

Minutes of the
NIU Board of Trustees
Research and Innovation, Legal and Legislative Affairs
COMMITTEE MEETING
November 16, 2017

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. by Chair Butler in the Board of Trustees Room, 315 Altgeld Hall. Recording Secretary Cathy Craddock conducted a roll call. Members present were Trustees Barsema, Boey, Coleman, LaGioia, Struthers, Wasowicz and Committee Chair Butler. Also present Acting President Lisa Freeman, Vice President for Research and Innovation Partnerships Gerald Blazey, and Acting General Counsel and Board Parliamentarian Gregory Brady.

VERIFICATION OF QUORUM AND APPROPRIATE NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

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

MEETING AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Butler asked for a motion to approve the meeting agenda. Trustee Wasowicz so moved and Trustee Coleman seconded. The motion was approved.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Butler asked for a motion to approve the minutes of August 17, 2017 LARI Committee. Trustee Wasowicz so moved and Trustee Barsema seconded. The motion passed. Chair Butler then asked for a motion to approve the minutes of October 20, 2016 Ad Hoc Committee on Governance. Trustee Wasowicz so moved and Trustee Struthers seconded. The motion passed.

CHAIR'S COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Butler commented: This is an honor for me to serve as chair of this committee. I've been committed to the isolation of the subject of research and innovation in a committee form for quite some time and I've been honored to see that vision carried out by prior Trustee Cherilyn Murer and then later by Dennis Barsema and others who have been involved in this process as well. I think it's important for us to continue this work. We talk often about the fact we're an NCAA Division 1 athletic program. We know what that means and we know that we're the only Illinois athletic program in the Mid-American Conference and there's a number of other data points that we are familiar with in relation to things that are very valuable to a number of people. We're also, on the academic front, classified as a doctoral national research university and we're categorized as a national public university in a number of ranking lists, as opposed to a regional or national liberal arts colleges. We're also a Carnegie doctoral "higher research" activity university and we share this distinction with SIU Carbondale and ISU. The only institution that is higher than this distinction in the state of Illinois that's a public is the U of I. I wanted to introduce that to you because I want to say that we need to zealously protect our status as a national research university because it's the lynchpin of all that we seek to achieve regarding the quality of instruction and student experience. And, we heard earlier from our students who want to see the hiring of more faculty of color. That agenda would be seriously compromised if we lost any of our national research university distinction. Everything we want to achieve is tied ultimately to the manner in which our academic programs are classified. So it's in that spirit that we begin this committee and we'll learn later the vision of the Vice President for Research and Innovation in terms of what we can do strategically to capitalize on our strengths. And, this informs the purpose of our presentation from our faculty member

who's here today, one of our distinguished professors, Aaron Fogelman, who is a Presidential Research, Scholarship, and Artistry Professor currently with a term from 2015 to 2019. He is here to talk about his book and we'll talk a little bit about him in just a second. That is the backdrop for this meeting. As I said, we're going to hear from Professor Fogelman today and then we're going to take a recess so that the Board can take a break because it's been a long day and then we're going to reconvene for the rest of the committee's agenda. I don't see anyone from the University Advisory Committee. Am I missing someone hiding?

PUBLIC COMMENT

Board Parliamentarian Brady indicated that there were no requests for public comment.

UNIVERSITY RECOMMENDATIONS/REPORTS

Information Item 7.d. Presidential Professor Aaron Fogelman to speak about his book, *Two Troubled Souls*.

Chair Butler indicated that he wished move Item 7.d. up to invite our special guest, who Vice President Blazey will tell us a little bit about.

VP Blazey thanked Professor Fogelman for his patience this morning. Professor Fogelman is a historian of transatlantic migration, religious conflict, gender, and the impact of revolution of American society in the Atlantic world. His instructional efforts focus on early American and Atlantic world history. He's lectured around the world, published in both English and German and does research in other languages as well. He's been a Fulbright Scholar and a Humboldt Fellow. Locally we recognized him in 2014 as a Presidential Research, Scholarship, and Artistry Professor. He's one of our most distinguished faculty and because of his accomplishments and his background, and he's a natural spokesperson for the breadth of our faculty excellence. We will hear just a bit about his book on transatlantic migration today and, as you've seen in your board item, his book "Two Troubled Souls" has won the American Historical Associations 2014 James A. Rawley Prize; and, so I'd like to welcome you, Aaron, to our proceedings this afternoon.

