

**FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT**  
**Wednesday, April 22, 2015, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Allori, Arado, Azad, Baker, Brubaker, Bujarski, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Chen, Chmaissem, Chung, Conderman, Feurer, Fredericks, Glatz (for Martin), Grund, Hathaway, Henning, Hoffman (for Macdonald), Hou, Hunt, Irwin, Jaffee, Johnson (for McHone-Chase), Khoury, Koren, Lenczewski, Lichtman (for Than), Long, Mackie, McGinn (for Demir), Millis, Moraga, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Patro, Pitney, Riley, Ryan, Ryu, Sagarin, Shin, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Stephen, Stoddard, Un

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Abdel-Motaleb, Arriola, Bateni, Briscoe, Campbell, Demir, Deng, Giese, Hedin, Konen, Lee, Macdonald, Manning, Markowitz, Martin, McHone-Chase, Mogren, Mohabbat, Montana, Plonczynski, Rush, Schwartz-Bechet, Sirotkin, Than, Tonks, Xie

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Armstrong, Bryan, Doederlein, Haliczzer, Monteiro, Stafstrom, Streb

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Gebo, Falkoff, Shortridge, Waas

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**W. Pitney:** Okay, can we come to order?

Meeting called to order at 3:03 p.m.

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**W. Pitney:** The first item of business is to adopt the agenda. Can I have a motion to accept the agenda? George Slotsve, thank you. And a second, Richard Siegesmund, thank you. I do have a proposal to modify the agenda. I propose that we move Items IX.F. (Elections and Legislative Oversight report) and Item X. (Unfinished Business) up in the agenda to just before Item V. Executive Session. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor, say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? The agenda as amended is approved.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 25, 2015 FS MEETING**

**W. Pitney:** Next is the approval of the minutes. Can I have a motion to accept the minutes? Richard Siegesmund, thank you. And a second? Paul Stoddard, thank you. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor, say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? The minutes are accepted.

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

**W. Pitney:** I understand that George wants to say a few words.

**G. Slotsve:** As we know, this is Bill's last Faculty Senate meeting and we want to present Bill with this gift as a token of our appreciation for his work this past year.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you; that's very kind.

A. [NIU Financial Landscape](#)

Alan Phillips, Vice President for Administration and Finance

**W. Pitney:** I'd like to welcome Alan Phillips to Faculty Senate.

**A. Phillips:** Thank you.

[microphone off]...To give you an idea of how much that is, if you took the entire higher education funding for two and a half years, which is about \$2 billion a year, we would just be breaking even if you spent not a penny on anything but for maintenance. A little closer to home, the deferred maintenance bill for NIU is about \$460 million; our annual budget is \$426 million. So even if you spend not a dime on anything here other than deferred maintenance, you still wouldn't have enough money to cover all your deferred maintenance and every year it just gets worse. Next chart.

So key issues: core funding obviously. Cash flow, I talked about that. Funding for need-based financial aid, deferred maintenance, unfunded mandates, funding for grant programs, and you're going to see a continuation of the implementation of performance-based funding. Currently it was about a half a percent of the budget, we tried to keep it really low. If a half percent is good, then twice that much is better and ten times that much is ten times better. So they're pushing to elevate that and move that to a higher level. I don't know how successful they'll be. We've tried to keep that down given all the other problems and challenges. Next chart.

Any questions about the overall budget picture? I can talk briefly about next year. Currently, as most of you know, the governor put his budget on the table. It cuts higher education for the public universities by 31.5 percent. That cut equates to \$29.3 million less from the state next year than we received this year. On top of that, we have enrollment declines. And actually the state budget is 20 percent of our funding, it's about \$93 million. When you add in loss of revenue from enrollment, that creates additional challenges. Our view is that was the governor's opening position. There will be a lot of interesting negotiation going on in Springfield. We expect that probably they will last through the summer. Normally we have our appropriations bills toward the end of May, early June. It's very likely we won't know what our actual appropriation of 2016 is until late summer. We expect it will be quite a bit less than 31.5 percent. It will still be a significant cut. As you might have seen or heard, I'm being pretty particular in what procurements get approved. We're watching all the spending. I'm in a position of trading off buying things for paying people. And we're trying to do everything we can to start now to start

dealing with and finding ways to get through next year. We will get through. It will be challenging, but we'll have to see exactly what the final numbers are going to be. Any questions?

**J. Stephen:** Looking at that one thing, I think it's sort of disingenuous to include the SURS in with our budget because that's just making up for their mistakes, but you have to do that. I realize that.

**A. Phillips:** Well let me talk about SURS just briefly. When I was at IBHE, it's included in our budget but it's not in the 2 point million. It's considered education funding, but it never touches education. But to give you an idea of how big the problem is, at IBHE I got to write the check to SURS every year. I was basically the CFO for higher education in the state. I wrote the check to SURS. For 2015 the check we wrote to SURS was \$1.55 billion dollars. The total amount of funding for the public universities was \$1.57 billion. So we are spending the same amount going to pension payments as we're actually putting into higher education. The problem is that by state law, the pensions have to be funded at 90 percent by 2045. So we don't have a choice. Every year this is how much. Next year it will be \$1.6 billion. Even when they raised the taxes by 60 percent that did not cover just the pension payments and Medicaid, which is why even with the tax increase, the state was still short about a \$1 billion a year. Next year, because the taxes dropped from 5 percent to 3.75 percent, the state is going to be short about \$6 billion next year which is why we're looking at sizable cuts. The pensions are currently funded about 49 percent. To make the problem worse, Illinois isn't hiring anybody. As a matter of fact, with all the cuts, there's fewer employees paying into the system, but there's more people retiring and more money going out.

**J. Stephen:** I have a second question about increasing tuition. There's been several stories over the last several months. I think one in the Atlantic and one in Bloomberg pointing out a significant portion of the increase in costs in university is administrative overhead. And I'll tell you, the Board of Trustees did not think it was funny when I made the offhand comment that we were producing vice presidents faster than Ph.D.'s. I'd be interested in knowing how much our administrative overhead has increased in the last 15 years?

**A. Phillips:** I can't answer that specifically, but I can talk to that.

**Unidentified:** We couldn't hear the question.

**J. Stephen:** I would be interested in knowing how much our overhead administrative costs and employment load has increased in the last 15 years seeing as we've lost 20 percent of our students?

**A. Phillips:** I can't answer that specifically, but I can talk to your point. Administrative costs are a number of things. There's a number of reasons why our tuition has gone up. For instance, we now have IT departments that didn't exist in the past. We now have requirements to meet all kinds of regulations and unfunded mandates which require additional people. We have typically the students that have been coming to universities are coming out of the high school pipeline which is declining, which means now we have more non-traditional adult students that require more care, more help, more assistance, more guidance, especially, for instance, first generation

students. In some cases you have, I talked about the maintenance. The fact that there's no money so you have to find other money such as operating funds and those kinds of things.

**J. Stephen:** You are missing my point. If there's no money, how come our administrators are more numerous and making twice what they were in 1998?

**A. Phillips:** I don't know that that's true here. I read the article in the New York Times.

**J. Stephen:** Well I've been here 27 years. I know that it's true.

**A. Phillips:** I've been here six weeks. I don't have those numbers yet.

**J. Stephen:** I think it's a problem. Oh you're in charge of landscaping too, right?

**A. Phillips:** Why, yes I am.

**J. Stephen:** Six years ago they re-did the sidewalk across in front of Altgeld Hall and there used to be two garbage cans there. And I asked Bob Albanese: Would you put the two garbage cans back in? And he said: I'll look into it. And six years later, I'm still walking by there and seeing all that trash. It's right out your window.

**A. Phillips:** I have only been here six weeks. I found that, however, when I got here there were a number of things that they saved for me. And I found out there were a few other things they didn't tell me. I've got a lot to learn yet.

**M. Cefaratti:** What is the proportion of our students that are MAP students, MAP students that are going to be impacted by the cuts?

**L. Freeman:** The MAP percentage varies because our students get their applications in at different times, but 45 percent of our students are PELL-eligible and 87 percent of our students receive some type of federal, state or other financial assistance if that helps give you an idea.

**M. Cefaratti:** So it impacts a significant portion?

**L. Freeman:** It impacts a significant portion and it impacts retention as well as recruitment.

**A. Phillips:** We've actually had a lot of cuts in funding. One of the priorities at the state level is financial aid. So even though they haven't been able to increase it, it has remained relatively flat. The only problem is that your costs continue to go up and it doesn't go nearly as far as it did in the past. And there's more people who need the financial aid so a smaller percentage actually get it every year even though the amount stays the same. It's about \$373 million a year.

