FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, November 19, 2014, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Baker, Bateni, Briscoe, Brubaker, Bujarski, Campbell, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Conderman, Falkoff, Feurer, Gilson, Gorman, Haji-Sheikh, Hunt, Irwin, Jaffee, Konen (for Wilson), Koren, Long, Macdonald, Mackie, McHone-Chase, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Patro, Pitney, Rosenbaum, Rush, Ryu, Sagarin, Schneider, Schwartz-Bechet, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Stoddard, Than

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Azad, Brown, Chen, Chmaissem, Deng, Fredericks, Giese, Hathaway, Hedin, Henning, Khoury, Lee, Lenczewski, Manning, Martin, Millis, Mogren, Mohabbat, Montana, Moraga, Munroe, Onyuksel, Plonczynski, Riley, Rodgers, Shin, Siegesmund, Stephen, Tonks, Un, Wilson, Xie

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Bryan, Coronado, Glick, Haliczer, Hammond, Meyer, Parks, Smith (for Monteiro), Stafstrom, Streb

OTHERS ABSENT: Doederlein, Gebo, Monteiro, Shortridge, Waas

I.   CALL TO ORDER

W. Pitney: We can go ahead and call our meeting to order please.

Meeting called to order at 3:06 p.m.

II.   ADOPTION OF AGENDA

W. Pitney: Our first item is to adopt the agenda that's before you. Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

J. Novak: So moved.

W. Pitney: Thank you.

H. Bateni: Second.

W. Pitney: Second, Hamid. Any changes, suggestions? Hearing none, all in favor of adopting the agenda say aye.

Members: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions?

III. APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES](#) OF THE OCTOBER 29, 2014 FS MEETING

W. Pitney: Our second item is to approve our minutes from the October 29 meeting. May I have a motion to approve the minutes?

G. Conderman: I'll move.

W. Pitney: Thank you. We' got a motion and now we need a second.

G. Baker: Second.

W. Pitney: Gary Baker second. Discussion, any edits, modifications or changes? Hearing none all in favor to approve the minutes say aye.

Members: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Alright so minutes were good.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A.   Use of microphones – William Pitney

W. Pitney: Before we get started I'd just like to remind folks: For any questions please be sure to use the microphones and it would be very helpful to just raise your hand as the microphone comes towards you so that our technician can activate the microphone. They're not all on all the time. So then we can get any comments, questions, concerns, dialog in general transcribed for our minutes.

B.   [Student Conduct 101](#): What Faculty Should Know About Us – Pages 4-7
        Brian Glick, Asst. Director, Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct

W. Pitney: So with that said, I'd like to move to our first item under President's Announcements. It's my pleasure to introduce Brian Glick and Jeanne Meyer. Brian is the assistant director of the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct and Jeanne is the director. Thank you for coming today. There is some information in your packet form, pages 4 to 7. And Brian suggested coming and speaking to faculty about what his office does and how things are processed, etc., what faculty should know, kind of a Student Conduct 101. I think this was last September, early September or if not August, maybe July. I don't know, it's all a blur. And I thought that was just a great idea so I'm very happy to introduce both Brian and Jeanne. Thanks for coming today. So I'm going to turn the floor over to you.

B. Glick: Thank you. Okay, we are going to see how well this works with a corded microphone as not to disobey the president by not speaking with a microphone. Good afternoon. I'm glad that you're here. I wanted to share with you, even at this point in the semester, some information about the Student Conduct Office, our interactions that we have with faculty, ways that we may be able to be of assistance to you, not only as the semester comes to an end which is generally

when we tend to see our most interactions with faculty members, but obviously in the coming semesters as well.

There are basically two primary ways that our office interacts with faculty. And that is through the reporting of academic misconduct and also disruptive students in the classroom. The information that you have in your agendas, pages 4 to 7, is a quick overview both in text and visually for those who do better with graphics, about how our office responds to academic misconduct, what the process is for reporting that, and so I refer you to that. And certainly as you have questions along the way, by all means please call us and most of our time is actually going to be spent with questions.

I wanted to show you our website, niu.edu/communitystandards, and if you don't remember that, A to Z index is a great thing. We're under student conduct, we're under C for community standards, and for those of you who remember, we use to be judicial affairs, we're still under J. Yeah I see a few heads nodding. You'll find us there too, we understand that and you'll get routed to the appropriate site. For those of you who have not visited our website either before or in quite some time, we have made a couple of changes, hopefully, so that it is much easier for you to find what you're looking for and also to submit those incident reports. Two places that I would point your attention to, right at the top along the header there where it says Faculty and Staff, on this page is a lot of information. We used to have a publication, we've moved it all online so this is going to help you define academic misconduct, what to do, when you see it how to report it, things that you can do to help prevent academic misconduct from occurring in your classrooms, step-by-step instructions with visuals for how to complete the academic misconduct form, the code of conduct, a link to the academic policy and procedure manual. So all of that information is there for you to peruse at your leisure and, of course, as you have an incident feel free to contact our office. We'll be glad to walk you through this process.

Two things that I would remind you in terms of this. There are two different pieces of academic misconduct: the grade piece and the allegation that somebody actually did something wrong. If you've got a student, let's say you believe I committed misconduct in your class. Have that conversation with me. If I disagree that I have done something wrong, refer that case over to the conduct office immediately. We'll take care of that.

If it is simply just that I disagree with a grade that you're going to give me: a zero for the assignment, an F for the course, make me redo some similar project, make me redo the same project over again, that's all within your purview. Feel free to have me do that and, if I want to challenge that, I simply go up the chain within the department. Go to the department chair, go to the dean, etc. And that's all outlined in the Academic Policy and Procedure Manual. Make sense so far? Excellent.

If at any point you're looking to seek a suspension or an expulsion as a result of academic misconduct, send that case to our office immediately. Only the student conduct office can suspend or expel a student. So that does need to come to our office and that's simply completing the academic misconduct incident report. Pat if you'd go back and actually if you just want to hit the back button on the thing there to get back to our webpage. Once you're ready to complete the misconduct report, this little red and white icon, click on that, and scroll down a little bit, a little

more, a little more, there we go – academic misconduct – and just clicking on that icon will get you to the form that you need to fill out. Very simple, tell us who you are, who was involved, we have several questions that are relatively self-explanatory, and feel free to tell us exactly what was going on, attach any documentation that you'd like, hit the submit report button and you can do that. You'll get a copy of that report. If you'd like to copy your department chair, you can do that as well, and that's the form.