Chair Butler noted that it is his pleasure to present to all of the members of the board a copy of Professor Fogelman's book. I was given a copy of a book many years ago when I was the student trustee. The book was written by Bruce Lincoln, who was one of our distinguished historians and it was a formative moment for me as a trustee. I read the book shortly after. I was 500 pages. It was tough. I wasn't particularly a reader at that time. There's something about a book that's given to you, hopefully you'll read it. I have read this book, I'm proud to say. Last weekend I committed the time. This is not my copy. This is Veronica's copy. Mine's in my bag all broken up and obviously read with marks and so forth. So it was very enjoyable reading. It's an extremely accessible book. One of the things I wanted to point out to all of you [showing the audience where the notes section of the book begins], beginning about here, the rest of the book is end notes, which gives you a sense of the kind of scholarship you can expect from a university press and the expectations that a historian has when writing a book like this. And, in that section of the book, it tells another story. There is almost another book in just the end notes about what we understand about Atlantic history and what's been written about the individuals and the characters that are featured in the book, and it gives you a real sense of what it means to research in this field. I wanted to say those things, give you a copy of this book as my gift to you, and then also now invite Professor Fogelman to the podium.

Aaron Fogelman began, thank you very much. I've never done anything like this before and I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you about my work and what I do here. The room's not as full as it used to be. I hope history didn't scare people away. There will not be a test later so at least you don't have to worry about that. So I teach in the history department. I work in two areas, Early American History and also History of the Atlantic World, which I define and explain as the world made by encounters among Native Americans, Africans, and Europeans, wherever they occurred, on all four continents, and also on the

ocean in between. Let me just tell you a little bit about how this project developed and then I'll give you an overview of it and mention a few things about what I've been able to do with it and what I hope to do in the future. This project followed some books and articles that I had written about German immigration into the North American colonies, gender, religious conflict; all from transatlantic perspectives. I found two unknown individuals - a husband and a wife - who had a tremendous story of traveling, what I call a spiritual journal in the 18th century Atlantic world. Their names, Maria Barbara Knoll, who was from one of the German Lutheran territories, and Jean-Francois Reynier who was from Lake Geneva, a French speaking area of Switzerland. Their adventurous travels through Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, England, Suriname, the Caribbean, and North America was a long and kind of grand spiritual journey in many ways. They worked as missionaries among Native Americans, Africans, and Europeans. They learned many languages. They were extremely capable in crafts, with languages and with medicine, both of them. They endured tremendous hardship and deadly tropical slave colonies. They were involved in four colonial wars, slave revolts, the Treaty of Maroons attack, revolution and deadly attacks on women. They were members of a number of religious communities and they got kicked out of most to them, actually because they were troublemakers. They also fought with each other constantly during their stormy 35-year marriage. The spiritual journey of Reynier and Knoll tells us a lot about the Atlantic world, how it provided space where adventuresome couples could explore, hide and experience unusual and revealing encounters with other Atlantic peoples. Their lives illuminate an underside of the empire where religious radicals fought against church authorities and against each other to find and spread truth. It was a place where spiritual, medical, and linguistic encounters accorded among Atlantic peoples that many had promoted the so-called Atlantic system neither could understand fully or control. And it was a place where wives disobeyed husbands to seek their own truth by alternatively accepting and challenging normal practice. Reynier and Knoll illuminate those norms and what it meant to break them. Finally, these two Atlantic lives reveal a tension or a struggle between opportunity, people seeking opportunity in the Americas and the difficulty that individuals had who tried to affect real change in this new world of opportunity. I have a long slide show for later if there's time and if you're interested, but for now let me just tell you a little bit about the creative process that led up to this. It took me about six years to write and publish this book. The research was in English, German, Dutch and French. I used archival material in Germany, Switzerland, Pennsylvania and Georgia. The funding was internal; a sabbatical from NIU and then a Research and Artistry grant, but also external funding. I was a Fulbright Distinguished Chair a few years ago teaching in Frankfurt, Germany for a year and also doing the European side of the search. I also had a grant from the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia. Let me talk a little bit about dissemination of all of this information and the work I did on this. I participated in a number of invited book talks, which is kind of what this is actually, and I list the places for you - the institutes and locations and years. Those are interesting because you really get to elaborate on what it's about. Sometimes with a group of specialists, sometimes generalists. Conference presentations: did quite a few of those. The book has been reviewed in at least 20 scholarly journals and, in one case, there was a book debate, which was kind of interesting, in a journal called *Social Sciences and Missions*. They sent it out to scholars who wrote each four or five pages about the book, a review and reaction to it, and then I got to respond to them. I got the final word - it's always good to have the final word. And there's a draft screen play. That one's a long shot. In fact, while I was waiting here, I've been reading for a class in a couple of days, but the guy who wrote the screen play was a former graduate student of mine, just came down the hallway. He was here for the event involving all the kids down the hallway here. But we'll see what happens with that. So what's been the impact of this book on my career? It helped me get the appointment mentioned as the NIU Presidential Research Professor. I've had numerous invitations to speak at conferences and institutes and to serve on panels. It's assisted with external grant applications and mostly that's hopeful now. They're out and waiting to see what happens, the applications that is. It's increased my profile in the profession essentially, which among other things assists me and us with recruiting graduate students into the history department here. Increased connection and profile, this helps me assist students that already have their research and placement. And the new scholarship continually informs my teaching and it's also informed two new research projects that I'm working on now. The impact of the book on others, course adoptions, it's been used at least a few times in various history courses around the country. Student engagement, as I get older I'm learning more and more and