**G. Chen:** I'm an engineer so forgive my naïve question. Would you please give me an account of what will be the main duties as a CFO at NIU?

**A. Phillips:** That's okay. I have an engineering degree too. I find it useful to be able to crunch numbers. My job is basically the day-to-day operations of the university. I am responsible for all

the facilities, grounds, maintenance, upkeep, capital projects, anything to do with any of the buildings. I found out we have 107 elevators in various conditions. We have 40 miles of sidewalks. I'm responsible for making sure they get plowed. So the day-to-day operation of the university and then also I'm responsible for the day-to-day management of the finances. So that's procurement, accounts payable, that's the controller. Before I was over here, I was on the phone with the Auditor General's office and our auditor. We have an audit starting at the end of the month. I'm responsible for investing the university's money, the funds, with a number of banks and other institutions. And then I'm also responsible for the budget procurement and looking out into the future. So basically, the day-to-day operation of the university aside from the academics and what the other vice presidents do.

**G. Chen:** I see. Will all this job related information or can all this be shared or transparent with the faculty in the future of Faculty Senate that say how the budget is planned? I know it's going to be transparent, but how they are going to relate to the future operations, maintenance and NIU's future well being, hopefully?

**A. Phillips:** Let me talk about that briefly. I spent some time working in Army procurement. Here our budget goes currently all the way out to about two months. At the end of June we won't have a budget yet for FY16. When I worked in Army procurement our budget went out 15 years. One of the things I'm going to try to do is push our budget out maybe five years so we can do better planning. We can anticipate some of these challenges. For instance, if you want to create a new academic program and you know you want to do that two or three years from now, we can put money in the budget to cover that so, when you finally get there, there are resources there to do that. One of the, I will say unpleasant surprises when I got here, I have a bill sitting on my desk for \$6 million of vehicles because we haven't bought any new vehicles anytime lately. That will allow us to plan, put money in the budget to replace on an annual basis the vehicles. Part of it in making it transparent so people can see what's going on and have input in the process, is to create a budget that goes out so we can do some planning. We can do some thinking ahead based on enrollment and state funding and those kinds of things so that everything is not a crisis or if you need money you're not taking it from over here and giving it to here because you don't have a choice. That's one of the things I'm going to try to do.

**R. Feurer:** Could you tell us the status of the reserve fund? At least when I was involved in looking at the budget in the past, there was this reserve fund. Is it still in the same shape?

**A. Phillips:** I don't know what shape it was in. We have several million dollars in reserves, but we're going to need \$30 million next year. Part of that will be to help get us through leaner times.

**R. Feurer:** Well at least what we used to be told was that there was a lot more in that reserve fund. Do you know what's happened?

**A. Phillips:** I don't know how much was there before. I would say there's probably in the vicinity of \$13-\$14 million and we're trying to actually add to that. If you go to NEIU, their reserve fund is about \$43 million.

**R. Feurer:** I thought that we had a lot more. We used to have a lot more.

**A. Phillips:** That's all we have now.

**R. Feurer:** Does anybody know what happened?

**A. Phillips:** I have no idea. I'm actually in the process of trying to build that up some to help get us through next year and years after that. But I have no idea what the reserve fund was in the past.

**R. Feurer:** Is there anybody who would know what happened to the reserve fund here?

**A. Phillips:** I don't know. I can go back and check, but I have no idea what it was or if it was larger. It's around \$15 million. That's what we have.

**G. Chen:** Or will the Faculty Senate be entitled to know what happened if we are making a request that we would like to know what happened?

**A. Phillips:** I can go back and check. I just don't know. I have no idea. That was before my time and a number of the people involved in that are no longer here. Any other questions?

**W. Pitney:** Thank you, Dr. Phillips.

**W. Pitney:** I mentioned before I wanted to provide some information before I turn the floor over to Provost Freeman and Carolinda Douglass. This relates to prioritization. At our March 25 meeting we had a vigorous discussion about prioritization. And ultimately a motion was passed to have proportional faculty representation on each program prioritization task force and for the selection of those task force members of those nominated to be at the respective college level. At that meeting, after the motion passed, I conveyed that I would convey that motion to the president and provost. I did that on the afternoon of March 27, so two days after our Faculty Senate meeting. I did have a brief conversation on the phone with Provost Freeman and Vice-Provost Douglass the day after our Faculty Senate met just to articulate the concerns of the Senate ahead of the letter that went out that Friday.

We subsequently met the following week, so Wednesday, April 1. We talked about the concerns of the senate, we talked about the motion and we agreed that it should be moved to the coordinating team – the program prioritization coordinating team – at its next meeting which was scheduled for April 3.

Also on April 1, I had updated the [University] Council under the President's Announcements about some happenings with the prioritization process and that included the Faculty Senate motion and the fact that that was moving forward to the coordinating team. And there were no concerns or questions raised at that time.

Beginning April 2, the coordinating team and myself received several letters expressing concern, among other things, that shared governance had been bypassed because the motion from senate wasn't taken to University Council. My interpretation of Article VII of the NIU Bylaws was that it wasn't an automatic requirement that motions and things go from the senate to the council, but

when the small letter writing campaign hit, I was concerned that perhaps I had made a misstep, maybe I misinterpreted some things.

So I consulted with Greg Brady, Deputy Counsel. I consulted with Greg because he's got an expertise in governance. So we pulled up the language reading Article XI that pertains to concerns, recommendations, positions of the Faculty Senate and what happens thereof. And while the concerns may be moved to the University Council, it's not an automatic requirement. Indeed, motions can go any number of directions. Moreover, the course of action I took to alert the president and provost about our motion was such that it was consistent with some other motions we had taken this past academic year.

More recently this concern was brought up at APC and so I took some time, I think it was yesterday morning, I reached out to our parliamentarian, Ferald Bryan. I probably should have done that before when I connected with Greg. But we reviewed the motion that was made. We reviewed the bylaw language and discussed it. And the interpretation was that the action taken was reasonable and appropriate.

My intent for sharing this here today is to convey that, while we might have some differences in opinion in terms of the mode of shared governance, and perhaps a misunderstanding about the processing of motions, concerns, positions that emanate from senate, I don't know that we can say that shared governance was bypassed because the motion was not taken to the council. It indeed was forwarded to the president and provost. Concerns expressed by the senate were received by the coordinating team – program prioritization coordinating team. They were weighed and considered. And they weighed not only the concerns of the faculty in that motion, but also other concerns from staff and students. That resulted in some change. The selection committee now has, the selection committee to choose task force members, now has faculty as the majority of its composition. And while perhaps not agreeable to everyone, I believe that the shared governance process worked and that changes were made.

Gary Olson in an article in *Inside Higher Ed* presents a pretty lucid statement of what shared governance is, and he reports that it's come to connote two complimentary and sometimes overlapping concepts. And that is getting various groups of people to share in decisions that have to be made and often through representation on committees and etc.. But it also means allowing some groups to exercise primary responsibility in specific areas. He suggests that shared means that everyone has a role but it doesn't mean that every constituency gets to participate at every single stage. Genuine shared governance, he writes, gives voice but not necessarily ultimate authority. He states that the key to genuine shared governance is broad and unending communication. In reflecting on this past year, I think perhaps that's where I have fallen short. I think if I could turn back the clock I probably would have had at every senate meeting updates on program prioritization just to bring everybody up to speed. I probably would have conveyed weekly via e-mail an update on things that are going on. I think that perhaps being in the know and having shared some of the things, I might have allayed some concerns. And so for that I wish I'd done things a little differently. But I can't turn the clock back, I can't go back and change that. But what we can do is try to look forward and move forward in a positive way with respect to communication. And to that end, I've invited Provost Carolinda Douglass and Provost Freeman to provide us with an update on prioritization, discuss how things were set up, where

we're at currently, where things are going to move forward, and then we'll have some time for questions and answers. Thank you for coming today. I appreciate your time.

B. [Program Prioritization Update](#)

Lisa Freeman, Executive Vice President and Provost

Carolinda Douglass, Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Development

**C. Douglass:** I think I know many of you, but good afternoon to you all. My name is Carolinda Douglass and I'm the Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Development. I'm also the facilitator of the program prioritization coordinating team. I'm here today with Provost Freeman, who I'm sure you all know, who is also on the coordinating team. And Jeff Reynolds from the Office of Academic Analysis and Reporting, who is on the coordinating team, also has served as the data subgroup chair. I'm going to be giving the presentation but the two of them are here, as well, to answer any questions that you have. I want to thank Bill for inviting us today. As program prioritization is evolving, we're going to be having ongoing dialog with all of you as well as other constituents on campus and that's very important for us to do.

