

**FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT**  
**Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Arado, Arriola, Baker, Bateni, Brubaker, Cefaratti, Conderman, Demir, Fredericks, Henning, Hunt, Irwin, Jaffee, Khoury, Koren, Lenczewski, Macdonald, Mackie, Manning, Markowitz, Martin, McHone-Chase, Millis, Montana, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Pitney, Ryan, Ryu, Schwartz-Bechet, Shin, Siegesmund, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Than, Un, Xie

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Azad, Briscoe, Bujarski, Campbell, Chakraborty, Chen, Chmaissem, Deng, Feurer, Giese, Hathaway, Hedin, Konen, Lee, Long, Mogren, Mohabbat, Long, Mogren, Mohabbat, Moraga, Patro, Plonczynski, Riley, Rush, Sagarin, Stephen, Stoddard, Tonks

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Armstrong, Block, Bryan, Freeman, Hardy (for Haliczzer), Klaper, Smith (for Monteiro), Streb

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Doederlein, Falkoff, Gebo, Haliczzer, Monteiro, Shortridge, Stafstrom, Waas

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**W. Pitney:** Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Let's go ahead and call our meeting to order please.

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

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**W. Pitney:** Our first item is to adopt our agenda, so I will take a motion to adopt the agenda please. Richard? Second? Thank you. In terms of discussion on the agenda, I think there's one small change we'll need to make. Item B under President's Announcements for the Budget Overview and Program Prioritization with Provost Freeman, she can't join us until about 4:00 and so she'll be here from 4:00 to 4:45. And so, as a small change to our agenda, let's just address that whenever she arrives, and we'll pause what we're doing at that point in time and cover item B. I think other than that, I don't think we have any other changes. So with that minor change in the agenda, all in favor of adopting it say, "aye."

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? Thank you.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 19, 2014 FS MEETING**

**W. Pitney:** The next item is the approval of our minutes from the November 19 meeting which seems so far ago, long ago. I'd accept a motion to approve those minutes, please? Richard? Thank you. We have second on the floor. Any edits or modifications, changes, deletions? We love the minutes. Seeing none, all in favor to approve those say, "aye."

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? No abstentions? Okay, the minutes are approved.

#### **IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**W. Pitney:** So, moving to our President's Announcements, and before we get to some of the official announcements, I'd just like to ask you to join me in a moment of silence to honor Dr. Donna Munroe, a dear colleague and friend of ours from the College of Health and Human Sciences whom we lost last week. So if you'll please join me in just a few moments of silence. Thank you. As we look down our announcements, one of the first items here, we've got an update from Dean Derryl Block on the NIU Smoke Free Campus Task Force. Dean Block is the chair of that task force and was willing to come in today and share with us some updates and announcements. So I'm going to turn this over to her.

**A. NIU Smoke Free Campus Task Force [draft policy](#) – Dean Derryl Block – Page 4**

**D. Block:** Hello. Thank you for the time. So as of July 1, an act called the Smoke-Free Campus Act will go into effect. This was signed by the Governor and it makes, it basically makes all of our campus smoke free – grounds, parking lots, everything is smoke free. We've had, for a number of years, smoke-free buildings, but this extends it. And I was asked to chair a task force to implement this, and we have about 10 people on the task force with representation from University Legal Counsel, student representatives, HR, public safety, the bursar's office, Health Enhancement, Environmental Health and Safety, student service, and two representatives of the Dekalb County Health Department.

So we've been meeting since late fall about planning how to implement this and the first task was to develop a policy for campus. And what was included in your minutes is what is – at this point – our draft policy. We have plans to talk about this at many governance meetings. We also will have community conversations with students, with representatives of various unions on campus, with faculty, staff. We have a number of community conversations planned, and there will be notice of these community conversations in NIU Today. We also will have conversations with businesses and people who live around the perimeter of campus because one of the things that we are concerned about is that, with all campus property going smoke free, people will cross the street to whatever is not campus property and then potentially, you know, leave cigarette butts or whatever on somebody's lawn or somebody's parking lot. So we want to really involve our neighbors about that too. So you have this policy in front of you, and I don't think I need to read it out loud. This is still a draft based on the law, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have. Yes?

**G. Slotsve:** Okay, I want to ask, in just reading the policy, there's a couple of things here. One is when I look at the first paragraph, we're not allowed to smoke in university-owned vehicles or privately-owned vehicles if they're parked in a campus parking lot. That's number 1. That's, from my understanding, that's different than what was reported earlier last semester. So I know some people I've talked to on campus are confused from what was reported last fall about possible policy. Now, I'll also just want to ask, we also have a prohibition against carrying, smoking, burning, inhaling, exhaling any kind of lighted pipe, cigar. Now, the first word there is "carrying." Do you mean, I want clarification on this, if I have a pack of cigarettes and I leave it in my car parked on university campus, that's illegal?

**D. Block:** I'll take the second question first. The meaning of that sentence was to carry any lighted materials. So if you, because people can say, "I'm not smoking, I'm just holding it, I'm just carrying it." And that is the implication. Nobody is going to search your car and you're allowed to have a pack of cigarettes in your car, but you're not allowed to have lighted cigarettes. Do you need more explanation about that item?

**G. Slotsve:** No, I'm just letting you know that there are people I've talked to on campus, this is going to get widely, if this is the policy that you bring in, you've got to inform people because there's a number of people that are under...

**D. Block:** We will inform. We have a whole plan for informing.

**G. Slotsve:** But there's a fair number that are thinking of quitting smoking, some are saying they're not quitting smoking but thought they could at least go to the parking lot and smoke in their car.

**D. Block:** About whether people will be allowed to smoke in their private automobile on university grounds, we've consulted with legal, and that is not, that prohibition is not mandated by the law. But, from looking at other campuses that have gone smoke free across the nation, some of them started off with allowing people to smoke in a private vehicle with the windows rolled up and what happened was, well first the windows are rolled up and then the windows are rolled down, and then people are smoking leaning on the car, and it was a very slippery slope. And the people that developed these policies have all suggested that we, so what those campuses have done is they've had a two-step thing, which they might have had for a year or two, allowing people to smoke in a private car with the windows rolled up and then they've had to go to a prohibition of that. So the policy wonks, there's many articles about this, have suggested that we start right from the beginning with not allowing smoking on university property. We've had, Jerry Blakemore has weighed in, because we were concerned about privacy rights, you know, is your car like your residence that you should be allowed to smoke in it even if you're on property, and his view was that we were allowed to prohibit that because it doesn't have the same rights as having, you know, a private home. There's no reason why people have to park on university property, so therefore, it's not done. But I agree that is a real sticking point and we will certainly get input from the university community about that. I am, if I could just ask you a question, you say you heard last semester...

**G. Slotsve:** It was in the newspaper, whatever, and the people looked up the state law and their view was they would be allowed to smoke in their car.

**D. Block:** All right, so it's interpretation, it's an interpretation of the law. I don't think we ever made any announcements about that but thank you.

**G. Slotsve:** To go back to the other question though, it's still not clear to me that when I look at this, and maybe I'm just misreading it, that you're referring to carrying lighted cigarettes. The prohibition includes carrying smoking, it doesn't say carrying a lighted cigarette or other lighted smoking equipment. It would be easier to rewrite this sentence. I think it should be up front because it's rather, having to wait until the end of the sentence to find out that you're referring to lighted. Are cigarette lighters allowed?

**D. Block:** Yes, a cigarette lighter is allowed, in my view. I mean, I can't, legal will weigh in on that, but yes. But I think if there is confusion about the wording of that sentence, then it needs to be changed and that's one of the reasons why we felt like this is a draft policy, and we wanted input from as many stakeholder groups as possible on campus for improving this.

