

Minutes of the
NIU Board of Trustees
Research and Innovation, Legal and Legislative Affairs
COMMITTEE MEETING
August 16, 2018

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 10:50 a.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 Dennis Barsema, Nathan Hays, Robert Pritchard, Timothy Struthers, Eric Wasowicz, Board Chair Wheeler Coleman and Committee Chair John Butler. Also present were Acting President Dr. Lisa Freeman, Vice President for Research and Innovation Partnerships, Gerald Blazey, Acting Vice President and General Counsel, and Board Parliamentarian, Gregory Brady, and UAC Representative Theresa Arado.

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 Coleman so moved and Trustee Barsema seconded. The motion was approved.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Butler asked for a motion to approve the minutes of February 15, 2018. Trustee Barsema so moved and Trustee Barsema seconded. The motion passed.

CHAIR'S COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Butler recognized the members of the University Advisory Committee. Professor Therese Arado said that she did not have any comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Board Parliamentarian Brady indicated that there is no request for public comment.

UNIVERSITY RECOMMENDATIONS

Action Item 7.a. – Delegation of Authority for Intellectual Property Litigation

Dr. Blazey began, we have one action item this morning, and it involves delegation of authority for intellectual property litigation. The Office of Innovation and the Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships has responsibility for establishing and protecting university-owned intellectual property and, with respect to inventions, on behalf of the university, processes nondisclosure agreements, initiates or accepts invention patents, and negotiates and collects royalties and fees. Unfortunately, occasionally the party to a royalty or licensing agreement fails to meet contractual obligations and typically we try to solve these breaches of contract through communications, and if appropriate, re-negotiation of terms. Unfortunately, such good faith actions at times are ineffective and leaves litigation as a final remedy. We've recently encountered such a situation with a firm that has failed to provide required sales reports or paid the sales-based fees for the third year now. The lost revenue is estimated between \$50,000 and \$100,000. I've concluded that litigation seems to be the remaining remedy; however, the authority to pursue legal action rests with the Board of Trustees. Rather than request authority on a case-by-case basis, we believe the Board should consider delegating authority to litigate all IP matters to the President

of the University. The option to quickly and efficiently move to litigation when warranted will strengthen the University's ability to protect IP and perhaps, most importantly, discourage future abuse of University IP. So, the University makes the following recommendation: To ensure a complete and effective set of tools to protect IP, the University requests that the Board of Trustees delegate authority to litigate intellectual properties' matters to the President. If approved, this delegation of authority would be documented in an amendment to section 7, subsection E of the Regulations of the Board of Trustees which you have before you in your package and on the screen. This text was provided in collaboration with General Counsel. Should the RILLA Committee endorse this request, the President will forward it by means of the President's Report to the Board of Trustees for approval at its meeting on September 13, 2018.

Chair Butler thanked Dr. Blazey and asked the Board to begin with a motion and a second.

Trustee Coleman so moved.

Trustee Barsema seconded the motion.

Chair Butler stated, this is the first output of efforts by myself and the General Counsel in cooperation with Dr. Blazey, in this case, to begin a process of amending the Board Bylaws and the Board Regulations. This was an important item for the Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships, and so we thought we could bring it forward in this Committee before we had a larger outline of all the changes that we were seeking to make over the course of the next year. I would appreciate your full engagement on this. We can make changes if we need to here. I'm looking forward to any dialog or input that you have. Trustee Coleman, you had a comment?

I've got several comments, Coleman answered. First, Agenda Item 7.a. on the Agenda is listed as an Action Item which I'm assuming is the intent, but on the actual document on page 16, it's listed as Informational. I'm assuming that's just minor and we don't have to make any adjustments.

Mr. Brady answered, no change needed as the action on the Agenda is what controls, and the fact that the Agenda has it on there, we can act on it.

Coleman responded that just for the record, it's listed as Informational, and it should be Action. Are we voting on amending the Bylaws, or are we just voting on the delegation component?

Trustee Butler responded, we would be adding the highlighted provision to the Board Regulations, Section 7, Subsection E, of the Regulations of the Board.

Trustee Coleman inquired, does that require multiple readings or how does that work?

Mr. Brady replied that, before the committee it does not require multiple readings, but before the full Board, the rules say "The regulations may be amended at any regular meeting of the Board by majority votes, provided that Notice of The Intention to Amend the Regulation shall have been presented in writing at least three days preceding that meeting. Such notice shall be provided so far as possible to the exact wording of the Amendment proposed." And so, the posting will have to be three days ahead of the full Board meeting.

Trustee Coleman responded, I need clarification on the intent. The intent is to modify the wording within the Bylaws or within the proceedings here. Are we also trying to give the authority to the President or to the appropriate leader immediately to start acting as they see necessary?

Chair Butler responded, yes, this would be a delegation of authority in the specific instance of initiating litigation in the case of a matter related to Research and Innovation Partnerships.

Trustee Barsema inquired, intellectual property only?

Chair Butler confirmed yes, it will be reserved to intellectual property and that would be regardless of the amount of the litigation. Right now, the Board is the only entity that can initiate litigation other than the provision, I believe, that's already in there related to claims and collection matters.

Mr. Brady responded, yes, adding that the current authority includes collections and evictions.

Trustee Coleman asked if we're okay with the timing? Because we're not going to approve it in our special meeting, we're going to approve this in our next regular meeting?

Chair Butler responded, yes. We'll be able to post it as clearly as it appears today, three days in advance.

Mr. Brady added, if you notice what I read, it must be at a regular meeting. We couldn't do it at a special meeting.

Trustee Coleman clarified, not at a special meeting, it must be regular. Thank you.

Trustee Barsema questioned, the previous Section VII, Subsection E, number 1, which seems to pertain to tenants, has a benchmark of \$250,000 that's delegated to the President before it needs to come to the Board. Was there any discussion on the new language relative to the anticipated size of the cost of litigation and if it's expected to go above a certain amount that it needs to come to the Board? My concern is, going forward, as I look out 20 years, as we just had a lease, right? Do we get a certain situation where somebody just spent a million dollars litigating a case that, you know, we wind up losing, and the Board had no vision on it?

Chair Butler continued, this would provide the Board a vision to it because it requires that the president or the designee notify the Board at the point of initiation. There's also this Committee which has a legal affairs mandate. That could be a vehicle for informing the Board as well as obviously all the other means that we have; but, as this is presented here, this would permit the president to initiate litigation on intellectual property matters regardless of the amount, but once they have done so, they would have to inform the Board of that, and the Board could exercise its judgement and offer its council.

Trustee Barsema commented, on this litigation, we state that we think we have not received payments of \$50-100,000, that we haven't received because they haven't given us the sales reports by which we apply a commission or a percentage to and so forth. How much is it going to cost to litigate something like this? And at the end of the day, are the only ones who are going to make money are going to be the lawyers?

Dr. Blazey replied, I'm sure you are aware it's a cost benefit analysis. We would certainly begin any litigation in-house to keep the costs to the University as low as possible.