I'm ready for you to hit the slide if you can. A little bit just about the context of program prioritization and what it is and what it isn't maybe. What it is is a possibility to increase alignment between priorities, planning and resource allocations. Basically it has a dual focus if you will. It's to improve quality and efficiency in an ongoing basis. We're doing this without anybody forcing us to do this, but there are certainly external reasons to do it as well. In 2014 you may remember the Higher Learning Commission came to see us. We had a site visit in March of 2014 and from that, although we had excellent results from that site visit and another ten years of reaccreditation for the university, we also were given a monitoring report and that monitoring report was to better align and show how we align our planning with our resources, aligning our priorities and our planning processes with our resources and that report will be completed by 2018.

Another external requirement that we have, the Illinois Board of Higher Education actually has had on the books for a number of years a requirement through Public Act 970610 that every year the IBHE needs to report to the legislature on how they are keeping track by each university the elimination or consolidation of low-performing programs. They basically have not been doing this very well other than looking at program review summaries that we've been turning in every year. But now they're asking us to do that in a more comprehensive way. I was able to say we're already doing program prioritization so we're well on the way.

A little bit of overview of what it is, a rigorous and methodical review of all programs on campus, academic and administrative. Not all program prioritization processes on other campuses necessarily do the administrative programs. One of the things we wanted to do is make sure we did all the programs on campus inclusive of all stakeholders facilitated by a coordinating team with diverse expertise. And I'll talk a little bit about why the coordinating team, what the expertise is that they have a little later on when I go over that.

Guided by evaluation criteria, developed based on input from the entire campus community and finalized through shared governance. The past five weeks, the APC and the RSB have been working very hard under the guidance of Bill Pitney. Any of you on the APC, RSB? These are



the individuals that have been working over the last five weeks to help finalize the criteria and I will be showing the criteria today. It will be the first time you'll get the preview of them. That's part of the shared governance process that we've build into this.

The process is informed by data which are analyzed by and narratives that are created by program leaders and that will all happen next fall. The prioritization itself is conducted by two task forces which are comprised of again, current faculty and staff with members nominated by faculty, staff and students. And that was an addition that we put in there by students who wanted to also be able to nominate people. You may have seen this before; it's also on our website as most of this is the guiding principles. All programs, academic and administrative, will be reviewed. That includes the president's office, that includes AI's office, that includes athletics. All programs will be reviewed. All employee contracts will be honored and all students will be guaranteed to finish their academic programs.

This is the coordinating team and I just wanted to go over the individuals who are on this. The coordinating team was put together by Provost Freeman at the request, obviously, of the president of the university. The first four individuals on that, I know there's a lot of things that are associated by their names, but the first four individuals on that, Jeff Reynolds, Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Diana Robinson and Susan Mini are part of the data sub-group. So those individuals have been working most closely with the data and reaching out to the divisions to find out how to get data from the various divisions that may not have the same kind of standardized data that academic programs may have. Ibrahim is also part of shared governance. His is the chair of the RSB. And, obviously, Jeff and Sue are part of the office of the Provost. Diana is from outreach and we brought her in primarily for an administrative perspective.

The next three individuals are part of the criterion sub-group and that is Bill, Brett Coryell, and Marc Falkoff. Marc is also part of shared governance in terms of the fact that he is the assistant chair for the Academic Planning Council. Brett, obviously, the CIO we needed him for his expertise in that area. And Bill, of course, is part of shared governance as he's president of Faculty Senate.

The next four individuals – Denise Schoenbachler, Andy Small, Kelly Wesener Michael, Dillon Domke – and then also Brian Cunningham at the top – are part of the communications team. Denise is from the Council of Deans and obviously a dean representative for the deans there. Andy Small is part of the Operating Staff Council. Kelly Western Michael is part of Student Affairs/Enrollment Management. Dillon and Brian are students. Dillon is an undergraduate student, Brian is a graduate student. Then there's me as the facilitator and, of course, Provost Freeman.

You may have seen this before. I think this was at our last update. It's changed a little bit but not a lot. We always said that the coordinating team which you just saw was going to be a porous group, if you will, in that we're reaching out, getting information from other groups, and sending information out to the university community and ultimately to the programs themselves. Two subgroups that are not part of the coordinating team themselves but are beyond that, the communications support team and the data support team are critical and going to become more critical as we move forward.

The communications support team not only includes the people I just mentioned in the communications subgroup, but also includes people from Marketing and Communications, people from Outreach, people from Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. I see Melanie Magara in the back, she's one of the people on our support team. The data support team has not yet been totally finalized. It should be within the next couple of weeks, but these are going to be people who work with data across the campus, so Institutional Research, Registration and Records; Jeff from Academic Analysis and Reporting, Sponsored Projects and others. Human Resources is another. This is still in progress and this particular group is going to be very, very busy over the summer trying to put the data together, get the system up and loaded.

Then of course we have expert advisors and this group grows as well. Cabinet members, Council of Deans, APC and RSB, you, and Student Association, have given us a lot of input over the last few weeks and we continue to want to have that ongoing discussion.

This is a really high timeline. There's a lot more detail to it, but just to give you a sense of where we're at and what we've achieved thus far. In the fall, this all started in late October, we went to the Academic Impressions Conference and we had the idea of formulating an exploration of program prioritization. We developed a coordinating team out of that and began some preliminary communications with the campus. I think one of the first communications was actually with the chairs through one of the chairs meetings in November.

This spring we've been doing a lot of work. We established those three functional subgroups I just mentioned. We established those guiding principles I pointed out a few moments ago. We developed the criteria that I'll show you in a moment with broad campus participation, not only with an online survey, but as I said with five weeks of back and forth, reiteration, discussion with the APC and RSB. We also had for one month an open nomination process for individuals to serve on the task force and, of course, we defined the composition of the task force selection team. To be done this spring, we'll need to select the task forces. Now that the nominations are in, that can be done. And we need to communicate the criteria with the campus community. Starting this summer once those task force members are selected, we'll need to begin the training and then, as I said, really launch the data support team and the communications support team.

One of the things you may be interested in is the communications support team and this has always been part of the plan but now they're moving forward on it. In fall of 2015 there will be a panel of individuals who have gone through program prioritization on their own campuses and the communications team is putting that together for the campus community. Also in the fall, programs will be provided with relevant data and information on how to access the data system. Program data will be analyzed by program faculty and staff in the form of program narratives so individuals will have an opportunity to tell their story about the data that is put forth. There's going to be ongoing training for the task forces. We're still developing the materials for that training, but those will also be on our website. Everything will be public.

The task forces will then review data and narratives that will move into the spring of 2016, at which point they will ultimately prioritize the programs into five equal categories or quintiles and provide recommendations to the president. A student panel will reflect on the task force recommendations and the recommendations will be shared widely with the campus and the community and the senior leadership. This will inform resource allocation decisions for fiscal

year '17 so starting July of '16 and changes will occur, in terms of the programs, only through the curricular process. So I just want to make clear that the way we've set the program prioritization process up, it is outside of the curricular process, thereby it does not replace the normal process for eliminating programs or creating new programs. That will still be part of the normal curricular process.

So the next one shows the criteria and I won't read obviously all of them. These will be on the website I hope tomorrow or the next day, very soon Melanie's nodding. But basically I can just go over a little bit about them. One is quality of faculty and faculty outcomes. Sixteen percent is the weight for that and obviously you're looking at what kinds of things faculty are doing. Criterion two is quality of student and student outcomes and that's another 16 percent, equally weighted looking at graduation and persistence, etc. Criterion three, financial efficiency, 11 percent. What are the direct or indirect costs? I know people are concerned about the extent to which costs are going to be included and obviously they have to be part of the process. The group decided to weight that at 11 percent. Criterion four, importance of the program to the university mission, back up to the 16 percent. Criterion five, program potential. So there's not only an opportunity to eliminate or consolidate programs or reduce programs, there's also an opportunity to enhance or create new programs. So program potential is weighted at 11 percent. External demand for the program also weighted at 11 percent. There's two more on the next page. Internal demand, this is an important one. This has actually got a higher weight, 14 percent. This is about not only what do your majors and your programs do, but what are you doing to service the rest of the university? What general education courses are you offering? What courses are you offering that another program has to take on a regular basis, the students have to take on a regular basis? So what's the internal demand for your program? And then last, five percent is program's contribution to diversity. Those are the academic.