J. Meyer: Let me just add a quick note. We instruct all new faculty members on academic misconduct and we put it this way. You're in charge of the grade; we're in charge of conduct. The way we handle it is academic misconduct you can get a letter of warning, you can get a deferred suspension, you can get a suspension, or you can get an expulsion. The academic policy states that you will notify us of academic misconduct. It states that you will attempt to meet with the student. Attempt to meet with the student is sending him an e-mail saying: I want to meet with you. That gets really challenging. Then you do whatever you're going to do with the grade and, if a student wants to challenge that with the grade, they'll come to you. If they're getting a letter of warning, a suspension, or expulsion and they want to challenge that, they'll come to us. Questions about that?

G. Baker: The responsibilities of the teaching assistant with regard to academic misconduct, sometimes I've seen a conflict between the TA and the faculty instructor of record. Is there a policy for what the TA should do if they suspect academic misconduct?

J. Meyer: Any academic person is to report academic misconduct to us. Okay. Who has control over the course? Who's signing for the curriculum? Is the instructor? So my position would be, though I'm unaware of any specific policy, it's your class, you're in charge.

R. Feurer: What's the time frame for reporting? Is there a cap line?

J. Meyer: Well, what the code of conduct tells the students is that whenever reasonable you should report it within the semester it happens. Now you all know academic misconduct happens when? Finals week. We want you to take appropriate measures with the grade and then you can contact us via this online. It's an online form. You can do it from Costa Rica. You should attempt to meet with the student which you can do via phone, email or in person. Does that answer your question?

B. Glick: It's most helpful to report this as soon as possible. Part of the reason that we want this and part of the reason that the policy exists is to say that you are obligated as faculty members, as TAs to report this is because, while it does not happen terribly often, it does happen that students commit misconduct in multiple places. So I cheat in your class, I go down the hall and I cheat in your class. Unless you two are talking to each other, you don't know that. Therefore, you are welcome, we encourage faculty, to contact our office and say: Does Brian Glick have any academic misconduct issues that are reported to your office? That may very well have an impact on what grade you choose, what sanction you seek, in regards to dealing with me if I'm doing this in multiple places. So we can share that information with you, we will share that information with you. We will only share academic misconduct information with you so don't ask about how many times has he smoked marijuana or drank under age. I can't tell you that, but I can tell you

there have been prior academic misconduct incidents. Please know that our office will also monitor that and, if we see Brian's name keep popping up and it says academic misconduct next to it, our office will step in and charge a violation as well and seek further action even though you may have already resolved things with simply a grade penalty. Yes sir.

J. Stafstrom: Earlier this semester I got a notification from you, from your office, that a student in my class had some kind of an issue and that's all that I knew and I think that this student either eventually dropped the class or maybe left for the semester, and that's fine, I don't need to know all the details, but can you just comment on that kind of a situation?

J. Meyer: Sure. What we utilize is the class removal form. We have just started this semester with a temporary and permanent. So, based on a student's misconduct, if there is a risk to the campus community, they may be temporarily removed from campus and you would be notified not to take any action but they have been removed. It would also say the university does not consider this an excused absence. Then, upon their removal as a sanction, we would send you a letter that says the student has been permanently removed. If it's within the first eight weeks, we will work with the advising deans to get them removed. If it's in the second eight weeks, the advising deans will work with you so you should call them to say: Where are they at in that process. On occasion, on rare occasions, I get faculty members who say: I really like this student, I'm going to go meet with them at Starbucks. Don't do that. They've been removed because they're a risk to the campus community and why would you want to put yourself in that position? Does that answer your question?

J. Stafstrom: It was just something that I had never seen before and, since the question arose, I thought I'd have you comment on it.

J. Meyer: And we will our policy is always to issue that to each instructor that is on the course all right so you'll get that via e-mail so that you know and it says right on there is this not an excused absence and whether it's a temporary or permanent. Now what you need to know is financial aid and how they do all that is another world. The student, while they're waiting to find out what happened, will sometimes withdraw and they can do that. Yeah?

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to ask: Has this information been provided to department chairs?

J. Meyer: Well, yes and no. It's provided via the policy. We would love to do more training with department chairs. We've been to see a couple of them. So we would encourage you, anybody who wants us to come and do a presentation, we're happy to. It's part of the academic policies and procedures, the student code of conduct, and the class removal is an internal policy with the academic deans.

G. Slotsve: Okay, what I was gonna suggest is maybe at least e-mailing at least some of what you've given us here potentially to department chairs and where they can find these forms. Because, at least in our department, we have kind of a committee put together that examines some of these issues, grading issues and that, but it would be nice if the department had some place where okay we know it's stored here, it's not sitting with the individual faculty member.

J. Meyer: Right, that's a great idea.

G. Slotsve: And that we can get together. It's also more likely to hit a departmental meeting and people getting a head's up; look you better take a look at this. If it's a mass mailing to faculty there's a tendency well I don't have time to look at it.

J. Meyer: Absolutely, thanks.

R. Moremen: Has this information been shared with Student Athletic Support Services?

J. Meyer: Yeah.

R. Moremen: And if we complete an incident report, are we in any way obligated to share this information with them or just with you?

J. Meyer: You know, I can't answer what their requirements are because I'm not aware. You know, I follow the Academic Policy and Procedures Manual and I would assume they would too. So, if there is an athlete involved in academic misconduct, Athletic Academic Support is aware that there's an issue. They don't know what exactly happened. Okay.

R. Moremen: Can I ask a follow-up? I'm well aware as I'm sure everybody in here is, that they have tutors who work with them. And that sometimes can be a fine line between what is the work of the student and what is the work of the tutor. And if you suspect that there is something funny going on there, what are our obligations under those circumstances?

J. Meyer: They are the same obligations you have. Anytime you suspect academic misconduct, you do a reasonable amount of checking up and then you notify us. Somebody in the back had something?

M. Streb: I am the faculty athletics rep and I'd be happy to talk to you about how athletics uses the and the process we go through when that happens. I will say that our tutors all go through extensive training and that's not to say that there may not be issues, but they certainly have gone through a lot of training to make sure they're not crossing…

J. Meyer: I can tell you, as a population, there's a lower incidence of academic misconduct among athletes than the general population. Anybody else? Questions for Brian? The other thing we want to talk about is disruptive students. If you don't mind going back on the webpage to the previous webpage. We have to follow the code of conduct. Unfortunately, like everything else this world is rather litigious and so I encourage you to look at the code of conduct with is on our webpage, on the top left, student code of conduct. It defines, you don't need to go to it, but it defines disruptive behavior. Feel free to report that, and the way you would do that is through an incident report, general incident report which is different than an academic incident report.

The other thing I wanted to let you know is we now have a student of concern form. A student concern form is available for those students who aren't violating any rules, but you're concerned

about. That's available through niu.edu/care. All right. In your red folders which tell you how to address students of concern we'll have added that or will be adding that. Okay. Brian. Questions?

