Sciences and they vary from 90% of the male mean down to 80% of the male mean through various years and it changes depending on the composition of the faculty; how many full professors, how many associate, how many assistant professors. Biological Sciences went through a very great bottle-neck. For many years there were no faculty hired so those of us who were in the early cohort, I was hired in 1983. I have actually completed my 32nd year here and I have kept statistics and tracked all those data for all that length of time. I could tell you for hours about statistical things and the financial issues and still working on it, but this is a very consistent pattern. And this is a very subtle pattern and what it is, is simply again, I'm calling this another version of a smoking gun that shows that the accomplishments of women faculty are discounted in comparison to their male counterparts because women's performance in terms of publications which is the only thing that has been valued by the evaluations committees are higher than their salaries. I had some instances where, to use my own as an example, I was told when I first got there most of my publications were sole author. I was told that not a good thing, that I needed to acquire collaborators because it looked like I was not collegial enough to work with other people. I acquired collaborators and I still did some publications that were on my own and I was told that well the collaborators were the ones that had contributed the data and I just got my name on the paper because I walked down the hall at the right time and that the papers that I was still publishing had a single author, I just had not given credit to the people who had actually done the work. Those are the levels of subtle forms of discrimination that these numbers demonstrate in Biological Sciences. Now we've had faculty salary equity task forces done in 2004, 2008, and again an in-

house one in 2011/2012 and with the first two we could not get an actual understanding of the analysis. We were told because I was on the Presidential Commission of the Status of Women at the time and Steve Cunningham, whom some of you may know and remember, was asked to come and speak to us and he very nearly didn't escape that room alive without agreeing that they would release something about the methodologies for the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women. This was the 2007/2008 season where it was done and what they finally released was the executive summary and the executive summary said they use sophisticated multiple regression analysis. Well I'm a biologist. Not only do I do math, I do statistics. I like numbers, I deal with numbers. I never got the memo that girls can't do math and science. Sorry, never got delivered. I looked at that and from those reports it said that 20 some odd factors were used to do those sophisticated multiple regression analysis. Anyone who does scientific work faces the fact that you cannot use that many parameters because every time you add a new parameter to your analysis you are adding a series of additional assumptions that are going to skew the results in unpredictable ways. You just can't do it. You can't get a big enough data set and, if you keep throwing things in there, eventually you'll find some sort of a spurious correlation but it may very well be just imaginary. And so, I've gone through that and one of the things that people have said is that there were four factors that were ultimately were used; sex because we're looking at male versus female that's logical; length of time in rank that presumably assumes that you get salary increments as you go along through your career; and then annual merit; and then long term merit. I was told long term merit was 15 years. That immediately makes it impossible to use long term merit evaluations for either assistant or associate professors. I do not believe in the history of NIU there has been an assistant professor in a tenure track position that could come up for associate professor that has been there for more than the six or maybe seven years and certainly not 15. The vast majority of people who achieve tenure and are associate professors are not necessarily going to be in rank for 15 years because the average person will try to come up for promotion to full professor in again another sixth year or seventh year. Then if you achieve full professor status having an additional 15 years is not necessarily likely to happen. That will bring the average person who starts their assistant professor track in their early 30's to close to retirement time by the time they have achieve 15 years. 15 years is a very difficult number to deal with. One of the other things that I wanted to mention is that in Biological Sciences, all of the women who have attempted in the last 32 years to be promoted from assistant to associate professors have been judged by their peers both with the university and outside and have been awarded tenure. 94% of the mail candidates have done so. So it's a 6% difference but it is something. But the other thing when you look at the length of time in rank from being an associate professor to being promoted to full professor for the women is 9.9 years when it is 6.1 for the men. So those are very significant differences. I could run percentages and stuff but I didn't do that for you. It's all on here. I don't believe that this is an unbiased analysis of the accomplishments of the women. 100% of the women should not have their salaries lower than their research publications should merit they would do. I have suffered very greatly from this as have all the women in my department. This is the subtle reality of what is going on with the sex discrimination that is happening on campus and I'm sure a comparable analysis could be done for every other department and you would probably see very similar results. I did it for Biology because I can get the data. All of my data have come from public sources and I didn't reveal any individual salaries. You could go over to the working papers and look that all up. I just wanted to try to inform you of this and I have lots more data. I'll be happy to come back and talk to you about these issues in the future as well.