getting better and better at employing, through grants and other means, undergraduates and graduates to help me with research. But it also furthers the humanistic pursuit of helping society interpret cultural interaction, exchange, and diversity in changing worlds where there are sometimes extreme cultural clashes present. Some of the basic issues I describe in this book involve different people and different cultures, and sometimes extreme situations, but also the ordinary, a husband and a wife and their everyday relations. They are as relevant today as they were 250 years ago. So this brings insight into it. I thank you for inviting me again and your attention, and if anybody has any questions, and if you want to see any of the slide show let me know. I know there's not a lot of time for that so that may not work.

Trustee Barsema asked, is this the first book that you have published?

Aaron Fogelman responded, no, this is my third book.

Trustee Barsema asked, and how did writing this book compare to the first two? Was it a similar process or was it harder? Because it seems, were the first two as well-known as this one seems to be?

Aaron Fogelman responded, I didn't win a big prize with the first two, but they've been out there, they've been doing some good. They get cited a lot. The first one was about German immigration in the colonial period, 18th century British North American, it was called *Hopeful Journeys*. The second one was about gender and religion and sexuality and religious conflict in Europe and North America. It's called *Jesus is Female*, kind of a provocative title. So that got some attention, that angered a few people, but you know just telling it like it is, or like it was, the way I see it. Lots of articles too.

Chair Butler remarked, so later we'll learn the strategic imperatives of the Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships and what I think will drive a number of activities of the faculty, including things such as preparing for changing demographics and interpreting our changing world. It seems like your scholarship plays right into that. How do we understand the impact of human movement, the cultural movement throughout the globe? And, when I read the book I gained such an appreciation for the pre-revolutionary time period, where I hadn't known much about it. I learned recently, in seeing Hamilton, that there was this migration of Hamilton from the Caribbean to the colonies, but I was just fascinated by that. When we think about a university's priorities and setting an agenda for encouraging research and innovation, what do you want to tell us is needed or would be useful to you as a faculty member who does a significant amount of research or serious intense research projects?

Aaron Fogelman responded, I could go on and on about that, but I would say first take the humanities seriously. This is a comprehensive university. We, you, the world needs this. Take humanity seriously, support it, that means money; that means psychological support; it means all kinds of things. The insight that this brings, what we teach in the books and articles that we write, that we inform each other with, and that we inform our students with. They really matter. So that's, first and foremost, what I would say. I could go into all kinds of details, but that's how I'd sum it up; and we're struggling. We work just as hard. I would like to think harder than a lot of other people that, maybe, you give more thought to, but this matters. This really matters. When I teach Benjamin Franklin's autobiography in the freshmen Early American Survey, every time I read it, I think this should be required reading in the business school as this is so important. He was the quintessential early American entrepreneur. I once had a somewhat older – I would say non-traditional – student who was a retired business man and he agreed, in fact it was his idea, "I wish I had read this in business school." That's how much this matters.

Trustee Wasowicz added, Tim Ferris would agree with you. If you ever listen to Tim. He's like the number one business podcast out there, but he would agree with you on that.

Aaron Fogelman responded, Okay, I'll have to remember that. I'll listen to him.

Chair Butler added, you and I talked a little bit before you spoke today, and one of the themes that seemed to enter your dialog with me, and even your presentation now, is graduate students and the importance of graduate students. Can you help us understand the importance of graduate programs for you as a faculty member and the work that you do?