Trustee Barsema asked, is this going to be litigated by outside counsel or in-house counsel?

Dr. Blazey replied, in this instance, we haven't yet decided. I think that Mr. Brady and I would discuss the best way to proceed. I think we would attempt to do it in-house if we had the correct IP expertise. IP tends to be a boutique matter of law, and so we may or may not have to go outside. At that point, we would, of course, compare the benefit with the potential cost.

Trustee Barsema continued, and we're comfortable that we have exhausted all paths to a negotiation with the company themselves?

Dr. Blazey responded, yes, in this instance. We're running into our third year now, and there's just been no coherent response from the business and the leadership of the business. I think we have caught their attention of late, and I hope that this will help us with that.

Trustee Barsema thanked Dr. Blazey.

President Freeman added, I would point out, too, that right now no official of the University other than the Board can write a credible letter, posing litigation as a last resort as a negotiation strategy. It would require full Board action to do that, and that's a disadvantage in negotiations.

Dr. Blazey added, President Freeman hit the nail right on the head. The fact that we must go through a long, extended process puts us in an uncompetitive stance.

Trustee Coleman added, I do have one other question. What about an arbitrator? Do we have clauses in some of our contracts that say...

Dr. Blazey replied, I will be the first to admit that our contracts related to IP are a bit toothless and one outcome of this experience is we're taking a hard look, and we're putting in clauses about 30 days - failure to respond in 30 days - arbitration clauses. The answer is no; the intent is yes.

Trustee Coleman thanked Dr. Blazey.

Chair Butler asked are there any other questions? Comments about the item? Of course, this will come before the Board at its regular meeting, so there will be more opportunity if the members of the committee wish to discuss it at the Board level. So, may I then ask for a vote? All those in favor?

Chair Butler announced that the item was approved.

UNIVERSITY REPORTS

Dr. Blazey began by saying we have four Information Items. Before we get to the items that are on the agenda, I just wanted to mention that, just this morning, with respect to our partnership with Discover Financial, we settled on a grand opening date. Karinne Bredberg sent me the e-mail during our meeting. It will be October 3rd in the afternoon. We will send a hold date to the Board, and we have started planning the event within RIPS.

Information Item 8.a. – State Legislative Update

Dr. Blazey introduced Dr. Matt Streb to discuss the state report.

Dr. Streb began, the Trustees may remember that, in the past, we've had a contract lobbyist who has represented us in Springfield. Last year, President Freeman and I sat down and talked about that model going forward and didn't think that was the most effective use of our University resources. And so, we

decided that we would hire a Springfield-based state legislative liaison. I'm happy to report that, on July 1st, Jenna Mitchell started with us as our Springfield-based Legislative Liaison. Jenna had several years on the Republican Senate staff. Several of the bills that Governor Rauner is signing into law right now, Jenna had a huge involvement in writing. She worked with Trustee Pritchard on the Higher Education Working Group. She has brought incredible energy, enthusiasm, and insight already in just a short period of time that we've had her onboard. I'm thrilled to have her here. Super excited to work with her on the NIU caucus and a variety of other things that we have going forward. Since she is in Springfield, normally I will still give the state legislative report, but we thought it was important for her to come up here, this being her first Trustee's meeting since she's been hired, to come up and meet the Board and to give our legislative report. I will ask Jenna to come up to the microphone.

Ms. Mitchell began, I'm excited to be here, very excited to join NIU this past July. There is a very detailed report in your Board packet. So, I'm just going to do a high-level overview and then open it up for any questions that you might have. The past legislative session there was a heightened focus on higher education in Springfield, which, after two years of the budget impasse, leaves us cautiously optimistic about the future. There was an increased investment in higher education this year. Northern received a little over \$1.5 million increase in their state appropriations for operations, and there is also a new program that was awarded \$25 million for all the public universities to create their own merit-based scholarship program. That's a state-matching program that the Governor is going to sign into law on Tuesday. We do not yet know what piece of that will come to NIU, but that's something that Rebecca Babel and I are working on. The Student Assistance Commission will be administering the program. This past session, we also saw a few other bills that we've had a close watch on, such as the nursing degree expansion bill, which did not pass but is likely to resurface. The Ban the Box bill was also something that came up this past session. It did not pass but is something that is recurring. Over the summer, we have been involved with one committee so far based on supplier diversity, and increasing the University's attainment of goals in terms of supplier diversity and who we're contracting with. I think that's something that all the universities are working on collaboratively to try and increase that participation but also work with the state on how they can help us reach those goals. There is a lot of regulatory tape that kind of gets in the way of allowing us to perform our best. That's one of the legislative priorities, to work with the legislature and all the other public universities going forward in the next year. That's been something that has been front and center this entire summer. There is a Senate hearing in two weeks which is not in the packet because it was scheduled prior to this being put together, but it will be on the Discovery Partners Institute, DPI, with the University of Illinois, and I think that Dr. Blazey will speak to that a little bit later. Also, I would like to add that all the Higher Education Working Group information in here that was sent to the Governor's desk is going to, or has been, signed. So, that's an update from the materials before you. Going forward, Matt and I are working very closely on developing a legislative agenda for this next session and for fiscal year '20, also working with Sarah's team. There is a funding formula group going on right now with the Board of Higher Education. There's just a lot of focus on higher education in Springfield right now. I think that November has a chance to change a lot of things, and so looking forward to veto session and what will happen this next session, I think it depends on what happens in the coming months. And I think that we'll be prepared with our agenda, either way that ends up going. And now, I will open it up for questions.

Trustee Struthers asked, on the topic we talked about in the enrollment segment of our meeting concerning out migration of Illinois high school graduates - does that have an appropriate level of attention in Springfield?

Ms. Mitchell answered, I think it does, but I think that there are still a lot of details that need to be figured out on how to address that situation. There's currently a bill that will be signed into law on Tuesday that creates a task force to get into Illinois high schools and collect data on college interests, interests of studies, and where students intend to go, which will allow for universities to have more ability to direct market to Illinois high school students. That's the first step we've seen legislatively. But outmigration is of significant interest in Springfield and the fact that there are a lot of Illinois students that don't leave. They just don't go anywhere. That's something that's very well-understood, I think.

Trustee Struthers continued, and when they leave, they often stay in the states where they're at for employment as well. It's a huge deal. I just hope that, typical of government, that they would study it to death. The trends are extremely conspicuous of what's going on, and it's very profound in just the absolute numbers, right? So, whatever we can do to encourage that and study it all day long, but it's economics to a large degree, for sure. And we need to give the incentive to economically have the kids come and stay in Illinois.

Trustee Herrero asked, related to that question, I'm just reading a little bit on your HB5020. It passed overwhelmingly, right?

Ms. Mitchell replied, yes.

Trustee Herrero continued, and now it's with the governor. Was there any concern that this might impact or exacerbate that problem of exporting students? Because if MAP grants, depending on how much money is available, maybe I don't just know enough about how large that pot is right now, if you first served the returning students, then there's little left probably for new students?