If we could move on to the administrative. In this area there is only five criterion. The first is the importance to the university mission and operations. That's weighted at 22 percent. The second is quality and effectiveness, also weighted at 22 percent. The third is productivity and efficiency, 22 percent. Internal and external demand are combined in this one and that's 22 percent and the last one is opportunity analysis, which is similar to program potential, but it's about what kind of opportunities could be taken advantage of in the future and that's 12 percent. Again, these should be posted on our website within the next couple of days and obviously Pat has the PowerPoint which can be made available to all of you.

We had said at the beginning that we were going to have two task forces: one academic and one administrative and that's what we're now in the process of setting up. The academic will be tenured faculty and instructors only. There will be at least one individual on the task force from each college. That's not meant necessarily to be representative, it's meant to have the perspective of each college. We basically want people to go into this with an institutional stewardship, a way of thinking about the university as a whole and what's best for it, but we certainly don't want to avoid or eliminate any perspectives.

The administrative task force will include staff, tenured faculty and instructors and it will be a majority staff and there will be at least one representative from each division. There will be no more than 20 members per task force and the task forces as we said were nominated, the individuals were nominated by the whole community. Did we have over 100 nominations? I

think there's 116 and they do, in fact, represent, there's at least one from every college and every division.

I just want to say, I know Bill already spoke to this a little bit, but I want to say a little bit more about the final task force selection team. Originally you probably remember that we thought this was going to be done by senior leadership. It was going to be done by the president, the provost, executive vice president and provost, the CFO and the president of the Faculty Senate. There was obviously some concern with that, yourselves included. We had thought we would do that in part because a lot of task forces are set up by senior leadership and we thought that would be a good way to go. But we heard certainly what you said and what some administrative folks said as well, some of the staff said. So what we ended up doing is we asked the president to recuse himself which he did. So we have two senior leadership team members here sitting next to me. In addition to that, we still have the president of Faculty Senate and then we added three faculty members. You voted for them, you know who they are. We added one SPS member voted on by the SPS Council and one operating staff member voted on by the Operating Staff Council. That piece right there, the Executive Secretary/Faculty Senate President, the three faculty members, the SPS, and the operating staff, is a mirror image of what we had at the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. And we thought this was a good model, a compromise that included all perspectives. Of course, we had students on the coordinating committee so we had to add a student as well which made sense. They've been good partners in all of that and so we also have a student on there. That is pretty much it. If you've got questions, please.

**T. Ryan:** The faculty that I represent remain concerned that NIU is embarking upon program prioritization without adequate discussion of its purpose and without consideration of its likely outcomes. I'd like to quickly share with you just three of the many questions that have been raised about the philosophy and methodology of program prioritization. Administrators at other universities say that it suffers from a variety of logical flaws. Academics describe it as anti-intellectual. Some colleges that have performed program prioritization talk of it as a miserable failure.

Okay so let's talk about the methodology first. The very focus on programs is inevitably by its very nature biased in favor of large programs. As a result of program prioritization, universities have tended to cut small programs that don't cost much and award resources to large programs that are already heavily funded and very costly. What this means is that in reality program prioritization actually does very little to address the problem of decreasing resources which is the problem we're hoping it would resolve here. In academics, as well, smaller programs tend to be advanced programs. Graduate programs are, of course, smaller than undergraduate programs. So the program prioritization model is also inherently biased against graduate programs. A second point is that studies show that program prioritization is just impractical. At one university, the task forces identified and then assessed almost 500 programs. This involved a review period of, on average, around 11 minutes per program. Eleven minutes to decide if a program should receive more money, less money, or be defunded all together. I don't think we can make reasonable judgments about the future of NIU at an average of 11 minutes per program.

Finally and third, if you've read Robert Dickeson's book which NIU has adopted and distributed as the standard how-to manual for program prioritization, you'll know that the creator of program prioritization doesn't think much of professors or their values. Dickeson also says that

universities should be shifting away from research. He recommends that university administration bypass channel of faculty governance in order to move program prioritization forward. This is the work that is been purchased in large numbers and distributed across this university, by the way. And Dickeson also casually acknowledges that program prioritization commonly results in the elimination of academic not administrative programs. At a recent meeting of department chairs at NIU it was noted the programs and departments here have always evaluated themselves and have always made their own recommendations regarding the allocation, increase, or decrease of resources. So my question specifically is what is the rationale for abandoning this system in favor of the impractical, inherently anti-academic, and widely discredited process of program prioritization? Thanks.

**L. Freeman:** You raised some excellent questions and I would like to try to address them. I'm going I think to start with your last comments and work my way to the front. And I hope that, when I'm done, I doubt we'll all agree, but I hope we can agree to disagree on some points. And if I haven't addressed them with clarity, I invite more people to come forward because we want this to be a dialog.

I will start out by saying that, although we have had program review by departments, we have never, as pointed out to us by the Higher Learning Commission during their visit, really linked the results of program review to resources. We have had statements at the end of the program review: We could do more in terms of program quality, enrollment, etc. if we had more resources. But those comments were just left because we have always been doing across-the-board cuts rather than thinking about the university at large. I mean we've never had administrative program review or thought about creating efficiency there and shifting resources from administration to academic programs. Personally, I would never have endorsed or supported the idea of doing program prioritization if we were at NIU at this time in our history to do academic programs without doing administrative programs because that would have sent a message that the allocations across academic and administrative were where they needed to be and I don't think that was necessarily the case.

When you talk about Dickeson's book, which I agree we have shared, it's a 1994 book and it was written at a time when academic program prioritization was the only program prioritization that was being performed. It is a starting point. We have not adopted it as our manual and, in fact, if you look at the criteria that NIU has selected through a participatory project, they do not look like the criteria that we started with out of Dickeson's book. They're criteria that we adapted to our culture.

Many institutions have performed program prioritization with varying degrees of success. I don't think that they have all shifted away from research. I can assure you, having come to the provost position from the position of Vice President for Research, I would not endorse a process from the beginning if I felt that a predetermined outcome was shifting away from research.

In terms of the impracticality and the time limitation associated with the peer review of large numbers of programs, I think that it's unfair to say that the only time the task force is doing its work is when it's sitting in a room together with the programs. For those of us who have participated in peer review panels associated with federal agencies or foundations, we know that there are accepted practices for managing peer reviews of large portfolios of programs. There are

assigned primary, tertiary reviewers and readers ahead of time. Everybody has the opportunity to review the material ahead of time. Yes, limited time is available for discussion, but sometimes it's not necessary to discuss each of the programs for the same length of time because you can have reviewer scales ahead of time look at large groups of programs.

Most history of program prioritization will show that the programs which come through and are ultimately deleted are often ones that the program submits saying we have not had any students in this program for a long time, we've been too lazy to take it off the books, so we're not going to even fill out a narrative. I don't think 11 minutes is too long to discuss a sheet that comes through that way. So I think it will be time crunched. I think it is a challenge. I also think that peer review is better than many of the alternatives.

Carolinda didn't mention this, but to comply with the Illinois Board of Higher Education directive stemming from this state act, some of the other public institutions of higher ed had submitted the way that they're going to be eliminating unproductive programs. And they're essentially going to be looking at three years rolling averages of program costs and students and just axing out those programs. So I think that we could be doing worse.

I would not say that this process is perfect. In terms of some of the logical flaws that you point out, I think that one of your presumptions is that this is solely a cutting exercise. I don't view it that way, although we are certainly embarking on program prioritization at a time of research scarcity and I am as well aware of that and probably more aware of that than most people sitting in the room because, like Vice President Philips, we look at the budget daily. I think program prioritization is a resource allocation, a rational resource allocation method that should be part of being a data-informed culture and should happen in times of richness as well as in times of scarcity. We should be looking at how we are performing across the university in terms of quality and effectiveness and making resource allocations on that basis rather than making across-the-board decisions that hurt some programs more than others.

The bias in favor of large versus small programs, again you focus largely on academic large versus small programs, and I think the definition of large versus small can be cut many ways. If you look at the bullets that were on the slide, a program that may not have a lot of students enrolled as majors, may do a large amount of service activity. Would you consider that a large program or a small program? If you look at some of our administrative programs, they are much larger than some of the academic programs. I think that it's not a perfect process, but it's a process that tries to allocate resources rationally. It's tries to be participatory and it tries to use peer review principles that are accepted across the academy.

