

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, September 7, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, D. Baker, G. Baker, Bishop, Block, Boughton, Briscoe, Campbell, Chakraborty, Chen, Chitwood, Chung, Coles (for Dannenmaier), Doederlein, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Freeman, Ghrayeb, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hathaway, Jorge, Kassel, Long, Macdonald, McCord, McHone-Chase, Mogren, Naples, Newman, Nicholson, Nobiling, Olson, Patro, Reynolds, Saborio, Slotsve (for Khoury), Staikidis, Tan, VanderSchee, Wang, Wyzard

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bond, Carlson, Dannenmaier, Khoury, LaGioia, Pavkov, Penrod, Rajagopalan, Riley, Rodgers (for Krmeneč),

OTHERS PRESENT: Beamer, Bryan, Coryell, Falkoff, Klaper, Phillips, Stoddard

OTHERS ABSENT: Hoffman, Kaplan, Weldy

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Good afternoon, welcome to the first meeting of the University Council this year.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: Can I will I have a call for the adoption of the agenda? Do I have a motion?

G. Slotsve: So moved.

D. Baker: A second? Christine seconded, Christine Wang. And just to remind you, when you speak, so we have the captioning, please say your name so she can get it right on the captioning, is that right, Greg?

G. Long: That's what I was going to say.

D. Baker: So any additions or deletions, edits to the agenda? Hearing none, all in favor please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? We have an agenda, thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2016 MEETING

D. Baker: Can I have a motion for approval of the minutes from May 4?

C. Wang: So moved.

D. Baker: Second?

C. Doederlein: Second.

D. Baker: Any edits? All in favor please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS – [report](#)

D. Baker: President's announcements. I see we've a few new deans here so let me start by introducing a few deans who you may not have met yet. I'm going to start with Omar Ghrayeb, he's been with us for a long time. Thank you for serving in that role. I saw Paul Kassel, where did Paul go, Dean of Visual and Performing Arts. Laurie Elish-Piper, who was acting and now is permanent dean of the College of Education. And I don't think any of the other new deans are here. Eric Dannenmeier or Balaji Rajagopalan. And Ete Olson, who is continuing in the library, thank you for doing that. And our veteran deans, Derryl Block and Chris McCord, I think I saw you here. Can we welcome the new deans and the old deans?

I had an interesting day yesterday. I was in Bloomington and I met with the other public university presidents, the Secretary of Education for Illinois, and the chair of the Board of Higher Education. And it was an interesting meeting. We discussed where we are in the state politically and financially, and then how the Illinois Board of Higher Education can more effectively work with the institutions to move the higher education agenda forward. I thought that was positive. You know, our board has done a good deal of compliance work and policy work. And now I think, if they can take on a more active role in making the case for higher education, that's going to be a very positive thing. So I appreciate them reaching out to the presidents and we had a good meeting yesterday. I mean, we talked openly about the difficult issues we're all facing. And I think there was a good understanding in both directions. Just a shout out to them in that meeting yesterday.

I wanted to talk a little bit about the budget and enrollment issues and a couple other things. Let's get started with that to kind of give you an update. Why don't we put up a couple slides here just to give you a summary. Here they come. Go ahead and go to the next one, Pat. Thanks.

So here's a summary slide. In 2015 our state budget was \$91.1million, our state appropriation. Actually it started at \$93 million but after Governor Rauner was elected and looked at the books, he said the budget is not balanced I'm going to cut everybody. So we were cut from \$93 million to \$91 million. Then we went into the protracted year-long we-have-no-budget year. That was the one that

just ended on June 30 of 2016. And on the last day we got a budget that was 29 percent. So we incurred a 71 percent budget reduction, or state appropriation last year. A reduction of almost \$65 million. So we got \$26.4 million.

And then on the last day we also got the MAP funding. So as you may remember, the Monetary Award Program is the scholarship program for students who have high need. And it was roughly \$20 million for us. And we credited that for the students under the belief that the money would come in, that we couldn't ask students for that money and particularly students of very high need and expect them to stay in school. So we wanted to credit it. And then we bet that the state would come forward, and they did. So we appreciate that. And we got that money. That money actually came in.

Then there was the stop gap budget at the last day of the session. And that stop gap budget was essentially a half year budget or a 53 percent budget of \$48 million. That would be a \$40, almost \$43 million reduction from our 2015 budget. But it was called stop gap in a half-year budget. So the idea was: Let's keep government going – I think that was the idea – and then let's get through the election and come back after the election and try and really address these issues. Are we really going to get to address these issues? I don't know. I guess we'll have to see what happens in the election and how the political playing field changes between now and January when they come back into session. So there are windows. There's the veto session and the lame-duck session where something might happen. No guarantees there, though. And the state has a structural deficit, so if they're going to have a solution, they're going to need some kind of, I suspect, grand solution where there's budget reductions, spending reductions along with some revenue enhancement, aka tax increase.