**G. Slotsve:** Just one last final point that I'd like to raise with respect to the policy and that is, I smoked. I haven't had a cigarette for three weeks, okay? I'm trying to quit. I'm going nuts, okay? I bounce off the walls sometimes here, but what I do want to point out here is if people are going to quit or have to go through the days if they don't smoke and they're buried in the middle of campus, there might be effect on their work and there is a sense of which at least temporarily, while they're trying to quit or adjusting to this type of routine, this may, you may be able to interpret this as a disability because there is a disability aspect to it just like alcoholism that it's going to make, it could be very difficult for some people to work. So I want that to be just put out that, I'm not saying it's a permanent disability, but the transition could be very difficult for many people.

**D. Block:** Thank you. Other questions or comments? Yes?

**R. Moremen:** Question and then I think the answer should be included in the policy and that is, who's going to enforce this, and it should state, I think, if we have a policy, what the enforcement mechanism is and by whom.

**D. Block:** Right. The law says that the campuses themselves can promulgate the rules and fines and enforcement mechanisms. It is the intent of the task force that, at this point in time, that we would have a very soft roll-in of this with perhaps enforcement by giving the person a card that this is against the policy, telling them verbally and giving them a card that would be against the policy for a certain amount, for, and I don't know how long that would be. And we would train students and workers here on campus about how to approach somebody because I think this enforcement could be done by people other than by the university police, how to politely tell people that this is not, this is against the policy if they are smoking on campus. But that we were not planning to institute fines at the beginning and as the task force continues their work, they will consider at what point any kind of sanction or fine or something like that would be instituted. So at the beginning, it would not have that at all. And that's the intent of this, and it

seems like that's worked on other campuses. We've carefully looked at how this was started on other campuses, and that seems to be the way that the reports from the other campuses are that that's a successful way to go. So at the beginning there wouldn't be a fine. There wouldn't be a write-up in somebody's personnel file or whatever, but there wouldn't be, a student wouldn't be referred to any sanction at the beginning and then we would roll in slowly some kind of sanction. Yes? We would not say that on the web page though. You know, we would just have that kind of vague at the beginning. Yes?

**Unidentified:** Hello. My question is on, I don't smoke, and on the electronic cigarettes, is there a health hazard to that, or, I'm assuming this policy is about health and second-hand smoke and plus garbage, right? Are those the two main things? So I was wondering about electronic cigarettes. I don't know much about them, but do they pose a health problem?

**D. Block:** The technology of tobacco, of products that would give you nicotine is changing by the minute, and electronic cigarettes are mentioned in the law as being prohibited. I'll just put on my public health hat, I'm a public health person. And there is some disagreement at this point in time among the experts whether electronic cigarettes are an effective way of trying to cut down on your nicotine use and that it might be a way to gradually taper off and stop smoking or is it in itself dangerous. And, as research happens, we will, perhaps this law will be changed. But at this point, that is one of the products that's included in the law as being prohibited. Yes?

**G. Slotsve:** If you are going to leave electronic cigarettes in there, you should move that to the next sentence because an electronic cigarette is not lighted smoking equipment, there's nothing to light.

**D. Block:** Thank you. Yes.

**E. Arriola:** Is there any consideration by the task force or any ability within the law to designate areas along the lines, for example, of airports where there are often designated spaces for smokers. Since a university, like an airport, I mean it has a dominant sort of community, but it also has people coming in from other parts of the country and other parts of the world. So whether you view it as the, it is an addiction after all and those who are trying to quit are having to deal with finding alternate methods including the electronic cigarette or simply an accommodation to the fact that this is not an easy thing to get rid of, that this is a pretty intense example of social engineering which is part of the criticism of the over-breadth of this kind of regulation. A huge intrusion on one's liberties.

**D. Block:** According to Legal's read of the law and my personal read of the law, having a designated smoking area on campus would not meet what the law says we should do. So the people who made the law could have considered that but at this point, we're dealing with what the law says, what the act says. Whether there would be designated smoking areas off campus, I don't know. That's something that we'll certainly talk about with people around campus. My hunch is that they would not want that, but perhaps they would. I don't know. We'll see. We'll see how this plays out. Yes?

**R. Moremen:** I recall from our discussion around the firearms prohibition that there was some mention that the sidewalks, like for example along Lucinda, that are circumferential to our campus, are not considered university property. Does that also apply here?

**D. Block:** As part of the task force charge, we are having the borders of campus very clearly designated and there will be a map about where smoking is prohibited and where not. So I think, I don't know about the particular instance that you are referring to, but yes, sometimes something that's on the border is part of our campus grounds and sometimes not. And that will need to be clarified in order for the campus to fulfill what this law says we should be doing. So there will be a map and we'll have that on our web page and we'll have that in the newspaper and we'll have to tell people. Other things that we'll need to do is remove all of the outside ashtrays, outside cigarette receptacles that we have on campus. We plan to first put signs on them this spring that this is coming and to notify people. I think I mentioned having a website already. We will have multiple, multiple kinds of ways to inform the campus. Somebody else? Yes?

**Unidentified:** You mentioned earlier that you're going to have other meetings with like the students and other people across campus. My question is, is it more of an informative type meeting because it seems to me that the decision has already been made and I wonder how much effect people's opinions about this or suggestions will alter what is inevitable.

**D. Block:** Well, we do need to follow this law, so that decision has been made. There are a couple of things that we could still perhaps change. I mentioned the smoking in automobiles that could be interpreted either way. We will see what the community feeling is about that. The other place where we kind of went a little bit further than what the law mandated is the last sentence of this draft policy which prohibits chewing tobacco, etc. There doesn't seem, from the people we've talked to, and the task group thought that that met the general intent of the law and it was good to do that too and we didn't want people having to put spittoons up on campus if people were trying to get other kinds of tobacco use, and we know that these other kinds of tobacco products are also dangerous for people. But that is another area where that's not mandated by the law, but the task force thought that was a reasonable thing to include to have a tobacco-free campus.

So in answer to your question, are these community conversations that we're going to have, is that just to tell them about the policy. It will tell them that there is a policy but for the nitty gritty wording of things, there is still time to have input, for people to have input. On our web page, we will also have a place where people can individually ask questions. We will have a frequently asked question section in there. I think we really need to solidify exactly what the policy is going to be by probably the end of March, April at the very latest, for people to prepare. We have heard just about from smoking in parking lots, we have heard from students, "Well, good. That will help me really stop if I can't smoke in the parking lot either." So I don't know exactly how that's going to be but yes, we're seriously taking into account what people are saying.

Also, their input will be important about other kinds of educational things that we'll have to do in relation to the law. We've started a number of articles in NIU Today about smoking cessation. We're investigating whether nicotine replacement therapy gum could be sold at like sporting

events, if legally it can be. We have some issues in order to who's going to sell that. So we're looking at some other ways to do things, but we're taking people's comments including your comments right now very seriously. Yes?

**G. Slotsve:** I was just curious, it is a task force. Was there a smoker on the task force?

**D. Block:** Yes.

**G. Slotsve:** There was? Okay.

**D. Block:** There is. As it turned out, all of the people who of the original group that was around the table were either former smokers, most of us, or nonsmokers, and we worked very hard to get a very outspoken smoker on the task force.

**G. Slotsve:** You did? Okay, I wanted to make sure.

**D. Block:** Any other questions? Thank you.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you very much, Dean Block.

B. [Budget Overview and Program Prioritization](#) – Provost Lisa Freeman  
[Postponed until 4 p.m.]

C. Open Access to Research Articles Act (OARAA) Task Force – Gleb Sirotkin – [report](#) – Pages 5-6

**W. Pitney:** Item B, of course, under announcements, we've decided to be flexible with that one and we'll address that one when Dr. Freeman comes on board. Item C is Gleb. I haven't seen Gleb. Okay, just an update there, oh he is. Where? There he is. Gleb, would you like to give us an update on the task force? Sorry I missed you back there, I just couldn't see back there.