Aaron Fogelman responded, there's a couple of things happening here that are really important. It's an interplay, a dynamic that is important to understand. First, we have this program, we have an M.A. and Ph.D. program in history here, and we're trying to attract graduate students from throughout the country. And, while we do get some, we would like to get more. We don't have enough funding to attract all that we would like. We see capable qualified people who want to come here and study with us and we tell them we can get them \$15,000 a year during their doctoral study while they're a teaching assistant and do all this other work, and they go to the University of Maryland because they're going to get \$25,000 there. So, that's a problem, but we try and, quite frankly, I'm an optimist on these things. I think we do pretty well with what we have, but the idea is to bring really good M.A. and Ph.D. students here. They inform each other. They inform and energize us and then of course we train them to do all kinds of things that you can do with an advanced history degree. And the interplay when it works as I think it is now, it works well. It does a lot of good for both sides, and it also affects our interactions elsewhere in the profession. When I'm at a conference in Philadelphia or Berlin or Savannah, Georgia or someplace, I'm meeting with other historians and related disciplines and we talk about graduate programs and graduate teaching. We talk about our doctoral students who are getting placed in universities, we build networks and connections with the doctoral students, and in some cases, like the guy I just met in the hallway again, with master's students and that makes a difference. It helps us and it also helps us help the students. They are, in many ways, the lifeblood of a good graduate program. But you need to bring them in and you need to be able to support them and take care of them and I, forgive me for bragging, but our history department here knows how to teach and train and work with graduate students with what we have. We're really good at it, but we don't always have the support we need.

Chair Butler responded, thank you. I would be remiss if I didn't point out, and you may have a comment about it, you make decisions to focus on not just the man where there might be a good deal of information and documentation, but also in your book, the spouse, and you make an effort to reach out and learn as much as you can about her as well as him. Are you leading a movement in this regard to bring a fuller picture with regard to gender, or is this becoming a common practice within the historical field?

Aaron Fogelman responded, this has been around for a while, so in some ways I'm contributing to something that was already there. As far as women's history goes, that really began to take off in the 1970's when I was an undergraduate, and when I was a graduate student at Michigan from '86 to '91 it was a big deal there. We were also moving in the direction of gender studies, which this book is about. It's women, men, it's gender and it's a lot of other things. That has a permanent presence now in our publications of historical scholars and in the classroom. You'll see that everywhere. You'll see that I think in at least 99% of all the history classes taught at NIU. One thing that I did with this, the approach, the methodology, is called "micro history," where you study intensely on one small unit one way or another. It could be an individual, it could be a group or something, but I did this with a marriage, an 18th century marriage, a husband and wife. And I looked and looked and couldn't find any other historians who have done that. I think I've seen one or two that have come out in the last couple of years since mine. So that was a bit unique. A micro history of a husband and wife in the 18th century. So hopefully that provided some insight and, I have to say while I was researching this and writing this up, it was just amazing, even though they were riding horses and on sailing ships, wearing different clothes, you can relate to these people. They were mostly arguing, but also cooperating on husband and wife things that you would all recognize if you're married. At one point in Georgia they're commuting like we commute now. I don't know if anybody in here commutes. She was in Ebenezer in the back country and he was in Savannah. It was because of work and also because they were fighting. Sometimes it worked better for them when they were separated.

Chair Butler concluded, thank you very much. I really appreciate you coming and speaking to us and giving us an opportunity to learn more about you and your scholarship.

Aaron Fogelman responded, you're welcome. It was my pleasure.

VP Blazey added, I just want to say that one of the best things about my job is learning about other disciplines and interacting with them. It's actually a very humbling experience to see the level of expertise in so many different disciplines that we have at the university, and I'd like to thank you, Aaron. You eloquently pointed out the importance of breadth to the life of the university. So thank you on my behalf.

Chair Butler addressed the committee, so what we're going to do then is now recess so that we can take a break as a board. The General Counsel has some advice for us as we do that. We're going to reconvene here. Is it fair for us to come back in 20 minutes? We'll reconvene, we'll recess until 2:20, and our General Counsel has some requests.

Greg Brady added, I honestly don't know if this is required or not, but, just in case, can we get a motion on that and a second, and a vote, and then during recess please understand that we are still in the middle of the committee meeting as such during the recess. Do not have conversations about university business during the recess please. Thank you.

Chair Butler asked for a motion to recess? Trustee Barsema made the motion; Trustee Coleman seconded. There was no discussion and the motion passed. Chair Butler announce that the committee was in recess until 2:25 pm.

Information Item 7.a. – Matt Streb (after break) 7.b. and 7.c.

Chair Butler explained, we have four items remaining on the agenda, but we are going to move quickly through them. We are not going to have a federal relations update. You have the information item in your materials for you to review and follow-up with the board liaison if you have any questions. Of course if you have concerns for the committee you're welcome to raise them. The Sponsored Programs Administration item, as well is an information item, which I'll ask that you consult on your own time. We're going to move to the state legislative update which is going to be provided by Dr. Streb.