Ms. Mitchell answered, yes for incoming. The program is wildly underfunded, and NIU benefits greatly from that funding. So, I think that that's a priority for increased funding for MAP to fund more awards, but it was intended to keep students in Illinois because of the ability for them to predict their costs, returning students. But that is an unintended consequence. Currently, about 95% of MAP awards are returning students. And I think there will be funding that's left over for freshman. I think that it's been calculated that about \$220 million of the pot, for returning students, and it's also only for Illinois public universities. So, the community colleges, the private institutions, and the for-profit institutions that benefit from MAP funding will not – those returning students do not receive priority. It's solely focused on public institutions.

Trustee Pritchard said, I would just add, part of the purpose of that bill was the facade where you could promote the fact that you had – call it 'assurance' – a four-year MAP funding, and that might help with the recruitment of certain students and retention of certain students.

Ms. Mitchell added, in the sense of affordability.

Trustee Pritchard continued, it wasn't as much financial impact as it was the ability to promote and position this to bring some assurance to the cost of attending Northern or any other public university.

Trustee Herrero added, it just sounds like it doesn't change very much.

Ms. Mitchell responded, not much.

Trustee Barsema asked, can you share with us a little bit more about your background, where you went to school, what you studied, why you wanted to get into this space, and why you came to NIU?

Ms. Mitchell responded, I studied political science at Eastern Illinois University with a minor in communication, and went to Springfield immediately after graduation with the University of Illinois legislative staff internship program. There, I was assigned to the Senate Republican staff on their appropriation staff, and beginning in January of 2015, I started staffing elementary, secondary, and higher education funding. I had the experience of the budget impasse and it was very interesting based on my two assignments because one sector was receiving a full budget that was increased each year and the higher education was not funded at all and went through the whole K-12 funding reform, with Trustee Pritchard, and then I had time with the Higher Ed Working Group this past year, and I think that the budget impasse just really drew me back to higher ed. I was very involved when I was an undergrad, and I just think there's a lot of space for advocacy for higher education in Springfield, especially with Northern and its credentials. And it's, you know, a gem that the State does not invest in, and I think that there's an opportunity to really make a presence in Springfield for the University.

Trustee Wasowicz asked, do you feel that Springfield does understand the severity of the problem, even with the students leaving the state? Sol enlightened us earlier here about how many students leave when they get a job offer and if they're in Tennessee or Texas or Florida. I mean it's obvious what you're going to do. Not only are you out of the state already and then you look at how much more money you can make because you don't pay the tax on it.

Ms. Mitchell added, Right. And it's the best and brightest that leave and stay in other states. I think that there is still a lot of education that still needs to happen, the severity of rebuilding Illinois' higher education system, but I do think that there's some optimism on the focus that higher education is receiving now in Springfield. I think over time within the next few sessions, there will be an increased understanding and productive action taken, but we also need to be at the table for that to make sure it's action that's beneficial to the University, guide and educate through that process. I think it's up to the universities to tell the story.

Matt Streb added, Trustee Wasowicz, to address you and Trustee Struthers as well, when we were going through the budget crisis, it was extremely difficult to get more than a handful of legislators to understand the impact that this was having on higher education. Higher education was not part of the conversation at all. When the budget went through and passed and was overridden, now suddenly, people looked and said, "Oh my goodness! Look at all these people going out of state. We've got to fix this problem." And now that became a huge issue. To the point where, it's wonderful that we got to be focused on keeping students in state. That's huge and that must be addressed, but now we're trying to bring the legislators back a little bit though to say, "Okay, but hold on a second. We're losing all these people out of state. That has to be addressed; there's no doubt about it." But to go to Sol's point, we have 1,000 students that are sitting right here in the state of Illinois who do not come to NIU and do not go anywhere, and we need to get them focused on that type of issue as well. I think to answer your question earlier, Trustee Struthers, absolutely they are concerned about this. And I think Jenna's right that higher education, I think, will become a bigger issue in the future because of it.

Trustee Wasowicz asked, Jenna, I was talking with Senator Rooney the other day, and he's very jealous that we got you. So, that's a big compliment, I would say.

Ms. Mitchell responded, thank you.

Chair Butler said, well, thank you very much. I want to add that I was very pleased to learn about the search and the outcome that has led you to us today. I've been long wanting to see state relations return to the Board as an important subject. It was interesting to me, as I was researching some of the prior Board decisions regarding the presidency, I was reading the minutes of prior Board meetings, regular Board meetings, not even the committee where state relations reported but regular Board meetings, and the subject of state relations, and what pieces of legislation were in play, and what was the situation with respect to the budget, was a much more prominent and significant subject of Board discussion and dialog than it has been over the years with this Board. And, I would really like to bring that back. I'm very pleased that Trustee Pritchard has agreed to be the vice chair of this committee because he will help us bring all of that back into the Board so that we can learn what we need to learn, also let you do your job without us getting in the way, but also learn what we need to learn so that we can be literate about state relations. I would also note, concerning the supplier diversity matter, the committee that's referenced in your report was a heated discussion, I believe.

Ms. Mitchell responded, it was.

Chair Butler added, and so, I wish you luck as we sift through that and hopefully can articulate our earnest interest in the goals of that body as well.

President Freeman added, Trustee Butler, if I can just point out that at the supplier diversity hearing, Jenna was invaluable, but Antoinette Bridges from Procurement also helped me prepare testimony. I want to make sure that she's recognized for the tremendous work she did to represent NIU.

Trustee Butler responded, great, is she here today?

President Freeman responded, she's not.

Trustee Butler added, ok, we'll have that in the minutes, and we appreciate everybody's work in that regard. Obviously, it's very important for the University to represent itself as best it can. On that note, we have information item 8.b.

Dr. Blazey added, before we move on, I'll pile on and welcome Jenna to the University. Jenna and our next speaker have already started working on a coherent state and federal strategy. I think that is important and is a great opportunity for us.

Information Item 8.b. – Federal Relations Report

Dr. Blazey introduced Dr. Anna Quider to give her yearly federal update. And, Anna, if you would say a few words about yourself, that would be great.

Dr. Quider began, thank you for having me here today. I'm Anna Quider, our Director of Federal Relations, and I run our Washington, D.C. office. It's a real treat to be here with you in person today because usually I'm on the phone or on a screen. For our new trustees, Trustee Butler has asked me to give a brief overview of my background. I've been at NIU for four years, starting in July of 2014. Prior to that, I was a Fellow at the U.S. Department of State where I worked on international scientific diplomacy issues and managed a program that operated in 54 countries on technology transfer. Prior to that, I was a Fellow in the office of Congressman Russ Carnahan in the House of Representatives, where

I handled education, science, technology, and a little bit of commercialization for him. Relatively unique about me in the field of higher education government affairs representatives is that I have a Ph.D. in astrophysics. To my knowledge, there are only four other university representatives in the country at the federal level who have Ph.D.'s in science. Two of my colleagues work for MIT, one works for Vanderbilt, and one works for the University of Chicago. I feel that that background allows me to understand what it's like to be a research student because I have participated in federally-funded undergraduate research programs. I feel I know what it's like to be a faculty member, having considered that path and gone through the professional research route for a time. Thank you so much for having me and welcome to the new trustees as well. I will highlight in my remarks today opportunities in the past year where I've worked with a couple of you on engaging our Congressional delegation. I would just say that I welcome all of you to reach out to me if there's anything that I can do or any questions that you have and if you have interest in working with me more on our Federal Relations agenda. Today I'll provide a brief overview of the Office of Federal Relations activities from the past year, and I'll provide a brief update on current Federal Relations issues.