**G. Sirotkin:** I think I gave a pretty good report last spring, and I included the final documents in this agenda, so everything that we were asked to do, we did; and everything in time, so there is nothing much to add there.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you very much. The task force worked to get some language together for a policy, and our Academic Affairs Committee under the leadership of Sarah McHone-Chase, developed a resolution from the Faculty Senate and a policy that passed through the University Council is now actually in our APPM. Thank you, Gleb.

D. Proposed curricular committee revisions – Bill Pitney

**W. Pitney:** Item D. I just wanted to update the Faculty Senate and make you aware of two proposals that are currently being examined by the University Council Academic Policy Committee. Virginia Naples is leading that committee, and they're examining these. So just for Faculty Senate's information, these proposals are a starting point to help streamline our

curricular processes here at NIU and each proposal consolidates two curriculum committees into one. For example, the first is a consolidation of the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment and the Committee for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education. Vice Provost Anne Birberick and I sat down in the late summer and early fall, and we started looking at these committees. We looked at some items that really, committee tasks, excuse me, that really no longer apply and some that were redundant across the committees and developed some language to allow us to fold those committees together so that we can kind of save some of our human resources and be just as thoughtful but a little bit more streamlined and efficient. The second proposal consolidates the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee. The same type of thing there, we looked for any redundancies and overlap and attempted to fold those together. So again, these are just some starting places to initiate the discussion to see how we can be just a bit less cumbersome with our curricular processes but just as thoughtful. And the Academic Policy Committee, we will work on this and once we've got some decisions made on that, we'll bring that back to the Faculty Senate for some input.

Some additional announcements: Our next Faculty Club lunch is scheduled for February 4 in the Chandelier Room. I believe the menu is soup and salad. Reservations are due to Pat Erickson by January 26. We had some great turnouts last fall with our Faculty Club lunches and it's a super time to connect with colleagues and have some interesting discussions over a good meal.

My last announcement is that nominations for the executive secretary for the University Council and Faculty Senate President will be taken at our next Faculty Senate meeting. So if you are interested in serving in this role and would like to learn more, I'm happy to meet with you and discuss that. So that's my announcements.

## **V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

- A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy [Award](#) – call for nominations – Page 7  
Written letters of nomination should be submitted to Faculty Senate President William Pitney no later than noon Monday, February 9, 2015.

**W. Pitney:** Let's move on to item IV on our agenda. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award nominations will be accepted by February 9. So I think this is a shared governance award so think of your colleagues that have served on Faculty Senate, perhaps on many committees, had a voice in our shared governance process and brought lots of issues to light and if there's anybody you would like to nominate for that award, please have letters to me no later than February 9.

## **VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

## **VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

- A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report  
[November 21, 2014](#) – Page 8  
[December 12, 2014](#) – Pages 9-10  
[January 16, 2015](#) – walk-in



**W. Pitney:** We have no Consent Agenda, so we're going to move on to our reports from our advisory committees. I'd like to ask all of us reporting today, let's just kind of keep it to the key points and findings, make these brief as we move through these. So we'll start with Sonya Armstrong, our representative on the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE.

**S. Armstrong:** Hi. So, I've actually been all over the state in the past three months with these meetings. The November meeting, I'll tell you is really information specific to that institution. I did provide you links so if you wanted to look up information on the work at Oakton Community College with regard to STEM, I'll leave you to explore that on your own. Not a whole lot of IBHE business happened at the November meeting.

In December, we did meet in Springfield with the staff of the IBHE. I tried to give some detailed information on some of the conversations, so I'll leave you to read those, but I can answer any questions about the game changers in the GPS program that IBHE has adopted. That's there at the bottom of page 1. Dr. Applegate did talk extensively about that. What I will say that is not on the December report is that this ended up being the last budget report from Alan Phillips from the IBHE, so we'll be seeing him around campus now more.

The January meeting just happened on Friday, and we learned of some staffing changes at the IBHE. Our IBHE liaison, that was his last day he reported to us on that day, so whereas in the November and I think the December reports, I've said that the IBHE Academic Affairs Division is fully staffed, that is no longer the case. And we've seen this before, so we're looking at probably some new folks to the Academic Affairs Division. I think those are the key points, but I'm happy to answer any questions.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Any questions for Sonya? All right, seeing none, we'll move on.

B. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC – [report](#) –  
Page 11

**W. Pitney:** Is Brian Mackie available? Okay, we've got our University Benefits Committee report. This is from the November 20 meeting, so it's been quite some time ago. George, I think you could step in and maybe comment on some of those.

**G. Slotsve:** Yes, I'll just highlight a couple of things. I'm also on the University Benefits Committee, so I'll skip Brian's report. I guess a couple of things that I just want to highlight, and that's under point 4, the two action items. Something that we've been looking into and talking about is seeing if we could get increased bus service or better transportation between the Elburn train station and NIU, maybe having it run on a more regular basis, that type of thing.

We also know there are a number of people who commute, say from Chicago out here, so we've also been looking into and we're going to check into is whether or not you can purchase, we can have parking passes that you purchase at Elburn so that you could leave your car there five days a week but rather than having to pay the \$1.25 or \$1.50 every day, that you could get kind of a

monthly pass or that type of a thing and maybe leave your car there, hopefully at a slightly better rate than the daily rate. So we're looking into a number of those issues out in Elburn.

**W. Pitney:** Excellent. Thank you, George. Much appreciated. Any questions for George? Seeing none, we'll move on.

- C. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – no report
- D. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and William Pitney – no report
- E. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – no report
- F. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Dan Gebo – no report
- G. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Greg Waas – no report
- H. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee – William Pitney – report  
[November 14, 2014](#) – Page 12

**W. Pitney:** I don't think we have any reports until we get down to item H, the Board of Trustees Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee that can be found on page 12. Just a reminder that the Board of Trustees actually created two ad hoc committees this past academic year. This was one of them, the ad hoc committee on enrollment. The November 14 meeting was essentially an information gathering session for the Board of Trustees to learn about what steps NIU is taking to improve our enrollment, what steps NIU is taking to retain students and those sorts of things. One of the key things from that committee is they asked for additional information, which was recently presented at the second meeting. Those minutes are yet to come and a lot of that information related to the number of scholarships that we provide and the basis of the scholarships and how we decide to award scholarships to students. Any questions on that ad hoc committee reports?

- I. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – William Pitney – report  
[November 17, 2014](#) – Page 13

**W. Pitney:** Moving on, there was also an Ad Hoc Governance Committee developed. The report can be found on page 13. This is the Governance Ad Hoc Committee. Like the previous one, this is a bit of information gathering, but also more of the Board of Trustees prioritizing some of their policies that they would like to update and change. Many of the policies for our Board of Trustees have been in existence since we moved from a Board of Regents to a Board of Trustees back in '96 I think. So they've not really been examined and updated. So just as some examples, they're keen on identifying a succession policy set of procedures so if the President might be indisposed for more than 30 days or incapacitated in some regard, there would be a clear line of succession in place.

They're also keen on looking at updating some conflict of interest policies for the board, etc. So they're working on those. Any questions about that governance? I guess I will point out also in this report the fourth paragraph down. Now I commented on this last November because there was a bit of information supplied in the Northern Star that didn't really reflect what the board was interested in. The board was interested in understanding more about the tenure process, tenure and promotion process because as it currently stands, what they approve are all of the faculty that are put forth to receive tenure or promotion. What the board doesn't see is the flip side, if there are any folks denied tenure or promotion, and the board was just interested in learning about that and obtaining that information; they're not interested in controlling or changing that process. So I just wanted to make that clear.

J. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Paged 14-15

**W. Pitney:** The last report, page 14-15. This is our December Board of Trustees meeting. I think there are probably three key items to bring to your attention here. Number 1, the Board of Trustees approved the cost of attendance put forth by the administration. What this means is that the cost of attendance for our students, undergraduate students in particular, will go down. If you dissect the report, tuition will go up slightly, but as I understand it, the room and board will go down significantly and offset that.

I think the second thing is that they approved some changes to the graduate and law school tuition. The key pieces here are that they have consolidated the tuition and fees to make it easier for our students to understand the cost of attendance and will also help some students get reimbursed for some of their courses that they might take if an employer is willing to pay for courses for him or her.

Then lastly, the recent search for the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management failed. As I recall, I think that might be the second such failed search for this position and because the university is entering, especially at that point in time in early December, entering such a critical phase in recruiting students to NIU, the administration put forth a proposal to sign off on a contract with Lipman Hearne, a Chicago-based marketing company. They actually specialize in higher education, specifically enrollment management. This is the same firm that Southern Illinois University had used to turn their enrollment issues around. They had a couple of searches, did a full, it's a very critical position. And what the contract will do is put two individuals from that company on campus, kind of as our boots on the ground, day-to-day operations of administration for what the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management would otherwise do. The other piece of the contract would pay for services directly from Lipman Hearne that will include some communications flow and outbound telecommunications and even some of the tactics for increasing enrollment used by the university. So that's kind of the jist of that contract with Lipman Hearne, that that's not in place of this position, this is temporary for the next several months to get us through this critical time. The search for this position will then be opened up I think next summer and hopefully get a full-time Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management in place at that point in time. So those are, I think the three key things from that report. Any questions?

## VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – no report
- C. Economic Status of the Profession – George Slotsve, Chair – no report
- D. Rules and Governance – Gary Baker, Chair – no report
- E. Resources, Space and Budget – Stephen Tonks, Liaison/Spokesperson – [report](#) – Pages 16-24

**W. Pitney:** Seeing none, let's go ahead and move on to our reports from standing committees, and I don't think we have any reports until we get down to the Resources, Space, and Budget. You can find that on page 16-24 in your packet. Stephen Tonks is not able to be with us today, so I will fill in as best I can. This report was born out of many questions that were raised by Faculty Senate at I think our first meeting last fall. There were lots of questions related to higher administration and salaries, etc. and so you'll see a couple things in this report. On the very first page is kind of just a summative overview from fiscal year 2013 to currently and then projecting to 2017 in terms of the salaries for upper administration. The sum and substance of this is that with the projections, after termination, appointment completion, etc., we're looking at about a \$300,000 reduction in those salaries. Some of that is spelled out in the table towards the end of this report. The rest of the report are each of the questions that the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee forwarded from Faculty Senate that we got answers to from our administration. So any questions on that report?

- F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair
  - 1. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the President of Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of University Council – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 7](#) and NIU Bylaws, [Article 14.6.3.10](#) – Pages 25-26

**W. Pitney:** Seeing none, we'll go ahead and move on. I think Therese Arado is going to move us through some Elections and Legislative Oversight tasks.

**T. Arado:** This is from Elections and Legislative Oversight and what we need to do is select a Committee for the Evaluation of the President of Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of the University Council and then also we're going to do a Committee for the Evaluation of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor. So the first item in this election is the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of the University Council, Bill, and the evaluation committee consists of several parts, and I'm going to do them one at a time.

The first is two faculty members of the Faculty Senate who are not elected faculty members of the University Council and one alternate. Would you pull three names out and hand them to me? It is a type of lottery, yes. Our first name is Donna Plonczynski, School of Nursing and Health

Studies. Number two is Gary Chen, Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, and three, you are an alternate. If you hear your name, this is the alternate name, Jana Brubaker, University Libraries.

The second category are two faculty members of the University Council along with one alternate. Pull three names out of here, please. Okay, so faculty members of the University Council, Abul Azad, Department of Engineering and Technology. I'm not hearing anyone cheering. Kheang Un, Department of Political Science, and this third name is the alternate, Fred Markowitz, Department of Sociology.

Now this is one student member of University Council and one alternate.

I'm sorry, I said those, and the second group was Faculty Senate who are not elected members of the University Council. The first was faculty members on the University Council, so Faculty Senate, not University Council. I listed the wrong title, but I pulled from the right hat for it.

Our first student member, Alyssa Freeman, College of Law. Good for her. And our student alternate is Ben Donovan, Student Association.

Category five is one Supportive Professional Staff member, Deborah Haliczzer, Director of Employee Relations.

And one Operating Staff member of the University Council, Gina Shannon, Department of Special and Early Education.

All right, so that was all of the ones for the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of University Council.

2. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 7](#) and NIU Bylaws, [Article 14.6.3.10](#) – Pages 27-28

Next, is the selection of the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor, Paul Stoddard. And this committee consists of three faculty members from the Faculty Senate and one alternate. The pool also includes the faculty members of University Council who have automatic dual membership on Faculty Senate. Now I'm paranoid, I have to check my envelope. Two names and one alternate please. Fred Markowitz, I just called you, you are a lucky man, go buy a lottery ticket. So because of that, because you're already on one, we're not going to have you, so I'm putting your name aside and selecting a new first person. Rosemary Feurer, Department of History. Brian Mackie, Department of OMIS. This is another duplicate, Gary Chen, so that one will get put aside. Barbara Schwartz-Bechet, Department of Special and Early Education. And now this is our alternate, Cynthia Campbell, Department of Educational Technology, Research, and Assessment.

Then there is also one Supportive Professional Staff member of the University Council. We don't need to draw that person because there are only two SPS members of the University

Council and so, since Deborah Haliczzer won the first race, Cathy Doederlein gets to win the second race on that one. Any questions that I may be able to answer or ask Bill or Pat to answer?

**W. Pitney:** Thank you very much, Therese.

## **IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

## **X. NEW BUSINESS**

## **XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

### **A. Faculty Senate's role in the curricular process**

**W. Pitney:** Well, we've moved along really well with our agenda. We've got about seven minutes before Provost Freeman will join us, and that will conclude our meeting. If you'll look at item XI (and I skipped to item XI because we have no unfinished business and no new business), I wanted to offer some questions to the Faculty Senate. So under Comments and Questions from the Floor, just to start a discussion here, I'm wondering what the thoughts are from this body of having Faculty Senate have a greater role in the curricular process. That's my general question. Right now, we certainly have an abundance of faculty representation at lots of C committees, curriculum committees, but right now, those decisions are made and reported to the University Council and into the catalog it goes. This is my question: Should Faculty Senate have a greater role in the curricular process? Then, of course, because it's yes or no, there's the please explain at the end. Any thoughts, reactions, comments to that?

**B. Jaffee:** I don't have a thought or a comment. I have a question. Maybe you could say something more about what the University Council's role is in the curricular process so we could think about what the Faculty Senate might add.

**W. Pitney:** I don't know if you could hear very well, but she asked me to comment on what the current University Council role is. Now, certainly right now, University Council has approval of all of the committee compositions, the committee structure and processes are all part of our constitution, so if we wanted to change the composition or structure or tasks of any of our curricular committees, we would have to go through University Council for approval. Also, curricular changes, for example, this is a good example actually, with the changes to the general education program to the NIU PLUS, Faculty Senate had a little voice on it to endorse the concept and framework and we did that last fall. That was voted to the Provost and Vice Provost, Dr. Freeman and Dr. Birberick respectively. That's gone through the committee channels and was unanimously approved by the UCC, the Undergraduate Coordinating Council. Now that goes up to University Council, and it's listed there in the information items. Right now, what can happen is, if the University Council thought that there were an issue with it, they could derail it by sending it back. So that's kind of where things are at right now. Right now, we've got a process in place that I think works, but I'm wondering if Faculty Senate shouldn't have a greater role. I don't know if that helps a little bit.