Matt Streb addressed the committee. Thank you, Chair Butler. I'll be very brief. As you all know last week the veto session finished up. It was a relatively interesting veto session for a variety of reasons. The governor had actually several of his vetoes overridden, which is not always common, but very little impact on higher education. The only major bill that you should know about, that our students were very supportive of and that the legislature overrode, was the Student Loan Servicing Rights Act. That creates a student loan bill of rights. It also creates a student loan ombudsperson that allows students to get advice and raise questions about improper student loans. That came out of the veto session. Other than that there wasn't much related to higher education. The big thing obviously going forward, as we're getting ready for the spring session is we're already preparing for the budget and it will be an interesting spring I think. Largely because we're going to be in the midst of what could potentially be the most expensive state-wide race in U.S. history, our governor's race. You probably just saw that Jeanne Ives, Representative Ives, is now decided she's going to run against Governor Rauner. Obviously the Democrats have a very competitive primary. Governor Rauner will be giving his budget address on February 14th and the primary is in March so it will be interesting to see how that plays out and what happens. I continue to be somewhat concerned about our ability to get a budget. You know rule number two in elected politics is you never run for re-election without a budget. Unfortunately, rule number one

was you also don't run for re-election after going 700 days without a budget. So I'm not so sure that the legislature will necessarily see it that way. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions. I put more stuff in your board book, but if you have any questions let me know.

7.e. – Strategies to Support Scholarship

Chair Butler addressed the committee: I would like us to just slow down a bit now and give our distinguished liaison Dr. Blazey an opportunity to talk to us about the strategic planning for research and innovation.

VP Blazey addressed the committee: Before I begin, I do want to just acknowledge the incredible efforts Dr. Anna Quider is making on our behalf in Washington. Things are in a high state of uncertainty, moving very fast, but she is participating with our peer and aspirational institutions on educating our delegation on our behalf. And, I believe some of the most concerning aspects of the tax reform bill will be addressed in the Senate and I'm optimistic and it's in no small part due to Dr. Quider's efforts and her collaborations with others in state institutions. I'd also just like to thank Dara Little and her crew for putting together the report. It's very accessible and it's got a great amount of detail if you want to know anything about Sponsored Programs and how we're doing there. Please take a look at that document.

VP Blazey continued, I'll get to the main task that was put forth for this session and, I'll remind you, at the request of the board following an analysis of program strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, a SWOT analysis. We were asked to pull together a strategic vision and a strategic plan for research, scholarship, and artistry. This has been done in collaboration with the Division of Academic Affairs and I've been working very closely with the Provost and the President as we develop this. We propose a vision and a strategy to strengthen and increase research, scholarship and artistry and those three things belong together for a university. As you saw, scholarship, history and the humanities and arts, as you saw with our previous speaker, have a very important place in our university. Let me just remind you of the mission of the university which encompasses excellence, engagement, and teaching and learning, research and scholarship, creativity and artistry, and outreach and service. I want to stress that these are all highly interconnected. High quality programs in research, scholarship, and artistry are essential for recruitment and retention of students and faculty and that becomes increasingly important as competition for students increases. Initial implementation steps of these strategic plans are underway. There are also ongoing campus-wide conversations, which will continue for the rest of this academic year, which will sharpen and extend the plan. At the highest level the vision that I've come up with, after consulting with many and considering our strengths and weaknesses, is to prepare northern Illinois and the nation for a century of change. As a leading public research university, NIU has the responsibility and opportunity for preparing our region and students for challenges of the future. And I can think of no more effective way to engage our students than to get them involved in the changes that we're going to face in the future. Nonetheless, a focus on regional issues with national relevance will also be important and will also attract our students by offering opportunities for meaningful engagement on all scales and also meaningful engagement that will be attractive to our faculty. So although they're distinct, the four areas of activity I have pictured here are very interrelated and they offer opportunities across campus for a wealth of mission-focused activities, and they are well matched to our faculty and staff. They all fit well with the NIU pathways: creativity and innovation, global connections, health and wellness, learning, origins in influence, social justice and diversity, and sustainability. So we have seven pathways and I have four main emphases here. Naturally, they reinforce one another and they have a lot of coherence. Just a word about each one of these; scholarship around the changing environment will involve