So I'm sure we will never agree on the wisdom of embarking on program prioritization, but I want to say that we have thought about many of the arguments that you have made. We will continue to listen to them, but I do not think it's a fair characterization of our process to say we have adopted a flawed methodology published in 1994 with no thought about how it would fit our culture or what the impacts would be.

**J. Stephen:** You mention that other universities have already been forthcoming with their program prioritization and perhaps their elimination of programs?

**L. Freeman:** Are you referring to what I said about the Illinois publics?

**J. Stephen:** Yes.

**C. Douglass:** At a recent IBHE academic officers meeting, SIU indicated that they were using, some of you maybe are familiar with the PQP system, the priorities, qualities and productivity but that was back in the '90's.

**J. Stephen:** Yeah, I thought that died a long time ago.

**C. Douglass:** It did die, but that's what's being brought back and that's what's being recommended as the scale that was used for that. So if you have a certain level of enrollments, if you have a certain level of below degrees...

**J. Stephen:** It was a hard line program.

**C. Douglass:** Very hard line and that is what the recent academic IBHE academic officers meeting that I went to. they're basically saying to us: You have to figure out some way to do this. They specifically said to me: We know what you're doing, but if people need something to do, this is what they can do to check on low-performing programs and figure out how they can be consolidated or eliminated and that is what SIU is doing.

**J. Stephen:** That leads me to my question that, if we have a series of low-producing programs across the state and SIU gets rid of it and Western and there's still a demand for that program, isn't that an opportunity for the same prioritization to perhaps expand some programs where they're being retracted at other publics?

**C. Douglass:** Absolutely.

**J. Stephen:** Is that on the table?

**C. Douglass:** Absolutely. Part of the criterion is the program potential which includes new programs or to enhance a program knowing that it's going to be a unique program in the state because other programs are being eliminated. Absolutely.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, so the emphasis on external demand is a little stronger than what we saw in the points.

**C. Douglass:** Well, that actually would probably fall under program potential, but then the external demand would be the potential demand for other students who would be coming from other areas of other programs were eliminated or reduces.

**J. Stephen:** Thank you, Carolinda.

**K. Lichtman:** Is program prioritization an administrative program and if so can the task force that's examining the administrative programs think about how often it might make sense to look at these programs before we commit to doing this again every five years? How effective is the

program? What are the outcomes of the program? What are the costs on the program in man hours which is going to be a lot?

**C. Douglass:** Absolutely, and we are developing at the same time (it wasn't on my PowerPoint), we are also developing a comprehensive evaluation with individuals from the Office of Assessment Services to gather an evaluation of just the things that you said: What's the man hours? What's the time that people are spending and the information that we have to get? And how does this actually help us save costs? One of the things that we'll have to do, though, is we can look at all of the phases along the way, but we really have to wait. Like anything else, this is an investment so, once the monies are reallocated in different ways, we're going to have to also look at if it was reallocated to some program, are those programs now doing better in helping the university and likewise in the reverse. But we are definitely thinking of that and, if you have ideas, it would be great to hear them.

**B. Jaffee:** One of the things that I have been thinking about, you're correct we worked long and hard and we did chisel away at the edges of Dickeson's criteria and come up with something that maybe or maybe not is more appropriate for our culture here. But what we have adopted without, as far as I'm aware, any kind of public discussion is the idea that program prioritization takes place at the level of programs and not departments. One of the things that I learned by serving on this joint committee that worked on the criteria is that there are a lot of different ways this has been done elsewhere. Unfortunately, I wasn't aware of that until we got to the point where we were discussing administrative criteria at which time we were given samples of criteria used by a lot of different institutions and considered those as we considered the material that came forward from the surveys. That is not the way the academic part of the discussion went. I guess that's another issue, but what I learned very late in the process was that, for example, if you focus at the department level, you could ask a department to do an analysis that looked at what was strong in their department, what perhaps was obsolete in their department, what might be enhanced through some strategic spending. And you get a very different kind of outcome by looking and asking departments to partner in this process than this kind of top down focus on programs.

**W. Pitney:** Can I speak to the first concern about the academic criteria? And for those criteria, the APC and RSB not examining other criteria used at different institutions. The reason I want to address that is because we actually did. In the advanced organizer, there was a table put together with the criteria from 11 different institutions and the links were below the table so that, if folks wanted to, they could go and drill down a little deeper. Now admittedly, that did have the components of each criteria as the administrative piece did. Originally when we created the process, we were going to – again originally, part of our emergent design – we were going to have the groups look at these criteria from a higher, more broad perspective. As things unfolded, the group became motivated to drill down further and identify the components of each criteria. And so then we went back to the academic criteria, drilled down a little bit deeper. At that point, we did provide a sample criteria component that matched up with the criteria we had developed. That's kind of how that unfolded. It wasn't identical processes for the academic...

**B. Jaffee:** They were not identical.

**W. Pitney:** But we got to where we needed to be.



**L. Freeman:** With respect to the question about using departments rather than programs as the unit of evaluation, there's actually a lot of experience across institutions including one where President Baker was the provost that shows that that's not an effective unit to use for program prioritization. If you think about an academic department, it is an administrative structure that houses the things that are quite important in terms of academic programs including minor certificates, majors, some of which do have synergy with each other that can be captured in a narrative submission, but they also have processes that are largely administrative, many of which they don't own. Many of which they exist to execute but that are actually – the responsibility for them is housed elsewhere. So in not choosing the department as the unit of prioritization, that was deliberate and intentional and based on what we learned from talking to other institutions.

**W. Pitney:** Yes, George.

**G. Slotsve:** Yes, I guess what I'd like to know is: We've got an academic side and we've got an administrative side for the task force, but the two are going to eventually have to be brought together and decisions are going to have to be made given what recommendations come up from the two sides. How is that going to be handled?

**L. Freeman:** The results of program prioritization will be presented to multiple groups across the campus: to the cabinet, to the dean's council, to the campus community at large. Ultimately, the resource allocation decision is made by the senior leadership in consultation with shared governance through the Resource, Space and Budget Committee and that's how this will be handled. One of the things that will be occurring at the level of, for example, cabinet is you will have vice presidents over multiple divisions who will be looking at what's said about the programs that rely in their divisions and being able to realize perhaps efficiency. If you look at most of where universities find resources through creating efficiency, it's in Human Resources and IT and a lot of times when those resources are over time liberated, they can be returned to the academic program.

Another place where cabinet will be very important is we will have a vice president for advancement who can look through program prioritization results and start to pick out philanthropic targets if she, because Katherine Squires will be starting May 1 and is a she, identifies places where she believes it will be easy to raise money or that there may be existing funds in the Foundation that can do a program enhancement that will allow funds that might have been put there from another source to be reallocated. Essentially the budget process will have a lot more data to be used to inform it and I suspect that, as we go forward, we're going to be building out the dialog about how these results are translated to our FY17 budget. So there's some things we envisioned very clearly, there are some things that we envision less clearly, and I'm going to ask Al to comment as well.

**A. Phillips:** As I talked before, we have a huge challenge ahead. We're going to have decreasing levels of funding unless we can turn enrollment around. To go in and do what we call salami slice where you just cut evenly across-the-board is incredibly inefficient and typically ineffective. Any information we have that can inform the process whereby we can make better decisions to reallocate funds in an appropriate way will be very helpful and very useful. And this will be done, as the provost said, in concert with the appropriate committees, the appropriate

insights. What we do is going to affect everyone and it's critically important that they all be involved in the discussion. I could go cut the budget, go back to my office and cut \$30 million out of the budget this afternoon; it probably wouldn't be the best way to do that. Anything we can do to help inform that process will be extremely helpful and at the end of the day will help us to make better decisions and help us to extend the life of the institution well into the future which is what we're really trying to do.

**V. McGinn:** I came here to Northern Illinois University 19 years ago as department chair of Electrical Engineering. Being involved with several program reviews, I can endorse the comment that was made a little while ago with regard to recommendations at the end of the program review just sitting there without any action whatsoever. I did notice in the slides here that reference was made to public law and public regulation, but the item that I am not certain about and I was wondering if this could be clarified, is: If there is any carrot or whip with regard to program prioritization? In other words, my question is: Undergoing program prioritization, will we be rewarded financially by the state or will we be effected in a negative way by not doing program prioritization? The bottom line is: Are we doing something as simply an exercise for ourselves or are we doing something that will ultimately benefit the university with state support?