One idea, just to further this conversation a little bit, one idea that's been batted around is whether or not Faculty Senate should have a little bit more oversight of those curricular items that really affect the entire university community, such as our general education program and the honors program. So that conversation is still in its infancy in some of the curricular bodies and amongst the faculty, but I think it's an interesting question, isn't it? If curriculum is in the hands of the faculty, maybe the Faculty Senate should have a little bit more input or oversight. Any other questions, comments, reactions?

**G. Slotsve:** I just wanted to mention another case where this might have made a difference, where there was more faculty oversight. That goes back a year or so when we were voting on the plus/minus grading. If we'd had more Faculty Senate oversight, it might have made a difference, and that process, how quickly decisions were made and exactly how those decisions were carried out, if we'd had more faculty oversight from the Faculty Senate.

**W. Pitney:** That's another good example, I think. So I'm not seeing a lot of hands raised, I'm not seeing people flock to the microphones, and it's coming right up on 4:00 on the button. Dr. Freeman, so perfect, why don't you come on up. We're going to go ahead and if you wouldn't mind please, just when you consider that question I asked related to Faculty Senate's role in the curricular process, I think that's worth discussing further and perhaps we'll bring that up in Questions and Comments from the floor here in the near future. But that concludes our business agenda. This is great timing actually. So this is perfect.

#### **IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**B.**     [Budget Overview and Program Prioritization](#) – Provost Lisa Freeman  
[Postponed until 4 p.m.]

**W. Pitney:** Dr. Freeman, thank you for coming in today to discuss some updates and things with us, and I'm going to turn the floor over to you. Would you like the microphone?

**L. Freeman:** All right, and when I'm ready for slides, Pat, are you going to be my clicker? All right, well good afternoon everybody. I hope everyone had a safe walk over here. It is a little icy right now, so please be careful on your way out. Thank you for inviting me here to speak with you. I understand that you're interested in updates on a number of subjects, not just program prioritization, and I'm certainly open to speaking about budgets, speaking to some elements that we might have heard last night in President Obama's address, answering any other questions that you have. But the one piece that I was asked to address where I felt that slides would be really helpful in starting the conversation was program prioritization, so I put together a very brief presentation, and I think it's really up to you if you'd like me to start there and answer all questions at the end or if you'd like to proceed in another manner, so Professor Pitney? All right, so if we could move to the next slide.

So there's a lot of talk at every level of NIU about program prioritization and what it means for our campus, and my experience in going out and talking to groups is that most people assume there's been a lot more decided than there actually has been decided, and that there's not necessarily a common understanding of what program prioritization entails where at large or



with program prioritization at NIU is going to look like or is designed to achieve. So I want to say that I think that program prioritization is an important step towards having a culture that's data informed and a process that's formalized for making decisions that we actually already make about how to identify philanthropic targets, how to invest resources strategically, how to restructure programs, how to start new programs, and how to sunset programs that aren't necessarily working. And when I say program, we'll talk a little bit more about the definition of a program in the context of program prioritization further on, but I don't just mean academic programs, I also mean administrative programs. It was before my time, but I assume that at some point, NIU had people who were tasked with purchasing and repairing Selectric typewriters and yet, I don't think we have that unit anymore or that task as a priority. I'm always asked, this is just a way to cut, this is just a way to eliminate programs, to eliminate positions, and I will thoroughly dispute that with every bone in my body. I think you should do this type of prioritization exercise to align your budget with your strategic priorities in good times and in bad so that you position NIU for excellence and value and that you have a foundation for having a portfolio of programs that allows the institutions to reach its maximum potential and to keep resources and programs in sync.

So I kind of have covered the what, covered a little bit of the why and really the rest of the slides are about the when and the how and in addition, there will be a lot more communication coming out over the course of the next really 9 to 12 months about the when and the how. I think I'm going to move next to the timeline to show everybody that this is not a process that is well worked out at this point and it's not something that's going to be over within the next three weeks or three months. This is a long process.

In fall of 2014, we did an initial exploration of the program prioritization process, developed a coordinating team and had only the very most preliminary conversations with the campus. This semester and over the course of the summer, we're going to be working with the campus community to develop the criteria for prioritizing programs, we'll be seeking nominations for two task forces that will be looking at doing the actual prioritization of administrative and academic programs, and I'll say a little bit more about what's involved there. We'll be gathering data, we'll be asking folks and assisting folks with receiving the data they need to do the analysis of the data relevant to their own programs, and we'll be continuing communications with campus.

In fall of 2015, we'll continue the analysis and communications process, and we'll have the two task forces starting to work on prioritization. This presentation will be made available to you and be posted so everyone will have it.

In spring 2016, we'll be expecting the task forces to complete their prioritization of programs, dividing them into quintiles or five groups, and then there will be some type of resource allocation exercise by the senior leadership based on the program prioritization that will impact the budget for the first time in 2017 and obviously through this, there will be continued communications throughout the campus.

So this is our intended tentative to-date agreed-upon timeline. And so I want to point out there that we're talking about an orderly process that's under development, that has multiple



opportunities for input from faculty, staff, and others who consider themselves to be key stakeholders, and that nothing the Governor sends us – and believe me, we have incoming messages from Springfield frequently with required responses – is going to force us to collapse or accelerate or really make this process lose its integrity. We're going to have respond to requests from Springfield, don't get me wrong, but it's not going to be by making a travesty of the program prioritization pathway that we've already started down.

So when you think of the basic components of program prioritization and when I say that, I really mean any program prioritization process. So if you're in a discipline where you submit proposals to seek external funding to a federal agency or to a foundation, or if you're in a discipline where you have juried performances or juried exhibitions, these are steps that are familiar to you. There's some type of guiding principles for the process, what's allowable, what the goals are, there's an inventory of available programs, there are criteria for the program evaluation, there are data templates and submission formats, review panels, scoring systems, and then processes for connecting the findings to action steps.

So I'm a life scientist by training, so the example that comes the most easily to my mind, because I'm the most familiar with it, is submitting a grant to an agency like the NIH. The NIH has certain rules about who can submit grants. You can't be working in your garage, you have to be working at a university. You have to be submitting something that is translatable to affect the public health of citizens in the United States. They have an inventory of categories where you submit grants and, under each one of those, there are programs that you can submit and programs that don't meet the criteria. So there are agreed-upon common definitions. They have criteria for program evaluation, they are posted on the website. They are made available to the people who submit grants as well as to the reviewers and you understand what the template for submitting a proposal is, what the expected data elements are, what the questions you have to answer are. And you use that to make your best case. There is a review panel that does the initial review. It's a peer review panel, it's held in confidence. The panel has a scoring rubric that they use to see which proposal is the most compelling according to the agreed-upon criteria and then at NIH, the process for connecting those findings to an action step is that the panel's findings go to a second level of review and then the grants are ordered and, according to available resources, awards are made. And so, to me, these are basic elements of any program prioritization system.

When we talk about the guiding principles for program prioritization at NIU, the first principle is there are no sacred cows. We are looking at a framework that will evaluate programs that are academic and programs that are administrative and, yes, that includes athletic programs. There are no sacred cows. Our guiding principle is that tenure will be honored, contracts will be honored and programs that may be restructured or diminished in a way that require personnel to change their suite of responsibilities or portfolio of expectations, those personnel will be supported, and we will make every effort to retain valued personnel at NIU.

So those are sort of our guiding principles, but our overall purpose is to really align our mission and our strategic framework with our budget, and this isn't some crazy idea that the Provost and the President came up with; it was suggested to us strongly by the Higher Learning Commission during our accreditation visit, and it's been a priority of the Board of Trustees from the time of the presidential search that hired President Baker and through the current time. Next slide.