disciplines from multiple colleges, the need to understand the science, develop engineering responses, humanist perspectives, much like the one we heard earlier, and explore the legal, social and economic impacts. Just take an example of precipitation becoming more sporadic but more intense. You'll need law to help you deal with that. You'll need engineering solutions to deal with that. You'll need to understand the science of what happens to your environment and your water supply as we start encountering these much more extreme precipitation events. Changing demographics is associated with growth and migration. Migration is attached to, or it's going to be influenced by, the first emphasis. Aging and composition, and by composition I mean diversity. We'll see very large changes of the composition of the regional population over the next decades. And these offer a wide range of scholarly activities in environmental education versus studies in the human and health sciences. And I'll say a little bit more, give you more examples later on. In the coming decades and you know we see it now and we're going to see more of it, there will be transformative and disruptive changes in technology associated with transportation. I've been having conversations with local entrepreneurs about developing completely autonomous farm implements and equipment. That will be transformative rather than disruptive, but it's also a huge opportunity. Other areas that will be transformative are computing and sensing, advanced manufacturing, biomedical engineering, which all require expertise from a broad array of scholars – our computer scientists, educators, engineers, biologists, social scientists, and humanist. I'm sure I've not been totally inclusive. And as our world changes, to help guide society to this new terrain, we'll need an opportunity for interpretation and forecasting by the humanities and arts. The question you asked, Chair Butler, about migration and our previous speaker, is completely relevant. That's an example of that. I also take this as something as a challenge to our artists in particular to see how they can respond to these foci and help us understand. They do strengthen and complement areas of already established research and they're not meant to diminish them. They're meant to be focusing elements that strengthen rather than diminish other areas of research. So supporting the vision requires a series of strategic actions or tactics. So the vision has to capitalize on those strengths and opportunities we cited in the SWOT analysis while eliminating or mitigating some of our weaknesses and threats.

VP Blazey continued, so here are what I would term some categories of actions or tactics, strategic tactics, that can support those four emphases in the division. As a university we are taking first steps on many. They are: offer new doctoral degrees in areas of opportunity; initiate research clusters or centers - and this harkens back to our conversation about those that we have sunset so that we can redirect faculty and resources towards these new clusters or centers; leverage partnerships; and improve infrastructure equipment. Graduate stipends are an area that we do know we have to address. That conversation has been continuous and you also heard Professor Fogelman mention that as well. Also, resources to promote innovation with our faculty and staff. We also need to continue to enhance our culture of scholarship by reducing impediments, shifting some of our attitudes towards service orientation, faculty incentives, and providing mentorship. Some of these require little by way of resources, but others may require significant investment. So let me focus on two as they illustrate growth targets as well as needs for investment. Those two would be new doctoral degrees and initiate research clusters or centers. Our students would benefit from both initiatives and the former, the doctoral degree, permits full realization of program scholarship potential. The research cluster ensures adequate personnel resources to pursue emerging scholarship activities. With a sufficient set of resources, a judicious combination of these first two tactics, the doctoral programs and the new clusters, could lead to a 25% increase in scholarship as measured by metrics appropriate to the discipline, and we can get into that discussion, that's a long discussion, within three or four years.

Trustee Barsema asked, does the cluster differ from the center?

VP Blazey responded not really. A cluster is focusing personnel and resources around a specific idea or specific discipline. A center could be a little broader than that. I want to stress that I picked what I believe is a conservative but a doable and meaningful goal, which is a 25% increase in our scholarship in three to four years. Given our situation, our financial situation and the climate we're in, anything much more would be not entirely realistic and I want to set a goal that is a significant change. The resources for these initiatives would be realized through program prioritization, the enrollment strategic plan, and succession planning with respect to our faculty. I want to focus on these two. It's where we put the most thought in. Again I will stress that I've been working with the Provost and the President on this and this is – I also want to mention – is explicitly one of the metrics for the presidential goals, and that would be new doctoral degrees. They would offer our students advanced preparation and improve their competitiveness. So more engagement, more competitiveness, better job preparation. Each new doctoral program will significantly increase the productivity of the faculty. They can have a longer, more lasting, more significant relationships with their graduate students. Rather than a half a year or a year, it's four to five years depending on the discipline and you can do a heck of a lot more when you train somebody and they are starting to be your collaborator rather than just your student. It's a highly effective way to increase your productivity. This would also increase the success rate of faculty when they apply for external funding. It's something of a check mark against them when they don't have a doctoral degree. It's not insurmountable, but you really have to have a mitigation plan for the fact that you don't have that capability. And it will attract research active faculty if a department that didn't have a doctoral program suddenly has a doctoral program. The quality of the faculty that are applying at least in terms of research intensity probably increases by order of magnitude. So a plausible estimate for the increase in research activity for each new doctoral program would be 5% per year relative to our last fiscal year. The calculation is quite easy. Currently we have about 70 faculty members who are involved in externally sponsored research programs. A new doctoral program in computer science or engineering for instance, would attract at least four new research faculty in each one of those programs and you can imagine at least four new external grants or programs corresponding to a 5% increase in our overall grant numbers and our faculty active in external funding. I mentioned computer science and engineering on purpose because we're well positioned for new doctoral programs in those two areas. In fact, recently there was a proposal okay-ed for further development in computer science by the Provost and there are some submissions from engineering for consideration. Both programs have master's degrees and curricular and research capacity already in place.