Outlined here are the types and frequency of activities that the Office of Federal Relations has led or facilitated this past year. This data along with more detail is included in the Federal Relations quarterly report and appendix. For purposes of this talk, I'm going to pull out a few illustrative highlights to discuss in more detail today. In March of 2018, NIU hosted a reception on Capitol Hill. This is the first Congressional reception that we've held in the time that I've been with the University. This event was done in partnership with the Office of Federal Relations, the Alumni Association, and the Foundation, was timed to align with the political science department, students' spring break trip to Washington, D.C. The trip brought 16 NIU students, to D.C. for a week. I'm highlighting this event today because it unites the numerous facets of Federal Relations service to the University, and that includes policy advocacy, relationship building with congress and our federal agencies, student engagement, alumni engagement, and visibility raising for NIU and our research enterprise. The reception convened over 80 attendees, including pictured here NIU alumna Congresswoman Robin Kelly, and NIU alumnus Congressman John Bacon from Nebraska, and those two members, as well as Senator Duckworth who's also an NIU alum, publicly were our honorary cohosts for the event. Other federal stakeholders in attendance at the event were staff from the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the National Academy of Sciences, and numerous Congressional offices. The Office of Federal Relations sponsored the attendance of five federally-funded NIU faculty researchers who before the reception participated in meetings with federal agencies or on Capitol Hill regarding their research, and then at the reception, they showcased a poster on their federally-funded research to inform the participants. The faculty spanned three colleges and represented the departments of physics, history, electrical engineering, special and early education, and educational technology, research, and assessment. Pictured here are four of our faculty members meeting with Congressman Randy Hultgren, which happened earlier in the day on the reception day. This was a marquee event that we intend to replicate. It was a busy 2017 and start to 2018 at the federal level. All the topics listed here are ongoing issues that NIU is engaging on. I'll do a quick run through to update you on these major issues. First issue, regarding higher education policy and funding, the Higher Education Act is the marquee piece of legislation that governs higher education policy in Congress. That law has not been reauthorized in nearly a decade at this point. There were movements to reauthorize it in the House and the Senate this year, but unfortunately, it looks like it's not going to happen this year. The Department of Education on the agency side is considering numerous regulatory changes, but they've announced that they will not be acting on those until 2019. We still have time to consider. Early signs are that we can expect flat funding for our federal student aid priorities for fiscal year 2019. That includes Pell grants as well as many other

programs. Next point, regarding research, policy, and funding, fiscal year 2018 which we are currently in for the federal level was excellent for research appropriations. It was the single largest year-on-year increase in regular appropriations for research in 17 years. Some of the agencies that we work most closely with saw double-digit increases percentagewise in their budgets from last fiscal year to this fiscal year. Early signs are that we can expect flat-to-modest increases in research budgets for fiscal year 2019. Immigration is another big issue on the national stage.

A big piece that NIU has been engaged on is the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. That program is still making its way through the courts so there isn't final resolution on the status of that program yet. We are also closely monitoring student and high-skilled employment immigration policy to see if there's any changes to the regulations or law in that area. And finally, regarding tax reform, that bill passed at the end of 2017, and the final bill retained numerous provisions that maintain the accessibility and affordability of higher education. On that point, I would like to do a bit of a deeper dive on the tax reform issue because I think it really illustrates the comprehensive way that Federal Relations is engaging on a complex issue such as this. Illinois was especially instrumental in maintaining the tax-free status of tuition waivers for graduate students.

And here listed are the provisions that NIU contributed to retaining in the final law. To preserve these various provisions, NIU deployed a multipronged approach to engage our Congressional Delegation. That included collaborating with the University of Illinois System, Northwestern University, and the University of Chicago which are the other Illinois institutions that have Washington, D.C. offices. I have their logos pictured here. We also collaborated closely with national associations for higher education, such as the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities and NACUBO, the National Association of College and University Business Officers, and President Freeman was engaged in sending letters to the Congressional delegation. We also had our students involved with the letter to our Congressional delegation from then president of the student association, Rachel Jacob. And finally, we, of course, had numerous meetings with members of Congress and their staff on this issue. Of particularly impactful narrative for this advocacy was that NIU exists at the nexus of high quality education, world-leading research, and educational opportunity for Illinoisans of diverse backgrounds. And, in fact, in the work that we were doing with the University of Illinois System, Northwestern, and the University of Chicago, a particularly resonant fact for our Congressional delegation is that Illinois serves so many students from Illinois. Preserving these provisions in the tax code, really meant helping the students of Illinois through NIU's advocacy. The office of federal relations will look to replicate this multi-pronged approach for other major legislative issues that come up. Moving onto more of the other component of what Federal Relations does is providing enriching opportunities for our students and engaging faculty. I'll talk about faculty in a second.

Working with students is a priority for the Office of Federal Relations, and here I picture a few of the ways that I work with students, everything from working one-on-one with my own student intern every year to supporting programs that we have for students in D.C. and bringing policy experts to campus to meet with our students. So, here are some examples. Pictured here is the student, Daphne Voorhis who through Federal Relations and the OSEEL office came to a policy workshop in Washington, D.C. last year, and that's been a partnership that we've been doing for the past three years. In the center, we have a group of women, science and engineering students, who met on campus with Erin Heath, who is the Associate Director of Government Relations for the American Association for the Advancement of Science. They talked about policy careers and women in STEM issues. On the right here, we have NIU alumnus

Ben Staub, who's a former Office of Federal Relations intern and an NIU sponsored Congressional intern. I'm proud to report that Ben is now working in D.C. for the International Monetary Fund.

Trustee Barsema asked, how do we – I mean I – understand the political science students likely know about these opportunities, but there are students all over our campus who might want to be in D.C. at one point in time doing policy change on environment and what have you. How do we advertise these opportunities campus-wide?

Dr. Quider asked, Matt, do you want to speak a little bit about the changes that have been made to the process for the D.C. Congressional Internship Program?

Matt Streb responded, that's a great question. John Peters set up the Congressional Internship Program back in 2009, and at that time he did it, he needed a place to house the internship program. And it was housed in the political science department. It always has been the intent that it's open to all students, no matter what their discipline, and we have sent many students to D.C. that were not political science majors in the past. This past year, though, to make sure that we were really reaching even more students, we've now had Cathy Doederlein who many of you know is our Supportive Professional Staff Council president, she's overseeing the program. We advertise in a variety of different ways, and we've essentially changed the academic requirements right before it was really something that was helpful to political science students, it was not necessarily something that was helpful for a finance student for instance or whatever. Now, we've changed the academic requirements to make it much easier for students outside of political science to engage in the program. Marilyn Chakkalamuri who is one of our interns right now, for instance, is a biology major. The biology department was wonderful working with her to help her get appropriate credits so she could have the experience but also help her move towards graduation.