Well, I would encourage you all to vote, vote often in the coming election. I think it's going to be important for us to make a statement and make this a public issue. But that's where we are. So we're we're planning around that. We're going to be okay this year. But we need to plan for staying in a fiscally constrained environment so we can continue to provide excellent education to our students and provide the basic and needed resources for the faculty and staff to do their jobs. So I wish I had better news. I guess the good news is we got a half a year budget and that we've worked through a number of budget reductions. I'll go into those in a second. Let's go to the second slide.

So I guess this is the good news slide. Half year budget, \$48 million. And the Stevens building that had construction stopped on it a year ago June 30 – that was reappropriated. So we're hopefully off and running on that. So we actually got enough money to finish the building. We were concerned we wouldn't get enough money to finish the building, but it looks like we're going to get enough money to finish the building. And that's actually a state-run capital project so it's not us managing it but the state. So we're working with them and then we've got an APB out for the contractors, trying to figure out where they are to come back and start it. As you might expect they went off and did other projects since that one was put on hold. So we've got to get them back on campus and working. So we're working through those issues.

MAP funding, the good news was we got the \$18.3 million for last year. The bad news is we don't have any yet for this year in the half-year stop gap budget. So once again, we are crediting. And

every legislator we talked to and the governor said we support MAP, it's really important, so we're going to believe them again, and we're going to credit the students again because I think we need to. But we're going to have to work hard again on that MAP funding to make sure we get that and we support our students. So that's the partial-year state budget. Any questions on either one of those slides so far?

So we've actually been going through budget reductions since 2002. Until last year we had about a 50 percent decrease in our inflation adjusted appropriation from 2002 to the 2015 budget. That's before the big cut last year. So we've had to reduce our spending in the three years I've been here, we've reduced it \$45 million. So we need to bring our budget into balance, and we've done that by making hard decisions. I'm sure all of you felt them. We feel it in personnel and operations and travel and in maintenance issues, capital construction issues. That's how we're getting through weathering this right now. And we need to continue to be vigilant about it.

We've done that, and I think maintained the quality of our teaching and research at the institution and our outreach, actually. When we did the branding study last year to see what people thought of us, the students, when they were surveyed and interviewed, had very high opinions of what you do for them. They're very satisfied with the quality of their education. So I think that's good news to build on. So thank you for all of that hard work.

Maybe this is a good transition to enrollment. And so I'll come back to the enrollment slide, but let me say a few words about where we are with enrollment. Did most of you get the email that went out this afternoon on enrollment? Okay, so let me briefly go through that and see if you have any questions. Before I leave the budget stuff, any questions on that last slide or anything?

Okay, so enrollment, we're down 5.5 percent, 1100 students this fall. Freshman enrollment got hit as it did at a number of schools, and we heard those rumors from moms and dads and high school advisors and even students themselves asking about the State of Illinois' higher education and how confident they could be in it. We tried to reinforce to them that high quality education, students really appreciate the education they get here, and the quality of faculty, staff, and facilities, programs. But we did take a big hit there. And we're going to have to turn it around. We're down much less in transfer students. And little bit less in graduate students and in international enrollment. International enrollment we had a big increase the year before and I think we've drifted back a little bit. We've got work underway to turn all those back around.

We did have some interesting bright spots. Bucking the trend of law schools around the country, we were up significantly in law students this year. And in my brief look back at what they did, it really wasn't about more applicants, it was about yield rate. It was about closing the deal and making personal calls and really talking to students about the high quality education that they got here. A couple weeks ago we had the president of the Illinois Bar here, the first African-American president of the bar, and an NIU alum. And he was very impressed, even had very positive things to say about the quality of education he got and how that prepared him for a successful career. So I think with those kinds of alumni, we've got a great case to make in the College of Law, and really across the institution.

Retention was up again. Thank you. That's something that we started working on three years ago, and it's been up every year since. So as you may remember, we were at 66 percent in 2013, freshman to sophomore retention. We're up again this year another percentage point and a couple points in transfer enrollments. I think we're 73 percent for freshman enrollment – up from 66 – and we're at 90 percent for transfer retention. So good number there. We have some more upside to do there, but I like the trend. It's the highest freshman retention rate since 2009, so good progress in a difficult environment. We might have predicted there would be lower retention because of some of these fiscal challenges, but that was not the case.

So I think the enrollment is down for a number of reasons. Lots of out-of-state competition. I think states are looking at Illinois. You can see the billboards as you drive to Indiana or Michigan that talk about we have a balanced budget and you don't. Those aren't very helpful. There are many universities in Chicago recruiting, 65 I think have offices in Chicago recruiting, and hundreds more online. So we've got a lot of competition. The demography is flat to declining for high school seniors.