VP Blazey continues, these new programs would be intentionally responsive to the regional workforce needs and these emphases we've listed, and those two disciplines, would fully leverage the collaborative opportunities offered by the national labs. Everything is looking good for us to increase our research intensity and reputation by moving forward with those doctoral degrees. Scholarship clusters or centers, a well-established technique for increasing scholarly activity. Again I want to stress that it's been used in other universities with great success. I do want to stress it's not meant to replace or reduce current research efforts. If we want to grow research it's meant to be something new and something additional. As with a new doctoral program, I think establishing one cluster per year each with four active scholars would increase productivity of about 5% per year relative to FY17. The metrics used to measure growth will vary with discipline. I gave you the basic metrics for STEM field, but there's other metrics for like the humanities and artistry that we need to acknowledge and recognize. But it would be some combination of grant activity, articles, books, presentations, performances, and exhibitions; and, we have the capability now and would actually analytically benchmark them as we go along. These clusters would be established through a partnership with the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Research and Innovation Partnerships. The Provost can dedicate tenure lines to the centers or clusters, and the vice president of RIPS can assist

with the funding of the new lines and startup funds. If you're thinking about something in the scientific and engineering disciplines, about half a million dollars per year for three years for a total of one and a half million beyond the tenure lines would be sufficient to establish a four-person cluster. After the initial three-year period, the new clusters would be expected to be fully self-sufficient by attracting external grants and then you would start to see meaningful return on your investment in terms of the funding, the training of students, and scholarship. The cost would be significantly lower for clusters or centers in the humanities or arts just by the nature of the disciplines. They don't need resources as much as they need time. I've been holding conversations and preliminary discussions with each college to discuss potential clusters and centers that are unique and regionally relevant, and I'm just going to list them by college because I think they show the breadth of opportunity that we have here: advanced technology for instruction in the College of Education. They made a major hire recently who is an expert in advanced technology and education, Dr. Yanghee Kim, who will be filling the Morgridge Chair in the college. Advanced manufacturing and biomedical engineering in CEET; aging and community in HHS; data sciences; water in a changing world and restoration of damaged ecosystems in CLAS; environmental policy and law; and data visualization in College of Visual and Performing Arts. That last one has already started taking off with a joint position we're sharing with Argonne on data visualization. The graduate students are responding strongly and I have high expectations for research coming out of that area as well. I think these are responsive to the vision and the strategic emphasis on our SWOT analysis and all clusters and centers, in addition to potentially new targeted centers and clusters, would support the humanistic and artistic interpretation of our changing world. What I mean is there would be an opportunity for scholars in the humanities and artistry to join existing clusters and start helping us with that emphasis. So some closing comments, just a reminder that scholarship is a vital and essential aspect of our interconnected mission and competitiveness. We need to strategically focus on opportunities and obligations presented by our changing world. We've developed a deliberate set of tactics moving forward, highlighted but not limited to these new degrees and scholarly programs and I have to say further development of the plan is required and investment will be needed. So those are my comments and I'm happy to engage in discussion because as I said we need to sharpen this and we need to further develop it both with the board and with our faculty.

Trustee Barsema asked, so over what period of time do you operationalize this plan?

VP Blazey responded, both the main tactics that we're pursuing, the doctoral degrees and the clusters, are in the president's goals and we believe that we should have the process completed this year and actually start with new programs in the next academic year. Then I see it as a continual process. As I said, each one of these will bump us up about 5% and we just need to set a goal. If we say 25% is the right goal, I would say it's three to four years because we need to see return on our investment and it takes time because recruitment, people have to get their programs established, apply for external funding, write those three year books. As you heard, Aaron took six years, which is not unusual. This is a decade type thing where you are deliberate and adding programs deliberately every year as you go. But to get it going, and earnestly I would say we could get it started in the next academic year. I would invite President Freeman to comment on that.

President Freeman added, depending on which clusters we begin with the time scale is slightly different whether the faculty champion is already here or whether we're hiring in. I think when you look at the doctoral programs you could say the same thing. We know what time it takes from someone having a thought to getting IBHE approval for a program, but you can start offering courses, you can create stackable certificates in emphasis areas. There are things you can do to position yourself to succeed, and

as Jerry said, with Computer Science and Engineering as our two initial targets, we've done a lot of the ground work. A lot of the pieces are in place and advancing them is part bringing things together as well. For Biomedical Engineering we have the right champion in our new dean and that's just one example, I don't want anyone here to think that that's what I'm advocating for above everything else, but I think the challenge is because the metrics are going to vary a little by discipline and we haven't quite picked the programs yet. Once we are little further along we'll have to come back and say to the board "this is how we're showing evidence that we did exactly what we said we were going to do," and that's why I created for my goals that sort of glossary notes appendix as a living document whereas we're picking our paths forward. We can update what the metrics are for a particular path. You know the growing external funding is a three/four year down the road goal, but we want to make sure just as we continue to report our funding every year, that we're actually looking at real metrics and gauge for what we said we were going to do in terms of our investment and build strategy and I expect you guys to help keep us honest on that.