B. Glick: Wow. Okay, as Jeannie was mentioning in response to your question sir, if you'd like us to provide some more information to departments, certainly to individual faculty, please let us know. Our contact information is on the website, judicial@niu or 753-1571. We'll be glad to come chat with either departments or individual faculty members as well and to share that information with you.

W. Pitney: Thank you very much. Thank you Brian, thank you Jeanne.

C.   NIU Cellular Phone Stipend Policy Proposal and Presentation – Pages 8-10
        Matt Parks, Senior Director, Network and Communications Services, DoIT

W. Pitney: Our next guest is Matt Parks. He's the senior director for network and communication services for the Division of Information Technology, DoIT. He's here to speak with us about the NIU cellular phones stipend policy. So it's my pleasure to introduce you to Matt Parks. Thanks, Matt.

M. Parks: Good afternoon, everyone. Has anyone had a chance, you want me to stand or sit, what would be best? Stand, okay. All right. Has anyone had a chance to look at the stipend policy yet that we gave to the Faculty Senate just as a preliminary review? No, okay. So I'm going to run through what this policy proposal is essentially, to change from an NIU-managed program to one that is a stipend-based infrastructure or program if you will.

So a little bit of background: We've had an NIU-managed cell phone program for over ten years at the university and currently it supports over 600 managed devises made up of faculty and staff members of which 400 of them are unique users. So the 200, we've got a number of groups between student affairs, housing, and athletics that we deploy. We manage the program for that. We work with the departments on the approval and process for doing that, the departments fund it. Our division procures provisions and activates all the services for those cell phones. So once the department sends in the form, we review it, make sure it's accurate and good. We then procure and then we get a monthly bill from Verizon Wireless, who is sort of our institutional partner with this program, and break that up by the different departments that use these managed services, and bill back. So there is sort of a billing requirement from our division. And, of course, because this is a state-owned property and state service plans, we're subject to standard audit requirements. And, frankly speaking, this is a program that's not really aligned with best practices and I'll get into that here in a few minutes. This is just a quick divisional breakdown of the managed program across campus.

So the biggest consumer of services is the operations and community relations sort of formerly the [inaudible] group, followed by Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and then IT. What's in the bubbles is the annual spend, and roughly the university spends about $400,000 a year on managed services with this cell phone program. You can see the breakdown of devices by color code. So Information Technology, as you might expect, has a larger portfolio of smart phone services than maybe student affairs does. And so, while student affairs has higher devices

counts, our annual spend for this program is a little bit higher than them. Academic affairs, of course, sorry go back one, academic affairs is sort of the fourth largest consumer with an annual spend of $45,000 in fairly equal spread between your standard cell phone, basic cell phones, without data and then the smart phone function. This is interesting in that about half of the managed devices we have on campus connect to NIU's e-mail and calendar functions, right. But it's a significant minority in the total devices at NIU that connect into our e-mail and calendaring functions. I think that's, we'll get to this in a few minutes, but there's an indication that obviously many more users at the university beyond just those served by the managed cell phone program connect in for e-mail and calendaring functions. So, the brief run-down, top of the waves on the proposed policy is to eliminate all discretely assigned NIU managed cell phones. Convert all individuals and their devices to personal plans. So anybody who currently, go ahead Sabrina.

S. Hammond: (No microphone) I just wanted to restate that in the way that says departments who come to us and they ask for supervisors for rotation for open house events and big events. Those kind of departmentally issued phones that are not assigned to an individual, we will continue to offer our services to help manage the ins-and-outs of procuring and maintaining that type of service. Those phones that are assigned to a specific individual for that kind of use is what we're recommending here that we change the model. Yes sir?

G. Slotsve: Just a point of clarification on this. If someone needs a cell phone to perform their duties, and maybe current they would have NIU supply them a cell phone, are you moving to a different technology now? Would an individual like that be required to get their own personal phone?

S. Hammond: I think the policy is that (no microphone) outline some of the particulars but the overall arching decision is that it's up to you and the department. It's a departmental decision. If the job or the role that you're performing requires you to have a stipend or perhaps a university-managed cell phone. There will be, speaking ahead of that, but we are looking to bring in a new telephone system and with the functionality that we're going to gain with our old 365 appointment and link, there will be a variety of options that will be available than that are current not. So we're going to see the landscape change for that. This is a little bit of a separate discussion, so I don't want to intermix the two, but I understand what you're saying. There will be additional functionalities in the future as we move forward on our phone system.

G. Slotsve: It's just what I want to have clear here is that you're not shifting to a system where somebody who may not currently even own a cell phone is going to have to go out and purchase a cell phone and things like that.

S. Hammond: Absolutely not. I've heard that from a few others too, so it's a good point of clarification. Thank you.

M. Parks: So, what we're proposing with the stipend itself once we convert all individuals and their NIU devices, what we did get approval on is we can take, if you have an NIU issued device, that can transfer over to sort of what we call personal liability if you will. There's a process and some paperwork we do to make that happen. But a three tiered stipend approach: a $35 basic

voice, $85 voice/data, and then $115 what we're calling expanded voice and data. These were informed by sort of the natural price points that we, NIU, bear for the different types of phones that we deliver services to. What our division is going to do, if and when this policy gets approved, is sort of go through our organization and do sort of a staff validation of the type of work functions that people do. Whether or not that work function qualifies for a stipend in and of itself. There will be certainly employees within our division that just simply don't qualify for the stipend, number one. Secondly, those that do will have a decision point within our division on what level and it's gonna be, you know, critical services will be a key driver for how we inform that. And that should flow through to the other divisions. Note next to the three-tier monthly stipend, we're saying division manager discretion. Through this policy, our division is getting out of the business with cell phones, right. The divisions, academic affairs, student affairs and so on, will then be allowed to develop their own internal policies and procedures both at the departmental level, but at the divisional level, on how they want to implement who gets a stipend, okay. So where I said a few minutes ago how you guys fill out paperwork, you get your manager approval, you get it to ITS right now or division of IT excuse me, we review it and make sure all the T's are crossed and so forth and then procure it. In this case we're out of that business. You are empowered, your divisions, your managers, are empowered to make those decisions about who gets a stipend based upon functional requirements. We don't look at it from the perspective of people, right? Alan gets one, Sabrina doesn't. But it's around the service, the function of the position and the type of services that position provides. An engineer, as an example, might require and I'm using IT speak so forgive me, but an engineer might require a higher order stipend than a frontline technician, as an example. So there's some work that feel like each division's going to have to go through to figure this out.