But we're responding. We've held the cost. If you add up tuition, room and board over the last three years, we've held that constant. That's good, I think. We're trying to do a much better job reaching out to students. communicating with them better, through our constituent relations management system and marketing activities. We've kept tuition at 12 credit hours. And we did see a lower reduction in credit hours than we did in actual head count so that's good. Students are taking credit hours, and that helps time to degree, and that helps ultimately their expense. And we're responding I think to the marketplace, partnering with community colleges in a much more effective way. And we've got a big up side there. So when we think about turning around enrollment, we need to work really hard on freshmen, and I think we can execute much better there from the recruitment marketing piece on top to how we go through the admissions recruitment process to how alumni help us, to how financial aid can be better administered on down to what faculty, departments can do. I think we got a lot of up side there.

But looking at this market, I'm not sure that's going to be a 1,000 student turn-around in one year. I think that's a longer play, and that may be a longer play out into the K-12 system, trying to get a higher percentage of students graduating or ready for colleges and universities. About a third of our high school graduates this year will be ready for college or career, only one third. One third will graduate and not be ready, one third won't graduate. That leaves two thirds for us to work on.

Next week we have our P20 meeting that has partners from 20 school districts, a dozen community colleges, state agencies and social service providers all working on how do we make that pipeline bigger and more efficient. Those are kind of shocking numbers when you think about what's coming to us. So we need to work hard on back-stream as well as upstream. We're working hard on community colleges, and I'll be back to you to talk about that this year. I think that's really an important piece for us to collaborate on more closely. A number of departments are doing that to get guided pathways and to even thinking about teaching on community college campuses with our degree programs. As you probably know, we've started a mechanical engineering program at Rock Valley College this year and a partnership with Rock Valley and industry there, who's donated I think about \$3.5 million at this point to help get that program up and running. So there are some real

opportunities, I think, in the community college environment.

We're also looking at the adult and online markets. There's what, a million and a half people between here and Lake Michigan that have some college and no degree. Many of them, the majority of them have had some community college work. So we can work through community colleges to them. Or we can work with their employers to see if there are things we can do for their organizations, not just them as individuals. So we have a number of plays there.

The international market's obviously another one that we need to think strongly about. And International Programs spent last year doing a strategic plan and will be coming forward with a number of initiatives there. I'm really excited about that. That's probably enough. I don't need to go into more depth on those.

We don't have to get locked into that freshman niche and think that's the only place to recruit. I think we can serve the state and our students well by thinking about other niches. To serve nontraditional students or transfer students from community colleges, that's a real opportunity for us. And it makes us more important, frankly, to the state, more important to the social fabric, the economy, as well as more important politically in the state. So let's all think hard about that. And how we can serve those students, help them succeed. Any questions on the enrollment pieces?

Okay, just to reflect briefly, you know, we can face and overcome these challenges. If we think back to three, four years ago, when our retention was at 66 percent, had been sliding for a decades, this university took it on. We took it on and met sometimes in this room for some Bold Futures workshops where we got around tables and talked about those kinds of issues and said: What can we do? What are the real issues? And we came up with some ideas and then we went and asked students: Were those right? And we got their feedback. And then we started executing. And look what happened. We've gone up for three years in a row on that. So thank you for undertaking that and executing it. We can do the same on enrollment. We focused largely on freshmen, which isn't a bad thing. It's still critical to our future, and how we're going to serve the state in an important way. But there are other places to do it too, and we need to think about those and how we can aggressively work on them. So I think that as we do that, we can use that triangle model, as I illustrated in Rockford where we had industry working with our faculty and our students. And if you're a student going in that program, it's a pretty good deal. You get the low tuition the first two years, you get our great program the second two years. You get a paid internship, and then you get the guarantee of a job interview at the end of the process. It's not a bad deal for those students. My thanks to the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology and Omar for moving that forward.

And I think as we go through Program Prioritization, we're going to be able to focus on those areas where we have growth opportunities, we now have a mechanism to do that. isa, do you want to say anything about where we are with the Program Prioritization?

L. Freeman: Now or later?

D. Baker: We'll come back to Lisa on that. Almost segued at the wrong time. Anything else on that?

Thanks. By the way, my thanks to everybody that put together the move-in week and the kickoff. I thought we had a good start. And we had almost 7,000 people at the president's picnic. It was good, I think, community-building. And a number of people from the community came. Proudly DeKalb and the chamber were trying to reach out to our students and make a more welcoming community. That's not only to our folks on campus, but those in the community.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

D. Baker: Next we're on to the consent agenda. So do I have a motion to adopt the consent agenda? I guess it's to pass the consent agenda. Is there a motion?