For the Spring Break trip to Washington, D.C. for the past couple of years, the Office of Federal Relations has sponsored one or two students who are majoring in a STEM discipline on a STEM policy scholarship to attend that week. On the faculty front, Federal Relations seeks to support faculty in their interactions with the federal government through the variety of ways listed here. So, here I have a few recent examples. Pictured on the left is Congressman Adam Kinzinger's visit to campus last month where he heard from Trustee Pritchard, Provost McCord, Vice President Blazey, and faculty and students about our new Shimadzu Laboratory and the importance of federally- supported national laboratories for faculty and student research. Thank you very much, Trustee Pritchard, for hosting the Congressman. In the center, we have NIU Professor Noel Ysasi, speaking with Congressman Dan Lipinski. In May of this year, Professor Ysasi showcased his research on veterans' mental health at a congressional expo at the invitation of Congressman Bill Foster. He also held meetings with congressional staff to discuss his research and the Veterans Administration. And then pictured on the right is Professor Holly Jones, showcasing her federally-funded research at a congressional reception in May. Professor Jones also attended meetings with congressional staff as part of a national delegation that included faculty from Princeton University, MIT, and other top research universities. She attributed this trip with opening new opportunities for her with National Geographic. I am presently serving as president of the Science Coalition where I lead government affairs colleagues from over 50 top American research universities, and I also serve on the Government Affairs Executive Committee for the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. In these roles, I work with campus to elevate the policy priorities that matter to NIU such as the democratization of science, access to education, and our federal funding priorities. As one example of how those leadership roles came to fruition for NIU, during a very busy day last month in

Washington, through the Science Coalition, Vice President Blazey – and this was all one day – attended a meeting at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy regarding the Trump administration’s science and technology priorities. He participated in a media roundtable regarding the economic returns of federal research, and he awarded the Champion of Science Award to Congressman Bill Foster at a reception attended by over 120 people, including the chief operating officer of the National Science Foundation and the undersecretary for science at the Department of Energy. That was all through the Science Coalition. Looking ahead, next year Federal Relations plans to continue to build on our advocacy and engagement successes while remaining nimble and responsive to the needs of our federal stakeholders and our campus community. I’m also looking forward to a robust working relationship with Ms. Mitchell to coordinate our state and federal policy priorities. As Jenna mentioned, 2018 is an election year so that brings considerable uncertainty to the policy agenda for Congress and the administration. Due to the over 70 retirements that have already been announced, we know that House leadership and key Congressional committees are going to have substantial turnover. Federal Relations is prudently working with our peer institutions in Illinois and our national organizations to prepare for the new Congress. Thank you very much. I’d be happy to take questions.

In terms of your priorities, now you’re a part of Dr. Blazey’s organization, asked Trustee Barsema?

Dr. Quider responded, yes.

Trustee Barsema continued, but in terms of your priorities and setting your priorities for the University, what’s the process? Who do you collaborate with? Jerry and Anna, in terms of what your priorities are going to be for the coming year?

Dr. Quider responded, we run a consultative process where we have a survey that we submit to the senior leadership team of the University to ask them what their funding priorities are, what federal programs or issues are on their radar that we need to be watching. Also, working through the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities, they keep an eye on the big picture of higher education and research-related federal issues. If I hear something that comes up through there, I can then go back to campus and inquire about where this falls in the priorities for the university. Anything else that you’d like to add, Dr. Blazey?

Dr. Blazey continued, I’ll just mention that Anna keeps the conversation up with the colleges. I believe she met with two or three deans just yesterday to understand the priorities at the college level as well. It is an important point. Although, Anna organizationally is in the Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships, we do try to keep an eye on all the interests. As you saw, we keep an eye on immigration and the Higher Education Act as well. We intentionally keep a broad open eye.

President Freeman added, I just want to make a point that it isn’t a complete loop. So, just as Anna sits on Governmental Affairs Committee for Association for Public and Land Grant Universities, for example, I would sit on the Council of Presidents for American Council on Education. Jerry would sit on the Council of Research. The Provost would sit on the Council of Academic Affairs. And so, through those bodies, we feed our priorities to the national organizations, and it’s a two-way conversation.

Trustee Struthers said, I have a question, and it dovetails a little bit on Dennis’ question. I realize it’s not real neatly, tightly compacted, but this idea of how do you define success. It’s not a highly objective thing, but I would be interested to know your priorities. And if you had three things at the end of the

year, if you had to assign a grade -- A, B, C, D -- what impact you had, how would you grade that, and again, more generally stated, how do you define success?

Dr. Quider replied, yes, it is a challenging question to answer because a lot of the work of a government relations professional is helping to prevent bad things from happening. So, you can talk about a lot of the provisions that didn't make it up for a vote that you don't have clear public record on. I would say that there's a few key things. Number one is visibility raising of the university. I think that a long-term goal of mine is to have our faculty and administrators called as a witness for Congress. That is, Congress recognizing our expertise, but for them to get to the point where they can call us, they must be aware of what we do and who we are. So, that's why I focus a lot on these receptions and the meetings and that type of thing, building that visibility crescendo. I think you also can look through tax reform. We did have a tangible, positive return from NIU's advocacy efforts. So, I mentioned briefly that Illinois was important in preserving the tax-free tuition waivers for graduate students. That was something that we worked with colleagues across the country on, but at the end of the day, three of the main public national leaders on that issue were members of the House from Illinois. And so, that's a way that we can say, our conversations, the work of President Freeman, and our students – it really was taken up by our delegation. So, but it's hard to say that for every – you know, members have their own priorities and that type of thing, and sometimes they would prefer to weigh-in behind the scenes, and it's hard to get that public accountability piece. So, do you have anything else to add on that?

Dr. Blazey replied, I would just say that it's a bit of a long game. Anna has already done a terrific job, increasing our presence in Washington, D.C. and both on the Hill and in the Executive Branch. The strategy in the long run is to get our faculty on study groups for the American Academy of Science, for the National Academy of Science in the agencies themselves and to plant our alumni in Washington so that they are becoming thought leaders and they remember us when they're in their offices. And the young man who's at the IMF now is a great example. So, one of the measures that we watch is what we call "touches." How many times have we reached out and had communications with various branches of the federal government, both legislative and executive? And there's the numbers right there. How many times have our students had meaningful engagement? And those directly relate to that long-term goal, increasing our reputation and our presence in Washington.

Trustee Struthers commented, mindful of time but very quickly, the federal sponsorship for funding at the end of the day would surely be a long-game measure of success, right?