Simply, we want make this as simple as possible so we would have an online employee self services stipend agreement form. It's a mouthful but it will be a simple web form that would go through a simple workflow to have the manager approve it. And then payroll requires this additional pay form which most people are familiar with and that is the means by which you would receive this stipend. Sort of a little bit of what George was talking about, we're allowing for an exception process.

So in the policy or the proposed policy, there is an allotment or an allocation or an accommodation, excuse me, for an exception right. So if you're job requires that you need an NIU-issued cell phone, we've had discussions with SPS Council and Operating Staff Council where HR brings – comes to mind is one that might require that we allow for that exception. And simply it's the vice presidential approval. If your division leader says yes that's fine, we're gonna still be in the business of providing managed-cell phone service for the group phones that Sabrina just mentioned, so they're still gonna be around, but we want a majority of those 400 individual devices to move into a stipend program. So what are the benefits? It eliminates complexity and conflict. So those of us who carry two phones, one for business, one for personal, we don't have to do that anymore. So that whole business and personal mix issue gets resolved. This is in line with industry best practices. The next slide will get to this in a minute, but what I'll just say is the three and a half years I've been at NIU, when I first came here I was quite astounded, and prior to coming to NIU I spent about 13 or 14 years in the private sector, I've never seen anything like a managed program from a university's perspective. My boss, Brett Coryell, the new CIO of the university, comes from academia and similarly had not seen a

university run a centrally managed cell phone program the way that we do where there's this intrinsic conflict between the Acceptable Use Policy of what you can do on these phones. I personally don't want to carry two phones on me. That's not something, I can barely manage one, much less two. So that's a difficult thing. We want to get rid of that as much as we can. You would no longer get cell phone bills from our division on a monthly basis. This relieves audit burden for those departments we can get away from with that. It relieves us of project managing this whole effort which is great.

Service provider agnostics, so I mentioned Verizon Wireless is the institutional partner for this program. This is whoever your service provider is, it's all good. And then, of course, it still works with NIU e-mail app. So back to that pie chart that showed a vast majority of the users that connect through their own personal devices, that's all of the above in terms of Verizon, AT&T and the other providers. We do anticipate, you've heard of exchange e-mail coming down the pipe here next semester. When that's done, we will likely roll out what's called an e-mail container solution which would sort of logically hold all of the NIU corporate data, if you will, on the phone so that, if you lost your personal phone, it had NIU data on it, we could remotely wipe it without affecting the personal data on it. So that's the idea there.

So a couple years ago we asked a number of our partner institutions that we talk with multiple times a year what they do both from the perspective of groups as well as individuals. And what you'll find in the far right column is they either do stipends or they do nothing. The only time that you see sort of an institutionally-managed program is for group funds which makes sense, and so we're sort of that outlier. I do caveat that this is not faculty and senior administration. I suspect presidents of universities carry an institutionally-managed device, but for the average employee out there, these are types of ways they are managed.

So we've gone through SPS Council, Operating Staff Council, I've met with the ethics officer and the Office of General Counsel to get input, feedback, concerns, and to validate some those concerns with these officials. And what we found is about 65 percent of SPS Council and Operating Staff Council are supportive of the stipend approach, number one. Secondly, the vast majority think the stipend rate structure is appropriate. So it looks like we hit the mark on the rate structure for it. Three-quarters approve of the stipend exception process that we allow for one. You're never going to get 100 percent of this so you need to allow for it and generally people feel good about that.

The concerns that have come forward of people who aren't in support of this are around ethics. So we've got some concerns about: Is it ethical to put NIU business data on your personal phone? I talked with Jim Guagliardo in some detail about this and basically the answer is no, right. The flip would be the difference. The Acceptable Use Policy is where you're putting personal data and abusing what is a state-owned device where, in this case, there's no issues whatsoever from the ethics office.

On the privacy front, of course NIU information is subject to FOIA and discoverability so a majority of the devices that do connect right now are already personal devices, right? So this is an issue we're already dealing with today. So people who have concerns about these transitioning from a managed device to a personal device, a vast majority of our staff are already

doing this. And we're going to have a corporate container coming soon which could sort of bifurcate that information or segment it off on the phone for protection purposes. And then there was some concerns about work-life balance and not wanting work to infringe upon life and I get that. We all deal with that everyday anyway.

S. Hammond: [off mic] a quick show of hands how many people in the room have personal devises that they use to connect up with their e-mail…

M. Parks: So by a show of hands who has an NIU issued phone? Okay.

S. Hammond: [off mic] So I'm assuming the rest of you do have cell phones, correct? Do you use that cell phone to read your e-mail and sometimes get phone calls from that? Do you have that? So you're already taking your personal device and you're using it to connect to the corporate or NIU mail? Okay.

G. Slotsve: Once again, I just want to point out because I don't know that people necessarily realize that even without the stipend you're subject to the FOIA. If I use my personal device and just connect in to the NIU calendar and everything. That's something that I don't know that is well known on campus.

M. Parks: Yeah and Greg Brady articulated that to me. If there's an assumption or if there is a thought – I'll use that word – that you may have NIU information on your device, whether you do or not, if they suspected you, they could confiscate that device to assess whether or not there's NIU information. That's straight out of the Office of General Counsel.

M. Falkoff: I'm a lawyer…

M. Parks: Yeah, I've got. Certainly I can forward an e-mail I traded with Greg on that, but essentially the point is: If there is an expectation or a thought that you have NIU data on your personal device, then they have the right to ask for that information.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I want to reemphasize this: That word, discoverable, is a big word, right lawyer? Extremely big word and if they put, I would suggest that you don't do any university business on your private phones just from that discoverability thing unless there is some other way around. Because if you are talking to someone and it becomes, for some reason, your phone gets picked up in a search and you have said something completely unrelated to NIU but say you have a little bit of an issue somewhere else in your private life, that becomes a problem. The police or whoever has this can take your personal information because they found it in discovery in another direction. Am I right?

M. Falkoff: You're right.

M. Haji-Sheikh: So this is a merger, not bad for an engineer, huh? This is a merger and those of you who know I've been fighting on the legal area last year so I have been having some fun with the administration. This is a major crossover of personal and private and if you don't want your private information discoverable for any reason, stay off.

M. Parks: So, and that's fair. Again, I'm not a lawyer so I'm not going to go too far down that road other than to say we did validate some of these issues with Greg and what I will do is provide some information on that conversation to Faculty Senate and we'll take that action item. Just as a response to that, what we see are a significant amount of NIU employees are using their personal devices for transacting with the university. That is happening today. George?