S. Farrell: So moved.

D. Baker: Second?

J. Jemison: Second.

D. Baker: Any discussion? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Okay, thanks.

- A. University Council Standing Committees – Per NIU Bylaws, Article 2, approve the [2016-17 membership rosters](#) – Page 4
- B. University Advisory Committee to the BOT – Per NIU Bylaws, Article 16.4.1.1, confirm the [2016-17 membership roster](#) and confirm Kendall Thu for a three-year term (2016-2019) – Page 5
- C. Northern Star Publications Board – Approve the nomination of [Matt Bute](#) to serve as a community-at-large member of the NSPB for a three-year term (2016-2019) – Page 6
- D. Student Conduct Board – Approve the nomination of [Anne Edwards](#), Career Services Placement Counselor, for a new three-year term, replacing Linda Styra-Bostedt. And approve the nomination of [Eric Armstrong](#), Director of Military and Post-Traditional Student Services, to fulfill the one year remaining on Jennifer Pippen's unexpired term. Both are supportive professional staff employees replacing supportive professional staff employees.
- E. Periodic Evaluation of the Ombudsperson – Per NIU Bylaws, Article 20.4, refer to the UC-University Affairs Committee

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Program Prioritization update – Lisa Freeman, Provost

D. Baker: Unfinished business. Program prioritization update. Okay, Lisa.

L. Freeman: I'm going to give a brief update and allow time for questions and answers. A lot has gone on since the end of the last semester in terms of Program Prioritization. Draft action plans were turned in by the vice presidents; all of the cabinet-level divisions have submitted action plans. And right now these are being revised. I gave a presentation at the leadership retreat to the chairs and directors to kick off the semester, and this is available on the president's website. I encourage people to review that and also to attend a town hall that we have coming up at the end of the month.

But let me just give you a behind-the-scenes snapshot of what we're doing now. So I'll talk first about what's going on within Academic Affairs with the recommendation from the Academic Task Force. The action plans are being revised at the level of the colleges and the Provost's Office. This is to correct any omissions or inconsistencies that were in the original drafts. Also to take advantage of opportunities that have presented themselves as the result of changes that have taken place since July 2015. In some cases we've had changes in staffing, changes in opportunities, new partnerships available. And so people are advising to write those in. Also because a lot of the planning was done over the summer, the opportunity to revise plans now as school started allows for more faculty input, and that's important in the Academic Task Force reports.

Overall we're also building a lot of stuff behind the scenes for Program Prioritization. The most important thing for us to be doing right now – and we're doing it – we're working really hard to create mechanisms that link the task force recommendations and the action plan proposals to our resource allocation plans, budgeting processes. And to create infrastructure to track what happens, particularly the release of resources and investment of resources so we can be honest in reporting to the campus what we've done with this.

There are a lot of meetings going on between the Provost's Office and Finance. I think people have probably read that Dean McCord and Matt Streb are helping to keep track of – normally responsible for things. Vice Provost Douglass and Mini are meeting also to make sure that we have the right structure to track and report what we did.

I'm very pleased to say that the first and most probably significant linkage of Program Prioritization task force reports to anything tangible in terms of academic investment will be the authorization of faculty searches for FY '18 hires. The criteria that are going to be used to rank search authorization and faculty hiring have a very significant criterion that's based on Program Prioritization recommendations and action plans. And the framework that links hiring priorities to the task force recommendations and the action plans mirrors pretty closely the framework that's being used by Finance to link other unfunded requests to Program Prioritization action plans. And so that's going forward as well.

On the administrative side, we also have vice presidents who are correcting omissions, editing their reports. And the president and I and Matt Streb and Chris McCord have met a number of times and develop a strategy for doing the same type of tracking. And Matt and Chris and the president are going to be meeting with the vice presidents individually to go over their action plans and to make sure that the task force recommendations were addressed.

As we move on, we're, you know, on the academic side, hiring is so time sensitive that we wanted to focus there first because we're already a little behind the ball, but we're going to be getting those searches announced. After that there's some sort of basic stuff to be done. We have created a large table of where there's substantive disagreement with the task force recommendations and see which need further discussion and which need – the agreement is – you know, we just accept the disagreement because the task forces didn't have complete information. An example of that – I'll give you a preview – the task force recommended merging the Graduate School and College of Law functions related to recruitment and University Libraries. And that just doesn't make sense from many standpoints. And so we've accepted the substantive disagreement with that and we're moving on. There are other recommendations that don't require resources that are being reviewed and you know, as I said, we're tracking these so we'll be able to release periodically to the campus what's going on.

I've agreed to update both Faculty Senate and University Council as a standing item, and I will continue to do that going forward. And I think I'll just stop there and ask if people have questions at this point in time. See if I can answer them.

M. Haji-Sheikh: One of the questions I have is some of this is going to have to do with workload. As you know, since we're now unionized, those workload discussions will be interactive with what's going on here. I mean you're talking about numbers of head count for different departments. Teaching loads are going to be part of the issue. So how are you planning to deal with that as coming November, say, the faculty's planning on having a negotiating team going?