So when we were thinking of frameworks for program prioritization, we looked at a conference that was held in Chicago sponsored by an organization called Academic Impressions that does professional development and continuing education. And they brought to Chicago, Robert Dickeson who wrote the book that was probably one of the major influential pieces that started the program prioritization movement within the academic context. Dr. Dickeson is shown below the book and I think many of you have looked at the book. Larry Goldstein who's in the upper right as you're looking at it, very familiar to business officers who attend the NACUBO conference, kind of the person who really took the next step along with the president of Drake University of saying, "Program prioritization isn't about academic programs only. When you're looking at a university's resource, you need to look at every penny that's invested by the university, not think somehow that it's only the academic side that needs to reevaluate." And then on the bottom right, we see Sharon Vasquez who's the provost of the University of Hartford and she came to the conference to give a provost's perspective. The big fat book that you see on the left side compiled the experience of about 10 universities who have done program prioritizations suggested some people who are contacts for any university who is embarking down this pathway.

And we felt very fortunate to be able to take the train into Chicago and start looking at this framework as the starting point for what we would be doing at NIU. Because you have to have a framework with the elements that I showed on the previous slide. The framework that's been put forward and that's evolved is the result of Bob Dickeson's book, Larry Goldstein and Bob Dickeson working with up to, I don't know, probably 50 campuses at this point in time. All of that framework, development, customization, university experience, provides a way for us to start. Next slide.

The people who went to the conference who are now considered the coordinating or facilitating team for the process on our campus are listed on the right. You may wonder why they're color coded, and they're color coded according to the sub-teams that we've formed for the initial group. Jeff Reynolds, Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, and Susan Mini are actually our data sub-team. Jeff Reynolds is basically our data and analytics person within the Division of Academic Affairs. Ibrahim was included because he's the chair of the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee of the University Council, so he represents the shared governance committee that is responsible for providing input on budget resource and space decisions. Susan Mini is the Vice Provost for Resource Planning.

The next color which is either blue or purple depending on your eyes. Bill Pitney is obviously here as the President of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Secretary of the University Council. Brett Coryell is our Chief Information Officer, but he was included in this team so that the cabinet divisions outside of Academic Affairs had some representation. We also knew that Information Technology was going to be an important partner going forward. Marc Falkoff is a professor in the Law School as the chair of the Academic Planning Council, so he is representing shared governance for a group that's already very familiar with program review, which is a process that's distinct from program prioritization but a process that at least allows people to have a breadth of knowledge about programs across the university and metrics that are commonly used.

In gray, Denise Schoenbachler is representing the deans. Andy Small is representing Operating Staff and also the statewide body that represents Civil Service employees. Kelly Wesener from Student Affairs was fortunate enough to have funding to join us. That committee makes up the Communications Committee. A lot of knowledge there about communicating across stakeholder groups, staff, faculty, and students.

Carolinda Douglass, our Vice Provost for Academic Planning is facilitating the entire process and obviously I went to the conference too because I thought it was important to hear from everyone who was sitting at our table and everyone who was sitting at the other tables. Next slide.

So when I envision the role of this team, I want to make it very clear this team is not a decision-making body, this team is a facilitating or a coordinating body. Drawn here with dotted lines because I sort of see them as porous, and the three subgroups within the coordinating team will work with communication support across our campus and the Division of Marketing and Communications, IT, the Provost's Office, to make sure that we get our message out. The President and I are doing a town hall next week. I spoke with SPS Council last week, I'm here today. We have a website that will be unveiled within the next 10 days. It will have a box for anonymous questions and answers as well as an FAQ page, and so we'll continue to try to have that type of communication on our campus this semester.

Next fall we'll kick off with a panel that includes faculty and others from campuses that have been through this so that we can learn from their experience. The data group within the coordinating team is working with the divisions on campus that always supply us with data that we need to inform our internal management decisions, so that's Institutional Research, Registration, and Records, Academic Analysis and Reporting, Sponsored Projects. I'm sure I'm forgetting divisions, but that fit in the box. And then we have people across campus who we need to contact at various points in the process that we will need to contact to ask their expertise when we have questions that we need answers to that are not immediately available to us. These include the Faculty Senate committees, the Core Budget Team, the Council of Deans and cabinet members. Next slide.

So I eluded earlier to the fact that the definition of a program for this purpose is probably not the definition of a program that you walk around with in your head every day. A program is any activity or collection of activities of the institution that consumes resources, and resources are dollars, people, space, equipment, and time. So the first thing to recognize is that on the academic side or the administrative side, a program is not a department. The other thing that's different in the way we use terminology in program prioritization versus our everyday lives is that academic programs in this context are really programs that get CIP codes, which means they're generally instructional or degree programs or centers or institutes. They are programs that the Academic Planning Council reports to the IBHE about and so they're not academic departments. An academic department typically has a bachelor's, a master's, a doctoral program, it may have a minor, it may fulfill gen ed requirements. There may be a center or institute that's nested within a department, but those would all be individual programs.

Some of the things that we very much think of as academic in the large sense like the library, the provost's office, are administrative in this context. Academic advising is administrative in this context because it supports the mission of the university including the academic and student mission but in an ancillary or an auxiliary capacity. We're not trying to make anybody feel that they're not part of the academic mission, but the way we're going to need to identify those programs using the university budget templates and funding lines for things like advising, for things like the library, fit more with the administrative side than with the academic side.

But again, administrative divisions and departments may contain multiple programs, so I said there are no sacred cows and athletics is being considered, but we're not like going to have athletics at large as the program prioritization unit of consideration. There will be the football team, the basketball team, athletic compliance, athletic advising, I mean there will be programs within athletics that are discernable units in terms of the way we fund them. Okay, next.

So the criteria for program prioritization vary across the campuses that have done this, and different campuses have different strategies for selecting the criteria. We have a subcommittee that Bill is actually heading, but that's sort of, I showed you on the previous slide who was in it, it was the blue group, and they're looking at how to do a Qualtrics survey and what to put in the Qualtrics survey so that we can get feedback from everybody in our campus community on what our criteria should be and what the weighting of the various criteria should be. One possible starting point and one set of criteria that I suspect will wind up in the survey, although we have no decisions yet, would be the criteria that are in the Dickeson book history, development, and expectation, external demand/internal demand, program inputs and processes, program outcomes. These are quality indicators, size/scope/productivity of the program, revenue and other resources, cost, impact justification and then opportunity analysis.

And I just want to make a couple points here. We own the right to choose our own criteria. In the guiding principles that we have agreed upon going forward in the process, it's very clear and very important to us that we want qualitative as well as quantitative criteria to be considered and I think number 10, a criteria that I personally like, although my vote will not have any more weight than anybody else's vote here, opportunity analysis of the program is a way to say, "My program could be that much better with this much resources, and that would benefit our institution or mission, etc."

So this is a starting point. It's probably one of the places we'll be asking for feedback, but many campuses, in fact most campuses that do program prioritization think 10 criteria is a lot and they tend to collapse them. If you look at these criteria, Drake University and the University of Minnesota Duluth and a number of other universities have collapsed the 10 criteria to these five. They use these five criteria for both administrative and academic programs; however, the questions that are framed under the five criteria vary a little bit from the administrative side to the academic side because of the inherent differences in the types of programs. I think the reason these five have become popular is because the campuses that use them were relatively successful and they were also the campuses that published in things like the \_\_\_\_ Journal about their experience, so these are out there for consideration. Again, we'll be asking about collapsed criteria, potential weights, different approaches, in the survey which will be going out sometime probably next month I think. Next slide.

Eventually when we go through the process, there will be two task forces that are separate from each other, one looking at academic programs and one looking at administrative programs. These task forces will have a slightly different composition. The one that's charged to look at academic programs will be 100 percent faculty. The one that's charged to look at administrative programs will have faculty representation but will also have staff and others. Both of the task forces will be representative in terms of units across the university. They'll be asked to evaluate the programs based on this criteria that were selected through a collaborative process, review and analyze what's presented to them and what's presented to them will be the programs making their own cases, doing their own data analysis. And then they will provide a prioritization of the administrative programs to the leadership, organized into quintiles.