G. Slotsve: Sorry, Matt I'll just finish with this because I know I mentioned this to you before, Marc, and it wasn't clear. But this is something that I think we may want to discuss at least here at some point and I think it's something that faculty and individuals need to realize. Just to reiterate, I don't think the information is out there and they're moving over with their personal devices and don't realize the implications of that.

M. Falkoff: The legal analysis may be absolutely correct. I think it's more likely that this is one of those areas where there is quite a bit of ambiguity and grayness. And, in those situations, one of the things I'm sure we would all appreciate knowing is that the university would be standing up for us and not willy-nilly or even in a casual way by releasing information pursuant to a FOIA or something like that. Let something like that pursuant to a subpoena as opposed to a warrant. I think these are really important questions and it only occurs to us to think through the legal ramifications when someone gets caught with something under circumstances that they think are unfair. Yeah, I think I would just love to get more information about that.

M. Parks: So as a starter, I will connect with Greg on validating some more of these points, get those to you all. And then, if there needs to be some follow-up discussion with the Office of General Counsel, that can happen.

D. Haliczer: One of the concerns that we raised at our council was that those of us who might decide to use the stipend policy to get the reimbursement, but if we have unpublished numbers, what happens with our phones numbers?

M. Parks: Sabrina, you want to

S. Hammond: [off mic]

D. Haliczer: My private number is an unpublished number, but if I accept the stipend what happens to that unpublished number here in the university?

M. Parks: So, I asked you and I'll say something and then you can take it. And actually, Sabrina, I think at SPS Council you may have brought this up. I mean if you are somebody who qualifies for the stipend based upon your job function, maybe that stipend can be applied to just a second phone that you can publish that number. I get the issue of the personal phone and especially the position you're in and a number of your colleagues are in, not wanting to publish that. So one of two things: One is you go through that acceptation process and, as I said earlier, that's one of those functions here at NIU that one could acknowledge maybe should stay on an NIU-issued plan. Secondly again the stipend is an avenue. Go ahead.

S. Hammond: And also there is some [no microphone] you can have a published number and have [inaudible] and that's not the number that you got. So we can work around technically to keep your private number private but give you a published number [inaudible].

D. Haliczer: Always got my back, thanks Sabrina and Matt.

M. Parks: Okay, so just to wrap up, we drafted an initial policy four or five months ago now, put that to cabinet. They gave a lot of feedback on some of the particulars of the policy that we made changes to and then we took it to shared governance. So six weeks ago, eight weeks ago, we went to SPS Council, about a month ago to Operating Staff Council, now to you all. We want your feedback. We want to consolidate and we are going to consolidate any and all feedback in that final policy to go back to the cabinet, hopefully, for final approval. One thing that we've done with SPS Council and Operating Staff that I'll assess based upon sort of some head knods here is a survey of a number of questions related to this policy. Would you all be interested in providing feedback via a survey that we could tally back up and share the results with Faculty Senate, is that appropriate? Okay, so we'll do that and that's it. So any other questions you all have?

H. Bateni: We do have an office landline and our department basically pays, I don't know exactly how much, but there is some money for it per month. Do you foresee a possibility that people give up their office phone and apply for this cell phone fund or support?

M. Parks: Do we want to go down the road of what we're looking to do?

S. Hammond: Well, part of our [no microphone] I'm thinking if you are not using your cell phone and yet you have a mobile and so you need that mobile phone number, your department and you will have to decide if you need a cellular phone to take care of your incoming communications, outgoing communications, but it's not like a one for one swap. We're not expecting that everybody is going to give up, all faculty are going to give up their landlines if they have one and now be given a cellular stipend. But that's a conversation you should have within your division, within your department. Does that make sense? Okay, thank you.

W. Pitney: Thank you for coming first of all. I assume there's cost savings to this. Can you identify what that is?

M. Parks: So, as I said, we spend about roughly $400,000 per year on the managed-service plan. I'm not looking at this necessarily, Bill, as a cost savings, more of a best practices, right. So we feel like right now the $400,000 is a function of the divisions making budgetary decisions about who gets a cell phone or not. The potential for cost savings may come in that somebody may be paying $ to $95 or $100 for a cell phone service today via the current program that really they need is just the basic $35 stipend. And so I think the one play about a cost savings here, because again my focus is really around alleviating some issues with how this program works with the university and align ourselves with best practices, would be a transition from a current department or division's profile of current expense for the program today to a smaller profile based upon the uses. And so maybe there might be more Tier 1 $35.00 a month stipend versus what the they might be paying for cell phone. So I'd say that's where some departments or

divisions might see some cost reductions. Overall, I'm not personally willing to predict where we think that's going to go at the university level. I think time is going to tell. Sabrina?

S. Hammond: I just wanted to add that we have in other councils and governance, we've asked the question on the survey: If given the policy as it is today, if you don't currently have a managed cell phone from NIU, would you be requesting a stipend? And quite a few said yes they would. So you might deduct some cost over here and then you raise costs now because you're bringing people into the program that were previously using their own phone without compensation and now would be looking for some compensation under the program. So again as Matt indicated, we're not looking at this as an overall cost saving, but more that it is the right thing to do at the right time for ethic reasons and for management reasons. That's where we stand.

W. Pitney: Well, thank you very much. Thank you for your time.

W. Pitney: Okay, just a couple of other announcements, though I don't report on this later on, I was at the ad hoc meeting on governance by the Board of Trustees and the Northern Star reported on that. And the report said that the Board of Trustees, that John Butler said the committee should look at such things as presidential succession, evaluation and tenure changes and that was not at all accurate. So to kind of allay any concerns that might have occurred as a result of reading that In Brief presentation in the Northern Star, what the board was interested in was understanding some of the appeals processes that occur with our personnel decisions for tenure, as well as not simply voting on approving the university's recommendations for tenure but also understanding were there any that were denied during that year. Presently at Board of Trustees meetings they're presented with a list of faculty that are to be promoted and tenured, etc. and they vote on those. What they don't always see is the other side of the issue in terms of were there any denials and they just wanted that information. John Butler e-mailed me yesterday. I had not even yet read the column, but he said there's been a misinterpretation of our intent and my interpretation having been at that meeting was just as he described and that is they just wanted more information on the issue, they're not looking to change anything or have a stake at that. So I just wanted to make that clear.

At our last meeting we voted by majority vote to endorse the concept and framework of the PLUS program. I just wanted to let this body know that I sent a letter to the PLUS Task Force letting them know that outcome. And I also sent, we also passed a statement of concern and I sent that to Drs. Freeman and Birberick. And what I wrote was that the second motion approved a statement of concern about the implementation of PLUS including both the pace and the modalities of implementation. At the core of this motion is the Faculty Senate's concern that quality not be sacrificed for expediency. Should the program move forward, we simply urge that what would best serve the institution is that implementation including timing, coordination and budgeting be carried out in a deliberate manner. So that was forwarded to them.