Dr. Blazey, yes and we will see some good news on that in the next talk, but by getting our researchers in front of program managers and in front of policymakers, they can see where our expertise lies. And it's not a direct link, but influencing their thinking on where money is well-spent does promote our interests as well. And finally, excuse me - I haven't gone to the trouble of monetizing what it meant for loss to NIU for the loss of those graduate tax break, but I think it would have been large. Hundreds of graduate students would not have been able to afford to pay tuition or come to school.

Anna Quider added, the total cost increased tax burden to our students and families would have been \$14.2 million. On the graduate student piece, I think it was around \$8 million.

President Freeman commented, and for the university, that would be larger because the classes those graduate students teach and would still have to be taught. I also want to say, Trustee Struthers, that, you know, we have a student engagement metric in the presidential goals, and the Office of Federal Relations contributes to that through all the opportunities created for students in Washington. So,

they're part of what we track there, and we can certainly break that out at any time as we develop the tracking system.

Dr. Blazey commented, I would just add that Dr. Quider is also sharing leadership of our national scholarships program, and that is increasing the opportunities for our students to have a presence in Washington and in other communities.

Chair Butler thanked Dr. Quider and asked the Board if there were any other questions for Dr. Quider or any other comments on this information item?

Information Item 8.c. – Sponsored Program Administration Report

Dr. Blazey began, our second annual report for FY '18 will be given by Assistant Vice President Dara Little.

Good morning, began Ms. Little. I know that we are limited on time so I'm going to keep this short with less on details and more to the highlights. We are also still crunching FY '18 data. We will be putting out our annual report in September. That is going to have a lot more information for you, and we'll make sure that you get a copy of that report. Of course, in the meantime, if you do have any questions, we're happy to address them or to provide you with any additional information. This first slide here is just a quick reminder of our funding portfolio, based on activity type and sponsor type. Overall as you can see and as was also noted in the written report that you've received, it was a very good year for NIU. Both total sponsored funding was up as was research funding. Overall total sponsored funding, the other sponsored activities of instruction and research, was up 17% this year over fiscal year 2017. Research funding increased 26% this year over fiscal year 2017. So, very good news there. Given the significant increase in research funding, I'm just going to spend the next few slides, sort of homing in on some of the key takeaways there. Before doing that, I do want to say certainly that SPA congratulates all the faculty who worked very hard over the past year to bring in external funds for all the different types of sponsored programs. So, if there was a key takeaway that I would want you to sort of have this morning, it's that close relationship between NIU's research growth and federal research funding. Despite heavy competition for those funds, it's still critical for maintaining and growing our research portfolio. So, the chart to the left just shows that relationship for you, and you know, shows our ability to secure federal research funding. That also models what Anna was just talking about. The infusion of R&D funds at the federal level for FY '18, and it also maps onto federal R&D spending since 2016 that it has been increasing after years of either flat or declining budgets. You may be wondering in FY '15 why there was a little bit bigger gap between our total research funding and what was provided by the feds. That year, we did have more funding from the state of Illinois. Every three to five years, we get a state research contract that is fairly large. We expect that something like that comes around every few years.

What isn't federally funded is a mix of corporate nonprofit and foreign funding. It's fairly small. The ratio between those three may change in any given year. Off to the right is just a breakout of those federal agencies that are very important to our research funding portfolio. Again, no real surprises there. This is fairly constant from year to year. The ranking order may change a little bit, but certainly, the National Science Foundation is always a very big agency for us, being a non-med school and just their broad disciplinary reach. So, the highlights for research funding this year, as I mentioned, we're up 26% over last year. This was the highest level of research funding since fiscal year 2015. We had a big funding year then because faculty who were hired a few years before that really started to hit on their grants. As a reminder, you know, new faculty it can often take a few years for them to receive their first award.

Federal research awards are also at a ten-year high. Typically, we see federal funds accounting for about 70-85% of our total research funding portfolio. This year, it accounted for 90%. Again, the highest that we've seen in ten years. So, our faculty are doing a very good job of competing for highly competitive funds. And then the STEM fields have traditionally accounted for a large portion of the university's research funds. This is still the case, but this year, we also saw growth across a lot of non-STEM fields here at NIU. For example, Mary Quinlan in the School of Art and Design secured over \$100,000 from the National Science Foundation. So, it's exciting to see the growth across all the different departments, and in those non-STEM departments, that growth was over 50% over last year. We would love to showcase all our faculty's work, but before wrapping up, I want to take a minute or two to highlight some of the funded work from this year that has come out of the initiatives and the strategies that can increase external funding. In the upper left-hand quadrant is targeted hire and donor-supported Morgridge Endowed Chair Dr. Yanghee Kim. She brought an NSF grant with her this year from her previous institution, and that accounted for \$400,000 of research funding this year. Dr. Kim's research is in advanced technology and education, and the little robot next to her is one of the robots that she uses in her work with children. Right below Dr. Kim, an alumnus learned about geographic and atmospheric sciences Professor Dr. Victor Gensini's work with advanced weather forecasting through a *USA Today* piece. That alumnus was able to get MetLife to fund a pilot study to evaluate a long-term research partnership between NIU and MetLife based on Dr. Gensini's work. Coincidentally, Dr. Gensini is also an NIU alumnus. In the upper right-hand corner is the Jones Diedrich Mennie Professor of Finance, Dr. Lei Zhou, who through a federal personnel exchange program served this past year as a visiting scholar to the Securities and Exchange Commission to research the quality and informativeness of credit ratings, and to assess the implications of proposed SEC rules. Not only will Dr. Zhou bring this work back to the classroom, but he's learning firsthand how federal agencies operate by embedding himself within one for a year. And then finally, NIU's proximity to Argonne National Lab provided chemistry faculty, Dr. Tao Xu, access to resources that helped him to compete and secure a prestigious NSF career award that integrates education and research which is certainly a core component of our mission as a student-centered research university. So, again, there's a lot more work that we could highlight, but knowing that we were short on time, we picked these four. And with that, I am happy to take any questions.

Trustee Barsema commented, I'm not even sure how to frame this question. So, if I stumble on it, I'm sorry. But we hold very proudly that we're one of a few public research institutions in the state of Illinois. Who is the body that governs the fact that we are a research university or we're not? Because I know we have a Carnegie standing, and is there a certain level of dollars that we need to bring in every year from a research grant standpoint to retain our research ranking?

Ms. Little responded, what I would say is there's really two bodies that set our establishment as a research university. The Carnegie rankings, as you mentioned, but then there's also the Higher Ed R&D rankings. That is an annual survey that's conducted through the National Science Foundation, but it's not specific to NSF funding to measure the R&D expenditures of higher education. That is, both sponsored funding, that is, sponsored research, but it's also what the institution spends to support research so, institutional dollars. Those Higher Ed R&D, or HERD for short, rankings feed into the Carnegie rankings or the Carnegie classification.