**A. Phillips:** Part of the problem is that the way I look at this we can take charge of our own destiny or have it done to us. The folks in the state – and we get to spend a lot of quality time with our fine legislators in Springfield – are looking to find money wherever they can find it. We're probably going to end up taking reductions. If we are able to get out in front of that and make good decisions, that's to our benefit. Essentially, we're not going to get any help from the state. The state doesn't have any money to give us. We're going to have to make the best choices we can with what we have to work with, and so the way I look at this is we're taking charge of our own destiny, the state is not going to be any help.

**L. Freeman:** I am going to echo Al's sentiment that this is the right thing to do to be responsible stewards, not only of the funds we receive from the state and elsewhere, but of the university's future so that we're strategic and that we don't favor mediocrity or manage decline. But I'm also going to say that, when I was a faculty member – and, believe it or not, I was a faculty member – I used to hate it when the provost or the president or the legislative affairs person would say, or the Board of Regents because I was in a regents state, we have to do this now because if not something worse will come down the pike from the legislature. And I sort of never really believed it. And I had the occasion to go to Springfield three times in the last two weeks to talk to our legislators about budget issues. I went with Al and with the president, with some of our students and some of the other members of cabinet. And every time program prioritization was brought up, it completely changed the tenor of the conversation either in the legislative office or in front of the hearing. It was seen by the legislature and the lieutenant governor and the folks that we spoke with as the university doing something very positive with the funds that they gave us. And so I came away from that being maybe a little more believing of sometimes it's helpful to get out in front of the whip and the carrot.

**W. Pitney:** Barbara, did you have a question?

**B. Jaffee:** Well, I guess I'm still curious about this issue about program versus department in part because my real concern in working on the joint committee that was considering criteria was the emphasis on demand which I interpreted, as I heard a moment ago, as having to do with relevancy. The ability to demonstrate that your program was relevant to a demographic within the region, but which came out of our discussion as emphasizing things like head counts and size. I am very concerned about the way in which this process seems to be favoring large programs and it seems to me, I guess I'm not sure what – the model that I looked at at Central Michigan University wherever that is – they put all of their process online and it included reports from the departments where they addressed in statistical form the criteria that had been agreed on as part of the process and then they were asked to create their own ranking system. They created quintiles within their own departments. If they had to make cuts or changes, how would they do it? It was surprising and interesting to me as I looked across different departments to see this trustee's mentality, which we've been talking about in terms of our task force, operating at a department level among colleagues who really wanted the best for their university, for their students and for themselves. So I would like to know more about it and I wish we had had an opportunity to talk about other types of models.

**L. Freeman:** We should explore this because, if I'm correct in my recollection, Central Michigan University has a responsibility centered management system where every college is in charge of their budget to float their own boat. And so the context in which they allocate resources and do a university-wide budget model is entirely different than ours and might speak. So I'm perfectly willing to continue this dialog but without having that fact I would also suggest that maybe we want to invite President Baker who went through two rounds of program prioritization when he was a provost, one with departments and one with programs in a more central budget model to. I think this is an excellent conversation to have, but I really do believe Central Michigan is RCM and that's such a different budget allocation model from the first principles that it would be hard to look at them as the best model for us.

**C. Douglass:** The only thing I would add is that, if you look at criteria six which is the one for external demand, it actually has one of the lower weights. It's 11 percent. I think the demand is, in fact, in part, the number of students who want to come to attend that program. And that, in some ways, I guess looks like it might favor larger programs. But that's 11 percent. Internal demand is 14 percent, so we've actually weighted more heavily how you service other programs and do general education than we have the number of students that you bring in yourself. Program potential is also 11 percent. Faculty outcomes which would include research and service is 16 percent, so I think the importance to the mission is 16 percent, so that would be about the types of service that you're providing to the region as well. So I don't think that it's heavily weighted toward external demand.

**B. Jaffee:** Well, in looking at external demand and the bullet points that are under it, eventually there is a bullet point that addresses this issue of relevancy, competitiveness; we talked about it in different ways. The idea of serving an unmet need. I think that actually came out in the bullet point at the end. I've raised this concern about those bullet points in other context as well so you're not hearing this for the first time. These bullet points address very different and sometimes competing interests so that, if there are head counts and there is, does it meet an unmet need in society, what is the relative value that's going to end up assigned to those things?

**C. Douglass:** So the bullet points are suggestive and maybe not even exhaustive. So individuals who write to the criterion may think of other things that they would like to say relative to those particular criteria. When the task forces are put together, which obviously hasn't happened yet, the task forces will think about the ways in which that 11 percent, for example, will be distributed. My hunch is that it won't be divided by three equally. They probably will think about those things and what matters most in each specific situation, but that really remains to unfold as the task forces conduct their work.

**W. Pitney:** Rosemary, and then Robin. And after that I think we're going to have to – we've got some business to take care of as well, but let's take these last two questions and then we'll move forward from there.

**R. Feurer:** I'll just reiterate what I said the last meeting which is I think the premise that should concern and does concern all faculty of these programs is that, when they are done so often, faculty members through attrition or other mechanisms, the numbers of faculty go down. I'd like to know explicitly what kind of assurance we have that this isn't the target. That we aren't the targets. We have 650 faculty and I guess my global concern here is, you know, is there a commitment on the part of the administration that we will retain that number of faculty. Is there that kind of commitment because, in the end when the bottom line is, it seems that the administration, the leadership of the administration, is going to be doing the cutting. I guess going along with that, my other concern is that we have this kind of split between an evaluation of administration and faculty. And I think many faculty would opt to have a much more rigorous examination of administration and administration salaries. And parallel with that is I just noticed and those slides went up so fast it was just impossible to keep track of it, but it seemed to me very interesting that for the administrative side, importance to the university mission was the number one or the first criterion listed. And I wonder why that isn't in the list on the faculty side or on the program side. It is in the list, did I miss it?

**L. Freeman:** Can I also just say that this is not a review of administrative personnel and academic personnel. It's a review of programs. And we have operating staff and SPS folks in the audience and I don't want us to believe that they don't contribute to the value of academic programs and that faculty don't contribute to the value of some of the administrative programs. So it is a program review, not a personnel review. And I think in the guiding principles we've addressed the importance of trying to preserve contracts and our commitment to students and reviewing everything. I think Al and I would not be responsible stewards of the university funds if we committed right now where we are in this budget year to a particular number of employees in any category going forward not knowing what enrollment would look like or what our appropriation would look like, but I think I can say there is no hidden agenda to decrease the number of faculty.

**R. Feurer:** Well, I am not saying that there's a hidden agenda here. I think that it's the very premise of the program prioritization and we're going along with this kind of austerity mentality that is in place at all levels of our society and not I guess basically saying the university has to address that, but what has happened, in fact, is that over the last 20 years is we have increased, I mean the faculty are the main direct contact with students and are essential to the mission of the university and so I guess that's the global concern is that are we really going to be assured that the faculty-to-administrator ratio doesn't continue to go the direction that it has been going? I

think that's a bottom line concern and it's something that all faculty, we should want a faculty-driven university with the mission of the university interpreted by the faculty. I'm very partial to that interpretation of a university.

**C. Douglass:** If I could say one thing in response to that, I just want to remind you that the intention is to have a faculty-driven process. Hence, the entire academic task force will be made up of faculty and instructors and there is also faculty presence on the administrative one. That is the intention is to have faculty looking at these and making these choice.

**R. Feurer:** I understand that. What concerned me was that statement that, in the end, the administrative leadership would make the decisions.

**C. Douglass:** Well, they make the resource allocation decisions which they have always done; I mean, that's their responsibility.

**R. Feurer:** And so I guess it's like we have a voice but in terms of in the process. But in the end, I see that, for instance, at other universities when this has happened, you can have all of these criteria nicely laid out and it seems great and it's like all these percentages and everything, but then the actual decision that's made befuddles the faculty and they've often complained. So I guess just assurance that there's some thought about how faculty intervene at that point when administrative leadership make the decisions. Is there going to be a concern that the administrator-to-faculty ratio does not go into the same direction it's going.

**W. Pitney:** I think that's something as a senate here in the coming years, as things unfold, we can absolutely monitor. I'm sure Dan House would provide data from Institutional Research so that we can track that and keep an eye on that.