We will be launching, after we finish the survey, a process this spring for nominating people to these task forces, and I just want to make the point here – and this point will be made over and over again before we launch the survey – this is not the place in the task force nomination to say, “I need to get someone from my department who understands my program on this task force to make sure that my program is advantaged.” The people who we want to have sitting on these task forces are leaders who have what I call and what has been called by others a trustee mentality, people who really can think from an institutional benefit.

The place to make the case for your program is in your submission and in how you analyze the data and what data you request using the criteria. I think that it's hard for people sometimes to trust others to do that, but I will also say that I suspect that if I handed out blank papers, and I'm not going to do this so don't panic, but if I handed out a blank paper and I asked everybody in this room to write down five names of respected members of NIU's faculty who have a trustee mentality, there'd be a lot of overlap among what people write down, because I think we all have a sense of who has that perspective. The nomination process won't just be writing a name. We'll ask people to justify their choice and we'll probably ask for references and go forward.

So I think that's all I want to say now and I'm happy to take questions, but I want to make it clear that when I say I don't know, there's not a hidden agenda, it's because I really don't know. This ship is under construction as it's moving away from the dock. This is typical of initiating this type of process on campuses, and I will tell you everything I know about this, the budget, the Obama speech, but there's going to be a lot of stuff where I'm going to be like, “Well, your guess is as good as mine, maybe better than mine, or I just don't know, it hasn't been decided yet.” And that's an opportunity for you to share what you think and if you don't want to share it in this format, people know where my office is and they know what my email is. So I'll stop there and leave time for Q&A. Yes?

**W. Pitney:** Any questions?

**B. Jaffee:** At one point you mentioned program review in proximity to program prioritization, making the point that the two are distinct from one another. Could you just say something more about that? They sound like they're the same thing.

**L. Freeman:** Okay, so that's a great question because that's something that's fairly confusing to people who embark on this process. And so program review is something that we do at NIU on a regular cycle for many, if not all, of our programs. The cycle for program review is, in some cases, mandated by an accrediting body and in other cases mandated by the IBHE. And I'm sure everyone in this room has had the experience, I won't even try to put an adjective on it, of preparing all of that material. If you think about what you do in program review, you're looking at your program and the health of your program, benchmarking it against like programs at other institutions. So, are my faculty more productive, are my students doing better in the workplace, am I creating a program that's recognized nationally through awards and how do I look compared to the programs that I consider peers, the programs that are at Illinois publics, the programs that are at MAC schools. So there, you're really comparing apples to apples across different institutions, and that's a very important activity for a program to go through to do the self-study, to think about things.

When you're looking at program prioritization, although some of the metrics in data analysis you do may be similar and some may be different, you're asking, I'm looking at all of the programs within the institution, and I'm comparing programs that are dissimilar in their discipline in different departments but using criteria that are tied at a high level to our mission and vision and saying, "How do we allocate resources based on the prioritization of these programs in the universe that we control?" And so there are similarities, but there are differences between program review and program prioritization. Yes?

**G. Slotsve:** I would like to ask. It's a question but it involves the affect it's going to have on enrollments as well as taking this into account for a program prioritization, but have you been thinking about what Obama mentioned about what Rahm Emmanuel started in Chicago in free community college and how that's going to affect enrollments at NIU? What's going to happen there? How do we take that into account on program prioritization? I'm assuming it's going to have an effect on the type of programs that we're going to be offering here.

**L. Freeman:** So, let me try to answer that in a couple of different parts and then, if I'm not satisfying you, we can come back to that. The specific Obama proposal for free community college looking like either Chicago Star or the Tennessee program, is a \$60 billion proposal that he has suggested paying for through taxes on the wealthy and with two Republican-controlled houses, the proposal will probably not have legs.

But the proposal speaks very loudly to the public perception of the value offered by community colleges, the importance of affordability and accessibility of education and the failure of institutions, like ours and others, to perhaps make the case for our value proposition. In the State of Illinois, I don't think I have to tell anyone that we are not on strong financial footing. If you've been following what Governor Rauner has been saying, if you've been listening to public radio in the morning like I do, you know that yesterday, the think tank at the University of Illinois issued a report called Apocalypse Now. I think the title says it all. It talks about a \$9 to \$10 billion deficit in the coming fiscal year that can balloon to \$20 billion deficit over the course of the next decade.

And so higher education in Illinois, which has to compete with prisons, which has to compete with other things, is in a precarious place. We can make the case that we can make for higher ed and by the way, I saw a fascinating statistic that I think you'll be interested in. I saw this at the Board of Trustees Ad Hoc meeting. Last year was the first time that, when you look at the educational investment in the State of Illinois within the university system, the contribution to pay pensions exceeded the investment in the university infrastructure. Those lines have crossed and the path is only going to be like this. So we have to think about ways to be more efficient. We have to make the argument that a university like ours offers more than a community college.

I think NIU is in a particularly good position to make some of those arguments because of the population that we serve. Historically, we have served a large fraction of first generation students and students from under-represented minority groups, historically under-represented groups. This means our students are more needy, it means we compete more with community colleges, but it also means that, if we offer them an experience that's superior because of the way we engage them and offer them the opportunity to see knowledge created as well as delivered, then we are contributing to the future of American competitiveness and we're preventing your address from limiting your access to a certain type of university education. That's a hard argument to make, and we need to think about what we do and make strong arguments for what we do as a university to contain our costs, to be efficient, to offer students various pathways, to work more closely with community college colleagues to set up programs that guarantee students can move through more efficiently.

The good news is we've been focused on this at least for the last 18 months and many programs way before that, looking at reverse articulation. And so when the governor comes knocking and says, "Why should we have NIU and what is NIU doing to hold up their end of the bargain?" we can say, "We're voluntarily engaged in program prioritization. We've been working closely with the 28 community colleges that feed our admissions. We are looking at better ways to serve adult learners who are an important part of the community. We've partnered with the region. Look at what we've done in Rockford. We look at those relationships as resources and we have programs that have been recognized nationally for their novelty and trying to maintain a workforce and increased degree attainment for the aerospace cluster there." And so we have an argument that we can make. I think in some ways, the same arguments that we need to make to Governor Rauner and that we need to make to the public who don't really understand higher ed, are going to be arguments that some folks might want to put under some of the criteria and program prioritization. So I don't see program prioritization and the fact that we're in a very scary landscape as antithetical. I see them actually as things that are congruent and speak to the challenging times that we're in, but our willingness to be responsive to those. Barbara?

**B. Jaffee:** I hesitate to ask this, considering this process is just getting started and the timeline you laid out is lengthy, but is this something that we will be doing on a regular basis? And I ask it because you mentioned the possibility of opportunity analysis, so the potential of a program if they get additional funds. So if that is a value that is weighted in our criteria, does that mean we'll regularly be doing program prioritization?

**L. Freeman:** Not annually, but regularly. So universities that go down this pathway, and I think this goes to the point I was trying to make, this is about having a data-informed culture. It's

about being intentional about linking your mission and your strategic framework to resources for the long haul. So typically, universities that embrace program prioritization do full-blown prioritization on kind of a three- to five-year cycle. And in between, there are check-ins on the expectations and are you on track. There are adjustments made, and obviously the process will be evaluated. So what the process looks like the first time may not be what the process looks like exactly the second time because you would hope that we would learn from the experience and try to streamline things and make them work the best way they can work in our culture.

So that wasn't a bad question at all. I thought you were going to ask, "What are we going to do if we really have to face a 20 percent cut?" and what I'll say to you is right now, that number is out there a lot but it's the first salvo over the bow, it's the first move in the chess game, and nobody really thinks that we'll have to face a 20 percent cut. But nobody thinks we're going to have to face a 0 percent cut either. So we're looking very hard right now to figure out what we can do to meet an expected cut in the next fiscal year and a possible to probable give-back of some magnitude in this fiscal year.