L. Freeman: So we respect the right of the faculty to unionize and we understand that in the current situation wages and working conditions are subject to negotiation. I would say that there's much that's recommended in Program Prioritization including permanent refill of tenured faculty positions that's not obviously a direct negotiated point. And we'll be moving forward with some of those investments as recommended. Obviously there are processes that will be followed, if people in the bargaining unit object to hiring tenured faculty in any department. And I'll just finish by saying we respect the right of our faculty to organize and we intend to bargain in good faith.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I don't think there will be objections to the hiring. The question is the loading. How are we going to load the departments? They're going to be very much interactive with what the decisions of Program Prioritization is going to be. That's all the question – I just wanted it as a thought process more than a direct answer. It has to be in the thought process of all of us here.

D. Baker: Anybody else? Okay. thanks.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws, [Article 17.1](#), Athletic Board – Pages 7-10
FIRST READING

D. Baker: All right, new business, proposed amendment to the new bylaws. I'm going to turn the next two over to Greg. Greg?

G. Long: Our first order of business is the reading of an amendment to Article 17.1, regarding the Athletic Board. I need a motion to approve.

C. Wang: So moved.

G. Long: Second?

G. Slotsve: Second.

G. Long: I'd like to turn it over to Matt Streb as chair of the Athletic Board to walk us through what these changes are and we'll go from there.

M. Streb: Thanks, Greg. Last year academic year the Athletic Board spent a great deal of time going through and looking at policies and procedures manual. Many years since we have done so. We've come up with what I think will better integrate us into the Athletic Department, will more accurately reflect what we do and will allow us to be more efficient.

I'll give you one quick example of that and be happy to answer any questions you have. We used to have these standing subcommittees that dealt with a variety of issues, gender equity, external affairs. And frankly, the subcommittees would barely get together, they're made up of members of the board. They didn't have much of a charge, didn't do a heck of a lot. Rarely reported back to the athletic board, and they weren't all that useful. When our new athletic director came in, he said we have working groups that deal with exactly those issues that the subcommittees deal with. Why don't you actually have a representative of the Athletic Board on the working group? And so those individuals now are involved in the working group, they're involved in the discussions, they're involved in the decision-making process. And then they can come back and give a really thorough report to the board as a whole about what's going on in external affairs or gender diversity, budget and student staff services. So that's just one change I think that will make the Athletic Board more valuable, will give us more oversight, and frankly, will make us more productive. So I'm happy to answer any questions that anyone has.

G. Long: One thing I would note quickly from a process standpoint from anyone who's new to the University Council, on any amendments to bylaws, we have a first reading on everything. So today's discussion is a first reading, there will be no vote on it. We would bring it up for a vote during a second reading at the next meeting. Just as a process, if you're not aware, this is how it works. Any questions for Matt? That was very easy. Thank you.

M. Streb: Thank you.

B. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws, [Article 15.3.1.3\(B\)](#),
Academic Planning Council – Pages 11-12

FIRST READING

G. Long: All right, our second item of new business pertains to another first reading. And it's proposed amendment to bylaws Article 15.3.1.3 (B), quite something there. It's described more fully on Page 11 of your handout. It's basically designed to acknowledge the inclusion of the Graduate School dean as an ex officio member of the Academic Planning Council. As noted in the rationale, the Graduate School dean and the VP for Research and Innovation Partnerships used to be the same person. That role was held by one person. In April of 2011 that was split into two separate positions. The Graduate School dean continues to attend the APC meetings, but was not formally added as an ex officio member so this proposed amendment is simply to acknowledge the Graduate School dean as an ex officio member of the APC. So any discussion, any question on this?

L. Freeman: I believe those positions were actually split in 2008 or '9, not in 2011.

G. Long: My apologies.

D. Baker: Great, and if you do have any before the next meeting, you know, probably be good to get them to Greg beforehand. So if there's any prep work, we can answer any questions so we have a productive meeting. And if there's something that could be answered and not wait another session, let's do it that way so we can keep stuff moving.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

D. Baker: All right, let's move to the reports from the councils, boards and standing committees. The first one is the FAC. Paul Stoddard has a report, Paul?

P. Stoddard: Thank you. For those of you new to University Council, I will just go over briefly what the FAC is. It is the Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Ed. It's a representative body including members from all of the four-year public institutions, several of the community colleges, and private institutions, that meet once a month at various campuses around the state. And our function is to provide input to the IBHE in matters of concern to all of us.

We last met in June of this year at Illinois State. This was a joint meeting with the IBHE. We meet with them twice a year. Meet with them is a bit strong. We meet in the same place and time as they do. If we're lucky, we get to have lunch with them, which we did this time. The main issue that came up as far as the FAC was concerned was something that's been contentious for a little while. And that is the filling of the faculty seat on the IBHE. Several years ago, the legislature determined that one of the seats on the board should, in fact, go to a faculty member from the state to provide voice and vote for the faculty. Students have representation, the community leaders are represented.