Trustee Boey asked, give me a hint in terms of the dollar amount, what do you think we would need annually to start this program?

VP Blazey responded, so I've intentionally given you sort of a menu. It depends on how many clusters and centers and doctoral degrees we would like to start and I think a reasonable number in the STEM fields would be a half a million a year for each one of those and it would be significantly less in the Humanities and in the Arts probably less than a hundred or so. Very rough figures. So the proposition I'm putting forward is I think we can get ourselves a 5% increase for every \$500,000 we put forward, if you really want to distill it to a single statement; but, there's all sorts of caveats with that.

Trustee Coleman asked, is that a combination of public, private investments that we're talking about?

VP Blazey responded, so this is the total that's needed. I didn't want to get ahead of the board. Yes, it could be in some of the disciplines, and we are having discussion that could lead to that, but that's just the total.

Chair Butler added, I just want to offer my gratitude for the progress you're making here from the early SWOT analysis effort. Dennis and I met with you when we were transitioning this committee. The conversation we had is now on the board, so to speak, and to me. It reminds me how a university's research and artistry agenda can drive a university's overall value proposition. What strikes me about this is, I think, we are super-charged right now with academic leadership. This may be the unique leverage we have as an institution in comparison to other institutions. If you think about the relationship between Dr. Freeman and her evolution as the former Vice President of Research to the Provost to the Acting President; your [Dr. Blazey's] background and experience in public policy and Washington, and the long standing leadership of our Provost over so many of the departments that figure so prominently in the work you have envisioned here, there's a chance here to capitalize on our leadership composition to really strike a unique strategy that could, for a long time, allow us to persist in our status as a "higher research" Carnegie university, and I think that this is exactly what we need to do and I like the focus. It makes sense to me. Have you thought about and talked about how we can integrate it into the university's effort to communicate externally our value proposition?

VP Blazey responded, at some level we have begun that. I do have a not insignificant share of some of the communications expertise, and we've started to, at least for the faculty, highlight positive things that our faculty are doing and also on our RIPS webpage highlighting some of these activities because we

know that people do click on research and they're trying to find things, they note things that interest them. I think that it will be one of our tasks to more thoroughly integrate this into enrollment management and communications. So we've taken baby steps, but again I didn't think I wanted to get ahead of the board on any of this. We have started thinking about it but there's more work to be done.

Chair Butler added, so you have a set of presidential goals the board has endorsed, have the presentation you gave us today, and not any significant pushback that I can see, so I hope it's clear that we support the direction that you're headed in. I hope it's clear to the President and to you and to the Provost that you have the board's support for this direction.

VP Blazey responded, I appreciate that and that makes the way forward much easier and I appreciate the support.

Trustee Struthers added, I obviously appreciate the direction and strategy as well. It just seems intuitive that there would be a proforma of some kind, maybe a conservative or most likely an aggressive strategy with the investment and the expected return. Not to lock somebody in, but to give some expectation, whether that is laid over the existing platform of "here's history and here's what we might think going forward," or a separate proforma that's purely focused on the expansionary activities just to set that stage.

VP Blazey responded, I tried to give you a sense of what that would look like and I'd be pleased to make it more substantive.

Trustee Struthers responded, thank you.

Trustee Barsema added, I don't mean to sound like a broken record here, but at the risk of doing that I would just encourage us not to lose sight on an ideation and innovation – whatever we want to call it – an incubator lab here on campus. It's going to take dollars and it's going to take resources. I would just encourage us as a university and administration to not lose focus on that. I do think that that's important to the total solution relative to research for the university.

VP Blazey responded, I didn't mean to slight that. I said early in my talk that we need resources to do that. I think that, as we go about socializing and refining these emphases, it will be much easier for us to engage outside institutions and donors and people with other interests in those areas where we could pursue innovation. I just want to update you on the innovation center: we are now actually discussing terms with Discover Financial and thinking about how we can leverage that relationship to get the space down there and to be in a condition where it could be our location to have those activities.

OTHER MATTERS

No other matters were discussed.

NEXT MEETING DATE

None given.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Butler called for a motion to adjourn. Trustee Wasowicz so moved and Trustee Boey seconded. The motion was approved. Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Before break, adjourned 2:05. After break resumed at 2:30 p.m. adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Craddock
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.