We have a faculty holiday social that is scheduled for December 4 from 3 to 5 at the Barsema Alumni and Visitors Center. I invite you all to attend and I really would like to encourage each one of us to reach out to a fellow faculty member or two or three and bring them along. So that's from 3 to 5 on December 4.

Gary I don't know if I'm going to put you on the spot, but you had asked me to comment on the brown bag lunches that were coming up in the following year and I forgot, I was remiss in bringing that e-mail with me today. Would you be able to comment on that please?

G. Baker: What Bill is referring to is the idea that, oh about a year ago, perhaps longer, Dave Stone put together an RCR Advisory Board, Responsible Conduct of Research Advisory Board. A lot of directors of graduate studies, for example, ended up on that board and so forth, but sort of an ad hoc committee developed out of that board that wanted to pursue an initiative regarding RCR and, more specifically, the idea that NIU lacks a centralized RCR training. A lot of departments are doing RCR. Our survey indicated that there is a lot of variability in that especially when it came to graduate students. And so, like many other universities, it was thought that a centralized training option for RCR particularly focused on graduate students would be a good idea.

And so this spring we are actually launching the brown bag luncheon forum series that Bill just alluded to. I think Brad Bond sent, in fact, all chairs and graduate program directors and coordinators an e-mail to this perhaps about a month ago in which the RCR forum series schedule was attached. It just kind of looks like this. Shannon Wapole over in the Office of Research Compliance and Integrity put this together. The committee worked on organizing membership on various panels and so forth and some of the topics, for example, will include human subjects research, laboratory safety, data management, authorship and publication, research misconduct. So these are spread out over the spring semester and the intent is to try to encourage as many graduate students, especially graduate students, as possible to attend these brown bag sessions and augment whatever you're doing in your respective departments when it comes to training them in the responsible conduct of research.

We intend to continue this with other RCR topics actually in fall of 2016 and then hopefully keep rotating this on a spring/fall basis. We'll have surveys, we'll probably try to get video of the session to make it available to graduate students not able to attend the particular kinds of resources that we intend to share at these individual sessions. We're setting up a Blackboard collection site that will allow a log in and access to various materials related to this that will be directly addressed for example during these individual lunch bag sessions. So the point is to have you encourage your graduate students in one capacity or another to try to attend these sessions. We want to try to get a good turnout and a good representation so that we can start to move RCR into a more centralized type of platform here at NIU. It seems like a good idea to start with graduate students that are obviously conducting research of one kind or another. So that's the announcement. Bill thanks for the opportunity.

W. Pitney: Absolutely, thank you. If we had some very motivated undergraduate students that were conducting research interested, could they come?

G. Baker: Absolutely, undergrads certainly are invited to these sessions as well. We have plenty of undergrads doing research and they should be eligible as well.

W. Pitney: Excellent. Thank you so much.

V.   ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A.   Chicago State University Faculty Senate
       [Clash Between Chicago State U. and Its Faculty Leaders Redefines Hardball](#) –
       The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 6, 2014 – Pages 11-15

W. Pitney: So, we'll move to Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. I'd originally put in our packet Item A, A Clash Between Chicago State University and Their Board of Trustees. If you weren't aware, their Board of Trustees had elected to no longer recognize Chicago State University's Faculty Senate as an official university body. And several other faculty senates across the state, for example at Illinois State University and I believe Eastern Illinois University, passed resolutions kind of denouncing that step and encouraging the governor to dissolve that board and elect new board members. I was going to bring it up to us to see if we would like to do something similar. However I received an e-mail yesterday forwarded to me from the State University college senate's body and basically it said that the Board of Trustees at Chicago State University had reversed their decision. They decided to re-recognize the Faculty Senate. So it looks as those that's been resolved at least for the time being. However, keep your eyes peeled on the Chronical of Higher Ed. As many problems as they've had between the Faculty Senate and the board of trustees at that institution, I wouldn't be surprised if other issues popped up. Any comments, questions related to that?

B.   [Position Exemption concerns](#) related to State University Civil Service System
       (SUCSS) – Pages 16-21

W. Pitney: The second item. Let me give you a little bit of background information. It's position exemptions concerns related to the State University Civil Service System and I'm going to preface any comments I have to say here that in no way, shape, or form does my sharing some concerns that have been expressed related to the State University Civil Service System mean that our Civil Service staff on campus is not viewed as important. I need to preface that. Indeed, our university would not function without our Civil Service and support professional staff and faculty and our student bodies collectively. Certainly a symbiotic relationship there.

But I wanted to bring to your attention to some issues that have come up. And I'll give you a little bit of history here. Gosh as far back as April of 2011, the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, their Council of Academic Professionals, they had produced a letter of resolution. And, at that point in time, what they urged was that the president of the University of Illinois and the Board of Trustees recognize the irreplaceable value and impact of their academic professionals, that's their version of SPS staff, to the teaching, research, public service, and economic development. They also steadfastly requested that the president of the university and the Board of Trustees take necessary steps to prevent the removal of any exempting authority from the Urbana/Champaign campus. What was occurring at that time were some perceived and/or real restrictions placed on the exemption of authority of universities, meaning that we all are civil service but then faculty, of course, are exempt according to statute. And, if the university has a need for a position and it may go beyond the parameters of what's identified by

the state university civil service system, they might have a need to exempt a position so that it's not civil service, it's SPS. And it was a big concern at that time that some of the restrictions on those exemption processes weren't allowing universities to be flexible enough in creating positions that were meaningful and important to the function of the university.

So forward ahead from there to 2013 and the chair of the Illinois Board of Higher Education Faculty Advisory Council had shared with the State University Civil Service System at that point in time their concerns of differences that exist between the Civil Service System and the state universities on the issue of exemption authority. And they also articulated some concerns and voted unanimously to communicate the concerns on that particular issue.

More recently, while I was at the Council of Illinois University Senates, this was last September, we heard from some academic professionals at the University of Illinois on some of the challenges they've had with the audits at their institution and how restrictive their exemption process has been. And it wasn't allowing them to maintain some of their academic professional positions and that was a huge concern for them. So I started doing some homework. Some senates have endorsed the statement of concern that you see in your packet on page 16. Among them are Western Illinois University, I believe Illinois State and University of Illinois Chicago faculty senates have all endorsed the statement of concern from the Council of Illinois University Senates.

Amongst the concerns and the reason why a statement of concern was produced by that body of which I was a part of it, is some of the information we'd received about some of the audit processes and how problematic those have become for folks, it just struck us as being fairly arbitrary and somewhat capricious. So we created that statement of concern. Since that time other faculty senates have voted to endorse that statement of concern in an effort to put numbers behind an issue.