It was thought that the faculty should also be represented. The governor decided to fill that seat with a part-time faculty member, non-tenure track, from U of I who is primary business is computer security. The board was very upset by this. The Faculty Senate at NIU and Faculty Senates around the state wrote to the legislature saying this was not a great appointment. They have not taken this issue up, probably will not do so until sometime later this fall. In the meantime the FAC suggested a compromise in which the governor could move Mr. Bambenek to the other vacant seat that he gets to appoint and then go ahead and appoint a full-time faculty member to the board. Couple of weeks ago the governor's office wrote back and said they think Mr. Bambenek is fine, thank you, and thanks for your concern. This is still an issue that the FAC is fighting. And again, it does go to the legislature to finally decide on the appropriateness of that particular appointment.

We did have lunch with the board. Several members sat at tables with the FAC, and we had nice conversations, but really didn't cover much substantive material. The board meeting itself commenced at about 1 p.m., and Tom Cross, the newly appointed chair of the board, reminded everybody that Illinois has excellent institutions despite a few hiccups. Jim Applegate, who is the executive director, recommended a couple of books that seemed to say things are not always as bad as they seem. He cited several good statistics such as Illinois has the highest completion rate in the country by 50 percent among adult learners. This is, in my opinion, kind of like saying somebody has the best batting average on Thursday evenings in months that begin with an R. But you take what good you can where you find it. Mr. Applegate also talked about the miracle on the Hudson, which Tom Hanks will be appearing in soon. Somebody pointed out you probably don't ever want to go traveling with Tom Hanks given his track record in the movies when you get shipwrecked and on the boat that got hijacked by pirates, and Apollo 13, and it's just has not been good. The Miracle on the Hudson, Mr. Applegate pointed out had its roots in improvements driven by the study of airline disasters. For us he said let's rediscover pragmatic can-do spirit nationally and at the state level. We are faced with many challenges which a lot of people like to refer to as opportunities. And he's encouraging us to do just that.

The other thing of note that I found: One of the reports from the board members stressed a need to work together across the state rather than as individual groups. And the greater need to employ people and fill our workforce, which I found an interesting phrase. There was a general panel discussion about the impact of the ongoing budget impasse on students, faculty and communities. And that went pretty much as you might have expected. The impasse has not been good for students, faculty and communities. That's from my report.

D. Baker: Any questions for Paul? I appreciate your wit and wisdom.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Cathy Doederlein, Greg Long, Holly Nicholson,
Rebecca Shortridge, Kendall Thu, Leanne VandeCreek

D. Baker: All right. Let's move on. Greg Long's going to talk to us about the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees.

G. Long: I'll be very brief about this. I just wanted to, for those of you who are not familiar with the group, it consists of the president of the Faculty Senate, the president of the SPS Council and the president of the Operating Staff Council, as well as three faculty members. And the board meets quarterly, also has a number of committees and ad hoc groups, in preparation for meetings, oftentimes, particularly the quarterly meetings, we will schedule a meeting of the UAC to talk with President Baker and discuss issues that are relevant to us as faculty and staff as well as to answer any questions that they might have for us.

I would say I want to thank President Baker for showing an increased interest in using us as being advisory in that position because the Board of Trustees is the overall lead, if you would, of everything that happens at the university. They delegate responsibility for managing the university to the president. So some of – to him to take advantage of our expertise. And I think we've been doing a better job of that as things are going on now.

As far as a reporting, what I would suggest you do is there's a Board of Trustees website that NIU hosts, and their entire minutes are available. I'd encourage you to look at those rather than have me try to give you a, you know, a five-minute report on a meeting that took literally all day long. They are not speedy in their meetings nor are they typically timely. Rather than like I say making my judgment as far as what bits to pull out for you, I'd encourage you to take a look at them. I think you might find them interesting. So that's my report on UAC to BOT.

D. Baker: Thanks. Question?

E. Mogren: Some of the representations are mandated, you said, right? Representation – there's specific

G. Long: Yes.

E. Mogren: How are those faculty going to – who votes on them? What's the criteria for selecting those three faculty representatives?

G. Long: So the question is basically how do we identify who the faculty are? That's something we should work out in more detail. Up to this point, it's been more of a catch as catch can. Who's available, discussion with the Steering committee. There's not a formal procedure in place for identifying those individuals.

E. Mogren: Are there plans underway to make a more formal process for selecting those representatives?

G. Long: I would certainly entertain a motion or discussion on that topic, absolutely.

E. Mogren: Maybe something that we want to think about. After all, these are the people that are representing the faculty to the Board of Trustees. I think that some faculty body ought to have some input on who is chosen to be the representatives of the faculty to...

G. Long: I think that makes a lot of sense. I would certainly endorse and promote having faculty have greater say in how those individuals are identified.