**R. Feurer:** I would really like some assurance going forward if that is a commitment from the administration.

**A. Phillips:** One of the things to go to your point, we're also not trying to do this on the basis of set ratios as we go through the process. Otherwise we may end up with other unintended consequences. We are trying to take everything into consideration understanding the importance of the academics to the life of the institution. What we're trying to do is determine how to make the best possible decisions because we do have some difficult decisions ahead and that's all the discussion, all the dialog. We have no intent to do things in a bad way or to even start off with preconceived ideas of what this is going to look like at the end. So the discussion will inform the decisions, but in the same way, we can't commit to specific ratios to say at the end of the day regardless of how this works out we're going to end up with these ratios. That doesn't necessarily make the process better either.

**W. Pitney:** As I mentioned before, we're going to go with Robin's question and then we'll conclude thereof because we do have to get some business done today before we head out. So, Robin, please go ahead.

**R. Moremen:** Okay, am I on?

**W. Pitney:** Yes.

**R. Moremen:** I have a slightly different concern that I think may potentially undermine this process and that is: As data are marshaled from the individual departments about their programs, how can you reassure me that this dynamic will not set up a kind of competition and circling of the wagons of individual departments regarding their programs that in essence undermines the shared part of shared governance?

**C. Douglass:** That goes back to the idea I think of having on the task force individuals that have changed to institutional stewardship rather than trustee mentality, but having people who are really focused on what's best for the university. In the cases that people are making for their individual programs, we are expecting people to put their best foot forward and write the best case they possible can in the narrative section and let the task forces know exactly why that program is important and how it's important. Also, to cut down on maybe competition, we're optimistic that people will actually think of some of their own areas where they could maybe consolidate or collaborate with other individuals or other programs and suggest that because that's going to help the task forces think about the kind of recommendations they can make.

**W. Pitney:** Okay. Dr. Philips, Dr. Freeman and Carolinda Douglass, thank you for coming today. We appreciate your time and consideration.

C. [Recognition](#) of faculty members who have completed their terms – Page 5

**W. Pitney:** We're going to get through; we've got one more piece, number C. Just to recognize folks that have served on senate. You can see on page 5 of your packet completing service on Faculty Senate, Briscoe, Stephen Tonks, Abul Azad, Mary Koren, Gary Baker, Timothy Ryan, Michael Konen, Gleb Sirotkin, Stephen Martin, Keith Millis, Richard Siegesmund, and Richard Schneider. Thank you for your service this past academic year. Several have been reelected. I learned just now that Richard Siegesmund has been reelected so going to the next list. Sukesh Patro, Mark Rosenbaum, Hamid Bateni, George Slotsve, and Sarah McHone-Chase, thank you for coming back. And then our newly elected folks; Brian May and Andreas Glatis. We welcome them into the senate this next year.

## **V. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

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

A. CFAC Learning Space Ad Hoc Team – report  
Therese Arado, Michael Konen, Sarah McHone-Chase, FS liaisons

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. We're under item VI now, Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. We've got a verbal report from the CFAC Learning Space Ad Hoc Team, Therese?

**T. Arado:** Okay, I participated with Sarah McHone-Chase and Michael Konen, as well as many other people, on a learning space committee that met a few times this semester. And we did tours of different learning spaces on campus and I have some feedback from that. The one thing of note was the wide variety of layouts and available space depending upon which department you

were in, and the comfort levels of the different locations. And then the last tour was last Monday, the 13<sup>th</sup>, and a few items came up for consideration by the group and Brett Coryell who was also at the meeting and I wanted to report on those considerations.

After having looked at these things with the idea is that a tool kit or a kit of parts would be created on campus with a variety of options for departments on campus looking to renovate a learning space. And I'm using kit in that it just has lots of parts that you can choose from. The kit would have a variety of options such as individual learning areas, two-person, multi-person collaboration areas along with suggestions for corresponding furniture and technological configurations within the space. Having such a kit would provide for some standardization across campus. Departments would be able to select from the variety of options in order to meet their individual departmental needs while still keeping with the campus-wide theme.

A campus-wide theme would assist students and faculty by allowing them to have an easier transition from learning space to space across campus rather than having to relearn something every time they go into a different building. Additionally, it would provide opportunities for collaborative learning that better meet the needs and works with the strengths of today's learners and the students coming in. To achieve some of these goals, there is going to hopefully be an inventory of the Department of IT Laboratory spaces throughout campus. This inventory is intended to inform the campus community of what we have and then to work on a ten-year plan for renovation of these areas. Department of IT will work across campus to help develop spaces and implement technologies within those spaces that best meet the university needs and that particular area's needs. The idea is that we should take time now to do this inventory and think about what we would like things to look like in the future so that we can plan accordingly rather than just doing something as it comes up. To that end, Brett Coryell would like for a space to be identified sometime this summer and a renovation to get started so that the ten-year plan can get into motion.

And the other thing that came up and this was at the CFAC meeting, that Brett indicated that he and the Division of Information Technology are willing to provide some funding to departments that are willing to renovate learning spaces in accordance with this common theme and open those spaces up to the university users at large. He is offering to provide support as long as the areas that are doing this renovation are willing to work with this kit of parts and work with the university-wide theme and then also make that space available to all university users. I can try to entertain question if you have them but I don't know how successful I'll be.

**W. Pitney:** Any questions for Therese? Thank you for doing that and for stepping in and for updating us; we appreciate that.

- B. [Request from COIA](#): Faculty Senate consideration of support for U.S. House Bill H.R. 275 – a bill to create a presidential commission to look into issues facing intercollegiate athletics – Pages 6-17

**W. Pitney:** The next item under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration is a request from COIA for a Faculty Senate consideration to support House Bill 275. You'll find that beginning on page 6. Essentially, the bill is designed to create a Presidential Commission for Intercollegiate Athletics with the idea that that commission would review some specific things: the interaction

of athletics and academics, the financing of intercollegiate athletics, as well as the recruitment and retention of student athletes, health and safety protections, due process and other protections for enforcement of rules and regulations sorts of things. So that's a sense for that.

Matt Streb is our faculty athletic rep. He had to leave, but in my conversation with him there are some instances where the faculty athletics reps and COIA reps don't always see eye-to-eye on things and their initiatives don't always align. However, in this instance it looks as though it's a pretty straight forward bill to create a commission. And, as we talked about this on our Executive Committee – Faculty Senate Executive Committee – it looks as though that commission could look into some important things in terms of how athletics affects academics, particularly as you think about how athletics affects the academic mission, integrity and credit worthiness of institutions of higher ed. So I think it gets at some issues, or will get to some issues, that would be appreciated by us as faculty. I'd like to maybe have a motion to support that and a second and then we can open it up for discussion. Could I have a motion to support?

**P. Stoddard:** I would move that we support this.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you, Paul. We've got a motion to support. Any second? George Slotsve, thank you. So we've got a motion and second. Any discussion?

**P. Stoddard:** It's a good idea.

**W. Pitney:** I think it is. Any other discussion points? Let's do an oral vote, is that okay? All in favor of supporting this motion signify by saying aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay so the motion passes. Thank you. I will write a letter back to COIA explaining that we're in support of this and then I can draft a letter that will go out to our representative.

## **VII. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Approve [list of candidates](#) running unopposed to serve on committees of the university – Pages 18-20

**W. Pitney:** We need a motion to approve our consent agenda. Richard. We have a motion on the floor to approve our consent agenda. Can I have second please? Therese, thank you. It's pretty straight forward. Now there are a few on there that we just haven't got the reps from the college yet, right Pat? But they're forthcoming. All in favor of this signify by saying aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? Hearing none that passes. Thank you.



## VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – [report](#) – Page 21

**W. Pitney:** Reports from advisory committees. Sonya Armstrong. Thanks for sticking with us here.

**S. Armstrong:** It's a brief report because it was a brief meeting. We didn't cover a whole heck of a lot so I would actually just allow you to read over the written report and if you have questions please let me know.

**W. Pitney:** Having examined the report ahead of time, are there any questions for Sonya? Seeing none we'll move on.

B. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie – no report

C. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve, Brian Mackie – report

**W. Pitney:** Brian Mackie, I think you have a verbal report for our CFAC committee is that correct?

**B. Mackie:** Yes, well it depends on an argument for that one, but part of that was talked about there. This was a subcommittee of it, it started from there. This is the Acceptable Use Policy for the internet or network. Last September, there were issues found in the Acceptable Use Policy. CFAC decided to create a subcommittee to update the AUP or come up with a new AUP. The subcommittee, under the leadership of T.J. Lusher, has worked through the process and has created a three-page AUP that was evaluated by CFAC at the last meeting. It was decided to move that forward with Brett Coryell as the champion for it to move it through the policy committee university approach to try to bring this forward next year. The main emphasis too was that it is three pages instead of all sorts of pages and it is tied together with other policy instead of having everything written out specific into one spot.