I wasn't sure I was ready to bring the issue to this body so I did some homework. I've met with several folks on our campus. I first received some feedback from Jay Monteiro, Andy Small corresponded with me via e-mail. I met with Celeste Latham in Human Resources to learn about her perspective. I also met with Lisa Freeman, executive vice president and provost, Lesley Rigg, I also met with Anne Kaplan. I wanted to understand how the exemption process worked and what meaning it had for us here on this campus and whether it was an issue. And I think, depending upon where you sit, the issue varies a little bit. I also think that, depending upon where you sit with the issue, it may or may not be a huge impact on faculty. But I'm aware that some of our academic advisors are not only SPS but also Civil Service. It's not clear to me if that's been the result of the audits, Deb's nodding her head, that has occurred. So there's been some shifting there with those positions and how they're classified.

But what I've learned in terms of how it's impacting our faculty, let me give you an example. I think that might be helpful. Let's say, I'm going to pick on Todd, let's say Todd Gilson gets a $3 million grant and that grant as written to the NIH requires that he hire a staff to conduct the procedures related to the grant in each of the three years because the grant's $1 million a year for those three years. And he has a need to hire some staff with very explicit and detailed skill sets in order to collect and analyze the data. If the staff fits the specifications already identified in the

State University Civil Service system, that's works great. There's already classification for that personnel. Human Resources can identify folks, put forward using the rule of three right? Three names of folks that are qualified for that position that can be interviewed, one can be selected, etc.

In instances where, the way I understand it, the job, role, and functions deviate from the specifications identified by the State University Civil Service System and the university feels there's need to make this a supportive professional staff position, an exemption application has to occur. In many instances, that can be a very lengthy and cumbersome process that delays being able to advertise for a position and hire folks. If there happens to be a disagreement between the Civil Service System and the university and negotiations occur in how to modify the language, it can be protracted and even lengthier in nature. So if Todd is awarded the grant in October and that exemption process and the grant is supposed to start in January and that process is protracted, the chances of getting the necessary staff in that position may or may not occur as needed.

So one of the ways in which this impacts faculty is in terms of our research and executing our research according to the parameters of the grant. There is some, and by the way if the specifications were such that we could hire somebody as civil service, once hired and providing they pass that probationary period, they're an employee of NIU as civil service staff. Once the grant is concluded they still maintain their employment at NIU and so then they've got to be identified or be linked with another project, etc. So there's that issue. For me personally, that just struck me in a state of fiscal problems, financial implications of that knowing that it's just a three-year grant. It just strikes me as being problematic in some ways.

Some of our advisors have concerns about moving from SPS to Civil Service. Deb actually published a great piece not long ago – two years ago or so, one year ago – on the nature of the concerns and whether they are perceived or real, etc. But, for some, moving from SPS to Civil Service is a concern. For others, not so much. At the end of the day what I've heard, for example, with outreach is that if we've got a grant with the need to hire folks with the necessary skill set and that grant for some public outreach initiatives is for one year or two years and then that project is complete. It puts us at a huge financial disadvantage to go through the exemption process. By the way, that's a process not required by our private institutions.

So that's a little bit of what I know. I don't know if I've done the issue justice, but I wanted to float that out to the Faculty Senate. Is this an issue that the senate would like to take up, perhaps learn more about, and see whether or not supporting other state institutions in terms of supporting the statement of concern or creating our own, is that something this body would be interesting in doing? We could certainly send it to committee to kind of vet it, wrestle with it, report back if we would like to do that. I see no need to force the issue and move on anything at this point in time. George?

G. Slotsve: [No microphone] I just wanted to say I think this is an important issue especially regarding our existing [inaudible] for research assistants. [inaudible] I think it's an important issue. On the other side, what I think we need to think about and be careful of is that we do not civil service, certain jobs reclassified [inaudible no microphone] and they are currently civil

service they could be reclassified and say oh jeez we want more flexibility and we dance around the civil service regulations and I think some of those are actually better [inaudible]. And that's what happened in the '90's and, as I understand it, some of this that the Civil Service System and their responses [inaudible] and that's partially why I think civil service may have responded the way they have. We need to keep a closer eye on the decisions. It's a fairly broad issue but the way the response would occur I think it does impact faculty. We should probably consider this. I just want to note you've got to remember the other side of the story as we go back to the '90's and start reclassifying everything civil service position in SPS.

W. Pitney: Absolutely. I think that's an excellent, and I appreciate your comments, that's an excellent one. We're not saying that to reclassify those that meet the specifications for our Civil Service System at all, but to try to maintain some flexibility for the exemption process to allow us to be at a better competitive advantage and have a little bit more flexibility. Any comments, questions, concerns? Any thoughts on moving that to committee to vet a little bit more?

P. Stoddard: I move we refer it to the appropriate committee. I'm not sure which one that would be. If that would be Rights and Responsibilities or something like that.

W. Pitney: Okay.

P. Stoddard: Whatever you think would be the best.

W. Pitney: Yeah, when I read the committee duties I'm not sure there's a clean one necessarily, but I was thinking either Rules and Governance or Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Any thoughts from you on which of those two would be most appropriate, or we could do an ad hoc but I'm loathe to do that.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, I agree with you that none of the committees is spot on for this. It indirectly affects our responsibilities and rights.

W. Pitney: All right, very good, thank you. So we've got a motion on the floor to refer this to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee? Is there a second? George. Thank you. Any other discussion on the issue? Hearing none, all in favor to move that to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay thank you.

VI.   CONSENT AGENDA

VII.   REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A.   FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – no report

B.   University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC –

no report

W. Pitney: All right, we have no consent agenda. Let's go to the reports from our advisory committees. I saw Brian Mackie, Brian I don't think we have a report however though from the benefits do we? I just wanted to clarify that. I didn't think so but I just wanted to make sure.

B.   Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – report

W. Pitney: George, Computing Facilities Advisory Committee.

G. Slotsve: Okay, there's a few things that I just want to quickly go through. I did receive some questions about two-three weeks ago, basically IT or ITS or DoIT on campus moved over some 10,000 ports of some 24,000 users during the middle of the semester, during the middle of the week and there were complaints. I just want to note because I brought this up through CFAC to the committee and did receive a written response that I have sent to Bill, but the error rate on that was around two percent. The complexity of the project, itself, because the question has been raised: Well why was this even done during the semester? This should have been done outside of the semester; it should have been during the summer. What it required was active engagement of the IT and distributed personnel, but it also needed to make sure everything was working. They had to have full load on the system and their concern was, if they tried to do this in the middle of the summer, for example, everything was going to go down the first week. They just couldn't test everything out properly is what they have responded back to me. So part of it was while it's painful, the implementation was very painful at times, in order to enhance the infrastructure it just have to be done under load and done mid-semester.