Dr. Blazey added, I can extend that a little, having spent a little time studying the Carnegie rankings. It is no longer done by the Carnegie Institute. It is now an independent center at the University of Indiana, and they're carrying on with the calculations. They have become quite sophisticated. Dara's right about that. There's sort of an informal ranking that comes from the HERD survey where every university just

submits its reckoning of how much they've spent on science and engineering, and then that is sort of an informal ranking where you can get a quick look at how you rank with your peers. That feeds into this Carnegie ranking. It's probably the most important variable in the Carnegie ranking, but other important variables are the number of STEM degrees. So, the two highest, most important variables are science and engineering expenditures and STEM degrees. But it doesn't stop there. Another important variable is non-STEM degrees, education degrees, pretty much all terminal degrees in all the disciplines. That's like four classifications, and then the final really important variable is research expenditures not in science and engineering. So, those are all taken, and they run it through a pretty complicated analysis and then come up with three divisions, research highest, research high, and research doctoral universities. And roughly speaking, the research highest is any university with over, let's say, \$100 million in research expenditures. Research high is \$20 million to \$100 million, and research doctoral universities are anybody below \$20 million. We are sitting at \$30 million. We are high on the number of degrees we award. We are pushed into the middle of the – it's called the R2, research highest ranking.

Trustee Barsema continued, So, the second part of my question, the level of research grants and funding that we bring in, that feeds into what you just said. If we stay in the \$30 million and above category, then...

Dr. Blazey, and an adequate number of terminal degrees.

Trustee Barsema, and an adequate number of degrees. Okay.

President Freeman commented, I would add that there are universities who pay very close attention to how they report data to the HERD survey because they understand that how they code things has a cascading effect in their research and reputational rank. I represented NIU at a joint meeting of the APLU group that Dr. Blazey would be a member of and the information measurement analysis group where I'm on the executive committee, and there was a very large session devoted to how people are managing the data. I don't want to say manipulating. Managing the data to optimize their rankings.

Trustee Barsema remarked, right, because you could have a lot of fun with numbers.

Dr. Blazey continued, I would like to thank Dara because she took on leadership of our HERD or our R&D task force because it was very clear that we as an institution were not properly accounting for our science and engineering expenditures, and with some help from DOIT and Finance and other units, we now have a way to get the right numbers. We were underreporting by what? 20%? Something like that?

Ms. Little responded, yes something like that.

Dr. Blazey added, and this had a 20-30 position impact on our rankings. So, it's not that the rankings are so important. It's just that we aren't doing ourselves any favors when we're not being diligent. So, thanks for that, Dara.

Trustee Struthers added, just one quick comment. Congratulations. This is awesome, right? To see a chart going up. And then secondly, just peeking into FY 2019, do we expect this bar to be equal to, a little higher, or a little lower?

Ms. Little replied, we would like to see it be at least at this level or higher. There many factors that come into external funding. One factor could be – and again, we're still going through the data to look to see

who has all been funded – when faculty receive their awards, it means that now they’re doing that work. So, they may not receive funding for another couple of years. It could be things at the agency level in terms of geographic distribution of awards. Some of those things are just beyond our control, but I would ask Dr. Blazey to chime in terms of broader initiatives or strategies.

Dr. Blazey added, at some level, those numbers have some built in stability. Most research grants are two to three years long. So, you wouldn’t expect to see any fall off greater than 30% if we had complete failure to renew new grants. The other thing is federal funding is going up and our advocacy in Washington is increasing. That leads to some optimism, but much of this we control. We attract new faculty. We give them the resources and they will succeed. I’m optimistic we’ll do at least as well.

Trustee Barsema commented, it would be interesting to see a graph that shows the recurring grant money as we go out in the years. To your point, most of these grants are multi-year grants. So, in fiscal year ‘19, how much are we guaranteed and how much new needs to come in to achieve growth or at least achieve the same amount? I’d be curious to see that, and that might be a good way to report going forward if that’s possible.

Dr. Blazey added, I was just thinking that, Dennis. We could get that easily.

Ms. Little added, yes, we can get that easily. Dr. Blazey, I’m glad that you mentioned that because I did look, and so out of the \$30 million, \$22 million of that is initial new funding. So, then we would just want to look to see out of that, how much of that is what we call “incremental funding” where we know that that’s going to be a multi-year award. We could probably get to that data.

Trustee Barsema added, that would be great to see. Great job to all.

Information Item 8.d. – New Initiatives

Trustee Butler noted that he asked Dr. Blazey to continue our dialog about the university’s research and innovation strategy and what are we doing to implement that strategy.

Dr. Blazey began, I don’t have any slides, but I thought it might be best to use the podium. In the last quarter, the university has embarked on two initiatives, addressing and consistent with our recently approved vision of research, scholarship, and artistry that is preparing northern Illinois and the nation for a century of change. As discussed at previous meetings of this committee, the emphases for future scholarship are responding to a changing climate, preparing for changing demographics, leading the evolution of technology, and interpreting our changing world. This has proven an excellent guideline for us as we take advantage of opportunities that have arisen, and I’m going to tell you about two of them today. The first, upon my recommendation, the president has approved a new research center that is named CREATE. It’s a long acronym. It stands for Cross Disciplinary Research on Engaging Advanced Technology for Education. I’ll tell you a little bit about it, and then I’ll invite Dean Laurie Elish-Piper to come to the podium to say a few words as well. It will focus on the interface between education and changing technology. It will be housed in the College of Education and led by Dr. Yanghee Kim, who joined NIU last year as the Morgridge Endowed Chair of Teacher Education and Preparation. There’s considerable resources associated with that chair, and she has offered up a Center to use those resources in response to our research vision. The center is responsive to the presidential goal to increase research capacity for research innovation and regional engagement as measured by initiation of at least one research center per year.

This is another reason I have some optimism that we'll see that total research. We're making a pretty significant investment, so we should see an increase. CREATE will develop innovative and transdisciplinary research programs that investigate cutting edge technology to address urgent challenges in education for all learners, not just primary and secondary but learners at any stage of their life. Some of the research strands planned are designing a humanoid robot for facilitating collaboration among young children, developing an intelligent robot system to facilitate teamwork skills among undergraduate students, developing a virtual advisor for underrepresented students in STEM at their community colleges, and providing tablet-based feedback for visually-impaired learners. So, it really is taking technology to the learner in a way that we've not been able to give as much focus in the past. Dr. Kim is not here today to talk about her Center because she's off at a conference in Asia and also tending to some personal matters, but I would invite Dean Laurie Elish-Piper up to say a few words.