E. Mogren: Procedurally, how do we ensure that that gets on the agenda to be moved forward here this year?

G. Long: Ferald, would it be reasonable to say that we would refer this to committee?

F. Bryan: Rules of Governance, probably.

E. Mogren: We need a motion for that? I ask that we ask the Rules and Governance Committee to investigate a more formal process for appointing faculty representatives to the advisory committee.

G. Long: All right, so we've got a motion to use the, have the Resource, excuse me, the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee provide more detailed guidance regarding the selection of UAC faculty members. Is that –

E. Mogren: Sure, yeah, sounds good.

G. Long: Okay, and this is a referral to a committee. First – motion second?

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

G. Long: All in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay.

E. Mogren: Thank you.

G. Long: You bet.

C. Academic Policy Committee – no report

D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – no report

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

1. Constitution & Bylaws Review and Policy Library update

D. Baker: Thank you. The next report is from Rules, Governance and Elections so, Therese Arado, how about that? You just got a job.

T. Arado: And it's not a report on what we were just given. This is on -- for those of you who are new to the council, just give a little history. It is on work being done with the constitution and bylaws regarding the policies and things that are available to all of us at the university. The Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, with work from some GAs through the University Council office and Greg, are working through the constitution and bylaws to try to make the information more accessible. It has nothing to do with the content of the information, but to try and get things into a policy library so that all of us are able to say: Oh, I wonder how we do A, and we're able to go find out how we do A rather than having to look through dozens and dozens of PDF documents or not know where it goes. And in doing this work, the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee is trying to develop basically a policy library where everything can live.

And so the work this year of the committee is to work with others to develop a place where these things can live and identify how they are by subject where they should be, and to arrange them so that everybody is able to equally access the information so that we don't have to be trying all different methods. And in the process, we may find things out there that are duplicative and that would be something to be dealt with at a later time. But the goal right now of RGE is to look at all these documents we have. And if anyone remembers from last year, Greg brought into one of our meetings our constitution and bylaws, and I might be getting the number completely wrong, but ours is about the two together, 100 and --

G. Long: 70 something.

T. Arado: I was going to say 51, but 170-some pages of things that don't generally fit in those documents but are important things we need to have in appropriate places and be able to find and access. Our goal as a committee right now is to be looking at all this. Looking at the types of documents that have been identified. And finding the right place for them to live, not, again, not changing anything, not altering any content, but trying to get it so that we all have the same access to finding this information throughout basically through the website. Is there anything from my committee members that are around or from Greg that I didn't think include in this?

G. Long: The only thing that I would briefly add is part of this process of identifying policies would be the idea of also policy management. So having some sense of who can create policies, who has oversight for them, do they have any sort of a sunset clause in them? How do policies work? Because right now there are multiple ways in which policies get invoked, get put into the APPM and other sources. So part of this process would involve the management issue of it as well.

T. Arado: Thank you.

D. Baker: All right, if there's no other questions, we'll move on.

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

G. Student Association – Giuseppe LaGioia, President – report

D. Baker: So the next is from the Student Association. We've got two speakers. Giuseppe LaGioia, the president of the SA, isn't able to be here, but Jorge Jemison is, and Christine Wang from the senate.

J. Jemison: Want to welcome everybody back to the school year. The Student Association is excited to have an [inaudible] year. We have been working hard all summer on a few initiatives I want to give you an update. Those include the Huskies athletics, the Speak Up. Get Help. Just Act campaign, which works to address issues such as hate, alcoholism and sexual assault. And working with NIU police in the City of DeKalb to engage students. We want to make sure our students are coming to this university feeling a sense of community and safe. Also want to stress, if you have any ideas or questions for us, feel free to reach out to the Student Association. We're open to anything, really. That's all I have.

C. Wang: Hello everyone. Welcome back to the new school year. I have a lot actually to talk about. The senate has been going through some issues right now, some internal ones. And other than that, we also have embarked on a couple of initiatives to continue on from last year and also to start on it from this year.

The first thing I'd like to talk about is the S.A. special elections. So we are currently under quorum for our senators. We have 15. We are supposed to have 20 in order to hold meetings. So we have been forced to hold a special election. Currently we have 16 people on the ballot which is incredibly encouraging. So that means that September 18 will be our first meeting. September 14 will be when polls will be open and students can vote for their representatives. And once, hopefully all of the, you know, the senators will be elected we will have a total of 31. Or less. But that is very encouraging.

We also are focusing on a bunch of goals for the senate, which will commence once we are able to hold our meetings. Right now we have been in talks with a lot of people, but we can't really move forward until we can meet. So our goals are to create a more inclusive environment, focus more on leadership development, and focus on the diversity and sustainability, which we have already started on from last year.