But there's a lot of politics in play and when I alluded to multiple things coming in from Springfield, early part of last week we were told, along with all of the other universities, in Illinois, public universities in Illinois, that we should suggest what number we could give back voluntarily and that we had until Friday to do that. I don't even think it was Monday, it might have been more like Tuesday afternoon or Wednesday. So there was a flurry of communications among the publics with the IBHE. Our new Vice President for Finance and Administration kept swapping hats from his NIU hat to the IBHE hat when we were in conversations. And the initial reaction of most of the universities was, "What are you kidding, 0 percent. You're going to take now and take later?" And then there was the, "Do you really want to poke the new governor in the eye with 0 percent?" And there's, "But 94 percent of our 02 funding is already vouchered for the year, so we really don't have a lot to give back." And so what finally was decided by all of the universities was that we would turn something in between 0 percent and 1 percent and we actually turned in something that 0.14 percent or 0.15 percent but I'll explain that. We used the best intelligence we had in Springfield, our lobbyists, our staff Mike Mann who's down there and people who are in the donor community and the trustee community of Illinois who know people in the Governor's Office and we kind of asked what the governor's thinking was, and the governor didn't want to see any institution give back something that would hurt students or the academic mission or the innovation possibilities, which is good because we didn't want to give that back and we didn't have enough to give back anyway, but that he wanted to make sure we were cutting appropriately in other areas. So since we had eliminated the vice presidency that was occupied by Bill Nicklas, what we actually did was take that salary, prorate it to the day that we eliminated his position, take that amount and express it as a percentage of our overall 02 budget and it came out to 0.15 percent, so that's what we submitted and everyone else was somewhere between above 0 and less than 1. I'm not sure if any institution went in at 0, we were told that none was, but I haven't looked at all the proposals. But when I say it's political, I mean, you know, it's political. Yes?

**G. Baker:** Given that complications, what can we expect for faculty hiring?



**L. Freeman:** The question was, given these situations, requests, dynamics, whatever word you word you want to use, what can we expect about faculty hiring? And so right now, we've let go all of the positions that we felt comfortable letting go, so there were certainly some that had been considered yellow light that are not going to go this year. We are trying as hard as we can to preserve all of the faculty hiring that's in pursuit with the caveat that whenever we do a search, there's always fine print at the bottom that says, "Subject to available funds." But we understand how desperately some of these hires are needed.

Last year, Nancy Suttentfield and I had the unpleasant task of closing a \$15 million structural deficit in NIU's budget, and we were able to do that largely through attrition because we had an unprecedented number of people depart from the university. So the good news was we were able to close the deficit without ever thinking about laying off people or having furloughs or anything much less desirable than natural attrition. The bad news is, and you can see I'm being very frank here, the bad news is people don't necessarily retire strategically. So if everybody in one unit retires, whether that's electricians or whether it's faculty in philosophy, we have a hole that we have to fill to have a critical function of the university. And so we have to do some hiring there, and we consider those mission-critical hires. Right now, what we're doing is looking very carefully at our budget to figure out where there is money that we could give back this year and what we could control next year. We're also looking at our budget, we're looking for money, we're also thinking about what we could anticipate in terms of other types of turnover, restructuring, etc. And so faculty hires, because they search now and hire after a delay, are probably more protected, and our goal is protect the academic mission more than everything else. So the answer is, we're not doing a hiring freeze beyond sort of the soft control we've had at this point, and we're going to do everything possible to allow critical hires to go forward, but it's a chess game.

We don't think it's going to be 20 percent. We're hoping it's 0 percent, but we don't think it's going to be 0 percent, and then we're going to figure out what our options are. So every day that it's warm is a little more money that we can skim off a line in the budget that's there for heating and snow removal. And so you think I'm kidding, but I'm not totally kidding. So pray for warm weather.

**J. Novak:** Do we have a sense in Springfield with how NIU competes for money with the other state schools, being Illinois State, Southern, Northern, etc. Are we considered equal, or are we looked at all very differently?

**L. Freeman:** Our appropriations formula for most of the universities until the last year or so has been in incremental formula, which in good times meant base plus and for the last decade meant base minus, and so it was not particularly strategic. In the last couple years, there's been a performance funding component of our appropriation. It's a very small component, single digit percentage, and those performance metrics vary across institution type, so the University of Illinois as a large AAU research institution has different performance expectations than we do and SIU does, and our performance expectations are different than Eastern and Western. So that small component has hurt us a little bit because of the nature of the institution that we are, but it hasn't been a big amount. I think there are other ways of looking at how do we look to Springfield, and I think we have a president who's considered a leader among the presidents.

We got on board with holding tuition flat last year. You'll notice University of Illinois did it this year, but we did it last year, so we appear sensitive to accessibility and affordability before Governor Rauner came into office. I did have the opportunity as Interim Provost last year to sit at the budget hearing in Springfield, and we went in sequence closely, if not immediately after Western Illinois. And I can tell you the difference between the way our president and CFO presented and the way their president and CFO presented was like night and day. So Western, who rumor says is barely making payroll some pay periods, I don't know if that's true or not, but it's certainly out there in the buzz sphere said, "We need money. We're asking for new money. We need this, we need that." And the legislators were fairly hostile. They pressed them on little things. We got up there and we said, "We understand that students need to be able to afford to access higher ed. We're holding tuition flat, we're trying to control expenses on tuition, room and board flat. We're not asking for anything new." And it was like a love fest. So I'm glad we did that last year so that it's on the record and that the governor's staff will be looking at that.

So when you ask, are we all considered equally, yes and no. Certainly if you look at the amount of reserves or funding other than appropriated funds, the University of Illinois has a lot more funding that's not appropriated than we do. We have more than Eastern or Western. When you look at non-appropriated funding, you're basically looking at tuition and fees, which we can't afford to raise anymore. We've shifted what the state has stopped giving us onto the backs of students to an extent where we just can't do it anymore and still have enrollment and still have basically justice.

We get external funding through grants and contracts, but most of that isn't general operating funds because it comes in with specific deliverables in mind that contributes greatly to our academic mission and to our engagement in the community, but it's not money we can spend on just anything and then philanthropy is one of the other big sources of funds and I would say again, our philanthropic operations are better developed than perhaps Eastern and Western and not as well developed as the University of Illinois. That's a place where we need to be doing a better job. One of the things that I think is a good timing for us during program prioritization, hiring a new VP for Advancement and being at the very entry stages of our next capital campaign, our large philanthropic effort is that program prioritization will help us identify things that are important to the university community that are in a priority area and that are also attractive to donors. I mean, I can sit here and tell you that deferred maintenance is a priority. We have pipes that are on the edge of busting. You teach in classrooms that don't look the way a classroom that someone with your qualifications should be teaching in, but a donor really doesn't want to fix a pipe; a donor doesn't care about HVAC. And those are a lot of the root causes for why some of the classrooms are uncomfortable. If we can get a donor to pick up a particular program, if we can get donors to pick up the financial aid that we use institutional dollars to give to students, that loosens up the other dollars to do some other things. And so I think the value of looking at all of our funds as going towards our mission, choosing priorities and then identifying targets that are more likely to get external funds is a good outcome of doing a program prioritization process.

I really appreciate you inviting me here to talk to you. Thank you very much. You've been a great audience and I'm sure you'll have additional questions and you can come directly to me, or you can submit them through Professor Pitney. I'm happy to take them either way.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you, Provost Freeman.

## **XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- E. [Minutes](#), Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- I. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- J. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- O. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- P. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee

## **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**W. Pitney:** That concludes our business for today. I would accept a motion to adjourn. Richard and John Novak. All in favor say “aye.”

**All:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you very much. Have a great day.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.