Dr. Elish-Piper began, good morning. This Center is extremely exciting, not only because of the content of the work that Yanghee Kim and her team will do but because it's an entirely new approach to thinking about research and to thinking about leveraging resources. As Dr. Blazey mentioned, Dr. Yanghee Kim came in as the Morgridge Endowed Chair of Teacher Education and Preparation. Historically, that position focused on kind of programming. It didn't focus at all on research. When our previous Morgridge Chair retired, we decided to sort of reinvent the position within the guidelines that the donor had provided to really focus on research. Yanghee has only been with us since January, and in that short time, she and her collaborators have submitted \$1.8 million in new grant funding. We're very excited about that. I believe she has four other projects that they're currently working on preparing for submission for external funding. What's also exciting is that it truly is transdisciplinary. Currently, she has five research teams working together. They represent multiple departments, and they span three colleges. The College of Education is the home, but in addition to that, there's strong collaboration with Engineering and Engineering Technology as well as Liberal Arts and Sciences. It's really exciting to see that moving beyond the traditional silos to do innovative kinds of work. Much of the research that Yanghee and her team will be doing will be funded by multiple funding agencies which is also exciting to see that with that collaborative work, that interdisciplinary work that really seems to be appealing to funders at this point because the more complex the problems we try and solve, the more important it is to have people with the different disciplinary expertise and talents coming together to address and try and solve those complex problems. She brings research funding from the National Science Foundation. The most recent applications are also to the National Science Foundation, but they also have grants in preparation for the Institute of Education Sciences, for National Institutes of Health, and for UNICEF. Her work is also international in scope. As Dr. Blazey mentioned, she's in China, preparing to do a keynote presentation on cutting edge technologies in the field of education. We're extremely excited about Yanghee coming on-board, but what we're more excited about is her ability to collaborate and bring people together to really mobilize and to also build expertise. She's doing a great job of mentoring newer faculty or even veteran faculty who haven't really been as engaged in submitting and getting and working on grants and engaging in that kind of high-level research. So, we're extremely excited, not only for the initial impact that she's been able to get going here. We think with the Center, she will really be able to scale up and truly make a difference.

Dr. Blazey added, I think Laurie would agree with me, one of the outstanding questions is whether the two of us will be able to keep up with Dr. Kim. She's ambitious and is aiming to make a mark. We have another interesting initiative I want to bring to your attention. It involves a joint effort between RIPS and the Division of Outreach, Engagement and Regional Development. I've been working with Dr. Rena Cotsones on this proposal, and it's to explore the creation of a Discovery Partners Institute hub, and I'll brief you a bit on what Discovery Partners Institute is. It is an interdisciplinary public/private research institute that's primarily to be in downtown Chicago and which will be accompanied by a set of virtually-connected hubs throughout the state. These hubs will be led, or at least have as a major partner, an institute of higher education. The DPI was initiated by the University of Illinois System, announced by Governor Rauner last October, and on June 3rd of this year, received \$500 million in state appropriations of which \$125 million, I believe, exists presently, and the rest the bonds will be sold in October. Did I get that right, John? Close enough? Okay. Representatives of the U of I system approached us last fall, and we've been discussing creation of an NIU DeKalb Discovery Partners Institute hub since that time. Now, from my point of view, there's been a convergence of events that have aligned where this really makes sense for us. They include the inception of DPI, the new research vision that we're pursuing, and there is gathering community momentum – not just here in DeKalb but around the country, around rural innovation. This presents the local community, our community with a tremendous collaborative opportunity for the university and our local partners. Accordingly, RIPS and OERD have met with local stakeholders and NIU faculty and staff to develop a programmatic and physical proposal for an NIU DeKalb-based hub, tentatively named the Northern Illinois Center for Community Sustainability. The hub will be dedicated to sustainability of communities and response to changes in the environment, demographics and technology which is consistent with our research vision. Building on the legacy of agricultural innovation in DeKalb County, the academic excellence of Northern Illinois, partnerships with other academic and private institutions, the hub will focus on research and education in three related areas: food systems innovation, water resources development and stewardship, and climate change adaptation with a focus on extreme events. We have great expertise in the latter two areas. We have substantial expertise in the food systems innovation, but we are working to identify and engage with partners that will round out that initiative. In terms of the footprint for the center, we are working with the city of DeKalb to identify potential downtown locations within the community. They're extremely interested. They see this as part of their revitalization. And frankly, they have funding for that revitalization, and they're looking for partners with long-term vision. The center will have significant impacts on NIU and the surrounding communities with increased research, broadening community engagement, economic development, and an enhanced statewide national and international reputation for NIU and DeKalb. Pending completion of the discussions with the potential partners which are quite far along, we plan to present an expression of interest to DPI leadership in the next few weeks. I'll just note that that leadership is sort of a bit vague. We understand it to be the vice president for economic development. He is working with the president of the U of I System and the state on identifying how the funding should be spent and when it should be spent. I'm happy to take questions on both initiatives.

Chair Butler asks, Dr. Blazey, who is it that you mentioned, you said the Vice President of Economic Development?

Dr. Blazey responded, yes, his name is Ed Seidel from the U of I system. I just want to mention that it's interesting, and it shows the value of sending our faculty to Washington for these IPA programs, etc. I worked with Mr. Ed Seidel when he was at NSF and I was at OSTP. So, out of the gate, we have a working relationship and a level of trust that we would not have had before. Just another advertisement for increasing our federal relations and our presence in the Capitol.

Trustee Struthers commented, regarding the footprint, and I realize it's early – ballpark, how many bodies are you talking about?

Dr. Blazey answered, I just sort of stuck my thumb in the air. With my experience with research labs, knowing that there's going to be three main research areas, I figured about 10,000 square feet each minimum. And so, in our discussions with the city and with DPI, that is sort of the nominal figure we're running with.

Trustee Wasowicz asked Dr. Blazey, this is like a -- so the main hub is right around by UIC?

Dr. Blazey responded, right.

Trustee Wasowicz added, from what I understand, down in the city. And then they're the hub, and we're the spokes coming out here then?

Dr. Blazey responded, right. The U of I System has identified three other hubs. They'll make an announcement on August 28th about one of them. There's active discussions about one in Peoria, and then I think the other one is in Edwardsville. Is that correct? Springfield. That's right. Two of them are rather small concerns. The one in Peoria will have some more substance because the hospital system is behind it there. This, in my mind, is by far the largest and most significant initiative currently under consideration that I know of.

Trustee Wasowicz added, I saw the governor speak about this a couple months ago, and there was like genuine excitement.

Dr. Blazey added, yes there is, and U of I is really struggling mightily right now to understand the organization and structure, and we internally, and I, have decided that we should move now while they're still trying to figure out what it means, and our partners believe that as well.

Chair Butler said, I think this is showing a great degree of integration and collaboration in the pursuit of the vision that this committee has worked with Dr. Blazey and President Freeman to develop, and I couldn't be more excited about the work that's being done here. And I think, too, the efforts to quantify it and to make clear the return on investment. If I think, back about five or six years ago, to Dr. Freeman talking about making these very strategic hires and what the long-term potential impact would be, it's all coming full circle and I'm really excited. Chairman Coleman and his efforts to reform the Board committee structure and to put these subjects in this one place, I think, is also making even much more sense than I would have predicted at this stage because usually it takes a longer time for everything to come together like this.

OTHER MATTERS

No other matters were discussed.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for November 15, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Butler asked for a motion to adjourn. Trustee Barsema so moved and Trustee Wasowicz seconded. The motion was approved. The meeting adjourned at 12:22 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.