More external initiatives are lobbying, over the summer we met with Representative Bob Pritchard when we planned on addressing the lack of the full budget. And with the resolution to be sent down to Springfield once we have a full senate. We also have been in talks with the Young Invincibles which advocates for economic stability for students and higher education. I'm supposed to be speaking with them September 9, and I'm looking forward to a very productive meeting there.

We also wanted to address the effect of the stop gap enrollment to students. We've had a number of questions, especially after that was passed on what are we supposed to say to these students? What are they supposed to expect? Are they going to be able to afford – Is NIU even going to still be here? And I think we have been able to allay a lot of those concerns, but the concerns are still there, and so that's something that we will be focusing on once senate is in session again.

I've also been talking to the City of DeKalb. This one has been very encouraging. I spoke with Mayor Rey and the city planner Derek Hiland to create more of an inclusive environment for both the students who live in DeKalb and for the residents of DeKalb, who aren't students, and one of them is kind of interesting. We are going to be, I'm actually going to be personally giving them a tour of the campus through my position as a Northern Ambassador and Speaker of the Senate on October 12 to administrators of the city, which will be very cool. We talked about marketing to DeKalb to not just potential residents, but also to students as well.

And finally, a couple other things that I embarked on was improving diversity, speaking with Dr. Walden, and that was going to be very encouraging. There's a unity march next week that I encourage all of you to attend. And I also spoke with members from Program Prioritization to give them feedback from students, including Dr. Freeman over here. So that's all I have and, if you have any questions, feel free to email me or ask me.

D. Baker: Anybody? Thanks to both of you. And Christine, thanks for mentioning the unity march. And afterwards is a dialogue so if you are able to attend, please go to both of those. I think those are important. These are interesting times in the United States, and universities are a place where we can have conversations about the social justice and inclusion that we strive for. And it's a place where we can help society learn how to have those dialogues in productive ways and actually move forward to action steps so we improve things. That's the focus of these dialogues, and I hope you're able to attend.

And thank you for reaching out to the city and giving that tour. I held a series of listening sessions with community members over the last year and one of the things they often say is we've lived here a long time but we really don't know what the university does or what's in that tall building with the thing on top or whatever it might be. And so I think really getting the community in to know us is going to help them make it a more hospitable place for all of us.

H. Operating Staff Council – Holly Nicholson, President – report

D. Baker: Okay, next, Holly Nicholson, you've got a report from the Operating Staff Council.

H. Nicholson: Yes, thank you. Our annual Staff Fest event celebrating the achievements on campus was held last month. We appreciate everyone who attended and everyone who made it possible for others to attend. And also to the administration for making the event possible. We had a new feature this year to raise money for our dependent scholarship, and that was a dunk tank. And we especially want to thank those participants, several of whom are in this room, and we were able to raise over \$400 for our scholarship between that and our 50/50 raffle. It was a fabulous event. We will be focusing on wellness as a council this year and we look forward to the collaboration opportunities that will bring. And finally we're extremely appreciative of our new administrative aide, and our personnel advisor position, which is a pilot. And both positions have been filled. Zach Bohn is our administrative aide, and John Hulseberg is our first operating staff advisor. I should mention the administrative aide is also shared with SPS Council and both are doing incredible work, hit the ground running and have been an asset to the council. Thank you.

D. Baker: Thanks. Any questions for Holly?

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

D. Baker: Next is Carolinda Douglass from the SPS Council.

C. Doederlein: Want to echo Holly’s appreciation in terms of being able to have Zach with us as an administrative aide. Shows the support that the university has for shared governance and we, as a Council, as well as the Operating Staff Council, appreciate that. We’re going to work on our SPS employee survey, we do that every other year. We’re finalizing the wording and formatting of that. and hope to have it go out later this fall to all SPS. And also just wanted to note that we are very much in appreciation of the concept of a policy library. That is definitely something based off of the policies that dictate or govern we do within SPS, it will be helpful to have that in one common area. Finally, just to kind of speak to some of the things that we’re doing throughout the year, one thing I wanted to mention is next month we’ll have the opportunity to have Dani Rollins and Eric Weldy speak to our council because the council wants to get actively involved in what we can do as far as recruitment and retention of students.

D. Baker: Great, thanks, Cathy. Any questions?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: All right, Comments and Questions From the Floor. Anybody want to know why it’s so warm in here? It is kind of hot, isn’t it? All right.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

D. Baker: Seeing none, we’ll move to the – note the information items on number X.

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- C. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

- Q. [2016-17 Meeting Schedule](#) – Page 13
- R. [2015-16 Annual Report](#), Academic Planning Council
- S. [2015-16 Annual Report](#), Athletic Board
- T. [2015-16 Annual Report](#), Graduate Council
- U. [2015-16 Annual Report](#), University Council Personnel Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: And I think that concludes our business so I would welcome a motion to adjourn.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Moved.

J. Jemison: Seconded.

D. Baker: All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Fare thee well. Go Huskies!

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.