**W. Pitney:** So, that Acceptable Use Policy will be coming forward in the fall to be examined by faculty?

**B. Mackie:** Yes.

**W. Pitney:** Very good. Any questions for Brian? Seeing none, thank you, Brian.

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](#) – Page 22

**W. Pitney:** We'll move on, our next report is the Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committee on enrollment. This was the meeting, they only spent about half of their allotted time, meeting in public space. They were slated to receive a report not only on program prioritization and its process, but also practices that affect academic program additions, deletions. They're mostly interested in the process that we go through for making curricular decisions just to educate themselves. They never got to that because they went into closed session. They did, however, hear a presentation from the provost not too far removed from what we saw today, but certainly not with the criteria on program prioritization. And they voted to endorse that program prioritization initiative identifying almost as Dr. Freeman mentioned with the state legislators in terms of having a sense of stewardship for the institution. They appreciated that process. So they voted to endorse that. So that's the highlights of that committee meeting. Any questions for me?

- I. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and William Pitney – no report
- J. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – no report

## **IX. 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 23-25

**W. Pitney:** Seeing none, let's move on. Reports from our standing committees. Stephen's not here today and Ibrahim couldn't be with us, but the only report we've got is under Item E, Resources, Space and Budget Committee on page 23. And we'll have an action item here. On page 23 you'll see that they've provided us their statement of budget priorities which is obtained from Resource, Space and Budget every spring. And what they've done is taken a look at the previous statement of priorities. They also did a survey earlier in the spring, looked at that data, discussed some of these items and they added to this a little bit in terms of having identified some bullets under "Space," which is on page 25. I think the item they added was to recommend exploring how to use existing space for revenue generation and supporting our academic mission. Other than that, are there any questions about the statement of budget priorities? Seeing

none, I would accept a motion. We'll need a motion to accept the report. George? And a second? Richard, thank you. Any discussion points on this? Seeing none, if you'll use your clicker, please, and go ahead for this motion to accept the RSB's Statement of Budget Priorities, please press 1 or A to approve; 2 or B to vote no; and 3 or C to abstain. So 1 or A is to vote yes in favor of the motion; 2 or B is to vote no not in favor of the motion; and 3 or C is to abstain. So if you'd go ahead and push your buttons now, please. Has everybody voted? Can we close the vote? And the motion carries. Thank you.

Yes – 26

No – 2

Abstain – 0

**W. Pitney:** We've already done nine F and ten we've obviously postponed. We don't have any new business. Are there any comments or questions from the floor?

**R. Feurer:** Why were we voting on this RSB report because we don't usually do that.

**W. Pitney:** We have in the past. We voted to endorse it or approve it and then from there it goes to the – so it's a joint committee and then it goes to council. If there are any changes then we can make those before they go to council.

## **IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair; Therese Arado, Alternate  
[Brought forward in the order of business.]

1. Nomination of the 2015-16 Executive Secretary of University Council, who shall also serve as President of Faculty Senate per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 2.1

[Greg Long](#) – Pages 26-27

[Virginia Naples](#) – Page 28

**W. Pitney:** We have moved on our agenda two items forward. Items IX F and Items X. So we're going to go to item IX F, that is our Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. Therese is going to take that and move that forward.

**T. Arado:** All right. We have a couple of items we have to get through and with everyone's cooperation we will move swiftly. First, for all of elections today we ask that you vote only if you are a voting member of Faculty Senate. And Pat will put up on the display a list of those of us who are voting members just in case we don't know. If you see your name on the list or you're serving as an alternate for somebody who is on the list, then you get to vote today. Per Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 2.1 we will nominate by secret ballot. That is the white sheet with three lines on it, two with names, at your spots. The Executive Secretary of University Council who shall also serve as President of Faculty Senate for 2015-2016. Based on advice from our parliamentarian, we are using the paper ballots. Please vote for one person by either placing a checkmark by the name of one candidate or by writing in the name of someone else in the blank line marked other. When you are finished, please fold and pass your ballot this way in the room

and we will collect them and count them during the meeting. After we collect all these, I will move on to the next things we have to vote on. All right, did everybody have a chance to pass in a ballot?

2. Election of University Council Personnel Committee representatives for terms to begin 2015-16 – Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; voting will be by college (COB, COE, CHHS, and CLAS) have vacancies to fill this year); votes will be counted following the meeting and newly-elected UCPC members will be notified – walk-in

**T. Arado:** Okay, the next thing we are doing is according to NIU Bylaws Article 2.4.1.1. We're going to elect faculty to serve on the University Council Personnel Committee. These ballots are color coded by college and I'll hand them out momentarily. Only four colleges have vacancies to fill this year: Business, Education, Health and Human Sciences, and Liberal Arts and Sciences. When I call the name of your college, please raise your hand and keep it raised until you receive a ballot. And then follow the instructions on the ballot and just leave those at your spot. The first one we're going to do is the College of Liberal Arts and Science. Anyone from Liberal Arts and Sciences, raise your hands. Everybody from Liberal Arts and Science got a ballot? Okay, the next one we have is College of Business. Anyone from the College of Business, raise your hand. The colored sheets you leave at your seat and they will be collected at the end. Anyone else for College of Business? Okay. On the Arts and Sciences, there's a name listed twice and I think that was just a mistype. All right our next group is the College of Education. And last, but certainly not least, is the College of Health and Human Sciences. Okay did everyone get one for their appropriate college? Hopefully yes and you can just leave those at your seat and they will be collected at the end of the meeting.

3. Committees of the University 2015-16 – Election of candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate – Ballot packets will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; votes will be counted following the meeting and those elected will be notified – walk-in

**T. Arado:** The last thing we have to do is to elect the faculty to serve on a number of committees of the university. These ballots are at your place. They are the 8 ½ x 11 little packet that says Committee of the Universities for terms to begin fall 2015. If you would please complete the packet only if you are a voting member and then leave the packet at your spot and those will get collected at the end of the meeting as well. Does anyone have any question about any of these?

**Unidentified:** The first ballot, the third candidate doesn't have a description if I'm reading it right.

**T. Arado:** Correct I believe all those people were invited to, but not required to, submit.

**W. Pitney:** Everyone was invited to submit. Thank you, Therese. Are we still counting the ballots for the – is that it? They've collected the ballots and counted them for our Executive Secretary of the University Council who also serves as President of the Faculty Senate and our next Executive Secretary is Greg Long. Greg, congratulations.

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** [brought forward in order of business]

- A. Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate Bylaws [Article 3](#) – Pages 29-32  
Rules & Governance Committee and  
Elections & Legislative Oversight Committee  
**SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM**

**W. Pitney:** That moves us to Item X. We've got some unfinished business. So this is the proposed revision of Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 3 and this was to consolidate the Rules and Governance Committee along with the Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. And the other portion of that proposal was to make that a joint committee across both Faculty Senate and University Council. So can find that proposed change on pages 29 to 32.

We need to test the clickers. What we've got to do is essentially take attendance to make sure we have an adequate number of folks because we have to have a minimum of two-thirds of our voting members here present to vote in order to make a Faculty Senate Bylaw change. If you would all take your clicker and push A please, just push A, and that should register A. And you should get a smiley face that will give us a count here without taking too much time to look around. Can you push it again? Did everybody push A? Not enough, we need 47. Does everybody understand whether or not they're a voting member? To make a bylaw change, we need two-thirds of the folks here present to vote and we needed 47, 46.6 put we rounded up to 47. Either way, if we rounded down, we wouldn't have that either. So I would take a motion to postpone the vote on that unfinished business and at this point it's going to have to be the first meeting of the fall to take our vote. George, I can see that motion and second? Thank you John. All in favor of postponing that to the beginning of the academic year say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay so we postponed that to the fall. That takes care of this.

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**

**XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**XIII. 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
- Q. [Meeting Schedule](#) – 2015-16 – Page 33

**W. Pitney:** Seeing none, we will move to Information Items. Item Q next year's meeting schedule for Faculty Senate. So take a look at that that's on page 33, and I'll accept a motion to adjourn. Richard, second John. Thank you all in favor say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

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

#### **XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

**W. Pitney:** I'll accept a motion

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.