Greg Long asked to respond with an update on the salary work that is being done currently. He began by thanking Professor Naples as this something that as a university we want to look at and be sure that we do pay people equitably and that there's no gender bias. Dr. Long continued, I would also second what she said in term of the report that was put out in 2011. It was an executive summary and so there was no accompanying technical reports such that people could access the data nor look at it in any greater depth. Those are certainly legitimate concerns. As a result of some of her concerns in April, Provost Freeman and CFO Phillips asked that I initiate a task force to look at a salary study. We have at this point two people who are co-chairs of this, one is Dr. Virginia Wilcox-Gok. She is a labor relations specialist and former chair of the Department of Economics. She would have quantitative expertise and the qualitative expertise looking at the stories, looking at the reasons behind things, we have Professor Kristen Myers and she is looking at that. Our goal on this is to do this in-house with the expertise that we have available and have it be something where we do within the group have diversity of race, gender,

and sexual orientation. We're looking at the Presidential Commissions. We're looking at getting people with specific expertise such that the colleges are represented. Ultimately we'd have an executive task force and then you'd have a qualitative committee and a quantitative committee. Again the whole point on this though is to do this in a way that is replicable, that's transparent and that we will make available to people after we're done. We're looking at it more broadly than just gender. We're including other variables such as race. Also looking at it in terms of salary inversion and compression. For those of us who've been here a long time, salary compression is a real issue much like Dr. Naples was mentioning. So looking at a broad based salary study that we will share with the Faculty Senate, University Council, as well as you. So I did want to let you know that we are as a senate and as a body responding to the concerns she raised because we want to be sure that if these issues do exist, let's know about it and respond to them.

## **6. PRESIDENT'S REPORT NO. 107**

### **Agenda Item 6.a. Appointment of Acting Dean, College of Engineering & Engineering Technology**

President Baker indicated there are two action items and Provost Freeman will provide background information for both items.

Provost Freeman began, the members of the committee heard from Dr. Ghrayeb this morning when he spoke about some of the efforts to close equity gaps and achieve equal outcomes that have been ongoing in the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. He spoke this morning as the Acting Dean but he has been an Associate Dean in that College, involved in all of their efforts related to community college partnerships, industry partnerships, curriculum development, advising; and so he comes well qualified to serve as the Acting Dean. He was selected in consultation with members of the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. There was an anonymous survey asking for individuals who would be interested to serve in this capacity and four qualified individuals expressed interest in leading the college. Dr. Ghrayeb was the most qualified of those and we're pleased to have him serving in that capacity. The recommendation to the Board is that Dr. Omar Ghrayeb be appointed Acting Dean of the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology retroactively effective July 1, 2016.

Chair Strauss asked for a motion. Trustee Boey so moved and Trustee Struthers seconded. A roll call vote was taken:

Trustee Robert Boey: Yes  
Trustee Wheeler Coleman: Yes  
Trustee Mathews Holmes: Abstain  
Trustee Robert Marshall: Yes  
Trustee Tim Struthers: Yes  
Vice Chair John Butler: Yes  
Board Chair Marc Strauss: Yes

The motion passed.

### **Agenda Item 6.b. Request to Transition Tenure Homes**

President Baker began, the second item is the movement for some faculty to new tenure homes. One of the main pieces of this is that in February you approved a name change for the School of Nursing and we need to align the faculty with the new department or the new school. In addition there are two faculty members being moved from the Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundations to the Department of Literacy and Elementary Education. Those change in homes is in response to program prioritization work and better alignment of faculty in the program of curriculum and instruction that had been split between the two departments. All the CI faculty will now be in one department of Literacy and Elementary Education which will allow the program to expand in innovative ways. So we would ask you

approve these changes in tenure homes.

Chair Strauss asked for a motion to approve the recommendation to transition tenure homes effective August 16, 2016. Trustee Boey so moved and Trustee Coleman seconded. A roll call vote was taken.

Trustee Robert Boey: Yes  
Trustee Wheeler Coleman: Yes  
Trustee Mathews Holmes: Abstain  
Trustee Robert Marshall: Yes  
Trustee Tim Struthers: Yes  
Vice Chair John Butler: Yes  
Board Chair Marc Strauss: Yes

## **7. OTHER MATTERS**

No other matters were discussed.

## **8. NEXT MEETING**

Chair: Strauss indicated the next full Board of Trustees meeting is scheduled for September 15<sup>th</sup>.

## **9. CLOSED SESSION**

No Closed Session was held.

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Strauss asked for a motion to adjourn. Trustee Holmes so moved and Trustee Marshall seconded. The motion was approved. Meeting adjourned at 2:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicky Rippberger  
Recording Secretary

*In compliance with Illinois Open Meetings Act 5 ILCS 120/1, et seq, a verbatim record of all Northern Illinois University Board of Trustees meetings is maintained by the Board Recording Secretary and is available for review upon request. The minutes contained herein represent a true and accurate summary of the Board proceedings.*