There was a question raised about was there a backup plan in case a failure? Yes there was. Basically they started the migration phase at 3 a.m. and tested things out. It allowed them sufficient time so they could have cut back over to the old system and the old set of ports at around 5:30 or 6 in the morning and you wouldn't have noticed anything. So, if they'd run into major problems, they could have reverted back to the old system when they brought it in.

Third question that was raised was there seems to be communication problems among the distributed IT security engineering integrating components of ITS. IT acknowledges and they do take responsibility or ownership for some of the communication problems that occurred during the transition. On the other hand, I guess their view is that not everything was necessarily their fault on this particular one. Well one of the things is… Well no it's the faculty and staff to work with distributed IT so I think their view, to some extent, was that there's also communication problems running the other direction potentially. I'm just letting you know that they didn't view it as necessarily all one sided. They think it's probably a two-way street on this, but this is the formal response I got back. You can read it if you want and Bill has it. If you'd like me to bring this up with CFAC or further pursue this, feel free to contact me.

M. Haji-Sheikh: The problem was they did not make any effort to coordinate IP addresses for fixed systems at all prior to conversion. There was a single – I talked to our own IT people in Engineering, not a single piece of information was relayed to us and now they're trying to blame our IT people for their incompetence. It shut my class down for a week. It shut several classes

down because we use distributed servers for identification of software users. So if I have a software user who's using a very high end software product, they don't like to have that software used for free and we have to have the identification of these IP addresses ahead of time. It wasn't for two days until we figured out what was wrong with the system and we found out when they sent the IP addresses. They did all this DHCP if you know what that is, and that's been the biggest problem we had in Engineering.

G. Slotsve: What I would suggest is you all, Engineering has a representative on CFAC and you could hopefully work through your rep there to…

M. Haji-Sheikh: I sent a direct e-mail to both the CIO and the network people right when it happened.

G. Slotsve: And also get your rep to bring it through at the CFAC meeting though is what I'm asking because it wasn't at the last one and I'm kind of carrying this and I'm getting stuff from Engineering it would be useful to have your own rep bring up the technical aspects of it if you don't mind. It will just help me out a lot because I'm trying to keep all this straight as to who's running into problems.

M. Haji-Shiekh: I understand.

G. Slotsve: Just a couple of other points. I just want to note is we're moving to Office 360 over the next few months or at some point this year. Students will be moving that way. Just so everyone's got a heads up, you do have access if you need extra storage you will have access to OneDrive. It's supposed to have a fair bit of storage. I forget the exact numbers at this point. One other point is that from here forward, and I know the IT personnel have been moved, but their changing from GroupWise to Exchange or Outlook Exchange or whatever. That's going to be done department by department or school by school and they're going to roll this out starting around this period forward. For example, I think LA&S will see their move somewhere around spring break. But I just want to note to people what's going to happen here is that it's going to read your GroupWise account and then they've got to transfer that over to the Outlook account. It's going to take a couple three days in order for all that information so you might get doubled up e-mails when you're brought over. So there's going to be a bit of a transition issue there. From what Brett was saying it sounds like it's a two-three day possibility of that. On the upside of this, I've also heard complaints about a lot of junk e-mail coming through GroupWise. Supposedly this makes a big difference. I guess there's something on the filters, they were mentioning filters and how they can work with Outlook, so hopefully you'll see a big reduction in the junk e-mail. So I just wanted to give everyone a heads up this is coming. Yeah?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Now there are people who don't use Microsoft products as operating systems. Those of us who do high end engineering a lot of us use Lenox systems. What is that going to do with Outlook?

G. Slotsve: I'll have to double check on that. I've got people, and I've used Lenox, I just never bothered asking the question because I use a bit of Microsoft as well. Deb said there's gonna be

training when they move over so ITS is offering it to everybody. So Lenox, once again, why don't you have your representative bring that up on CFAC.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I'll do that because this sounds like it's ready for a fun week or two.

G. Slotsve: No, granted we've got to get the representatives showing up from each of the colleges as well and bring these issues up. So I just wanted to let everyone know.

L. Rush: Yesterday, actually the IT people met with our department to discuss these changes that are going to occur and one of the big things they told us to do was get rid of all of our junk mail now before the process begins. I'm just sharing.

G. Baker: My understanding with Office 365 is that it's a push in the direction of trying to become device independent which also implies operating system independence. For example, it's entirely accessible over the web. There's a top navigation bar that facilitates access of Outlook and I can currently access it through multiple devices, table, phone, whatever. So I think that's the intent. So you can get web access. It's actually pretty good.

W. Pitney: Thank you, George.

D.   BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee –
        Dan Gebo and William Pitney – report – Page 22

W. Pitney: On page 22 from the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee, I think just the two things of note. Those committees voted to approve the move from an Ed.D. to a Ph.D. in counselor education and supervision and they also voted to approve the doctor of nursing practice, the DNP degree in health sciences, the College of Health Sciences. So that was just the two items of note for that. Are there any questions related to that report?

E.   BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee –
        Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – report – Pages 23-24

W. Pitney: Hearing none, I don't think Jay is here but he's got a written report on pages 23-24. I think I saw Karen. Did you have anything to add to his report at all?

K. Smith: No, I haven't even had a chance to read it yet.

W. Pitney: That's not a problem. So he's got a written report from the Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee. That's on pages 23 and 24. The one thing I would like to note there you probably all read about the tuition, fees, and room and board recommendations. Those recommendations were brought forth from the Tuition Task Force. Stephen Tonks was the Faculty Senate rep so there was Faculty Senate representation on that task force.

F.   BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee –
        Deborah Haliczer and Dan Gebo – report – walk-in

W. Pitney: Moving on, Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee, Debbie is here.

D. Haliczer: Hello. Okay, the Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee, you've got a written report as a walk-in. We had an excellent report from Lesley Rigg who talked about some increases in our funding in the research areas and the report is posted on the web for you to look and see where the areas, where the research funds are going. And she was very excited about how there were 12 new researchers who were able to get funding. The other really high point of that particular session was meeting and Anna Quider who is our federal relations representative and she listed some of the initiatives that she's been working with Vice President Freeman, Vice President Rigg, and the president on and you see the summary there. But it looks like we have an active, credible representative in Washington who will, I think, advance research at Northern.

W. Pitney: Very good, thank you.

G.   BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee –
        Deborah Haliczer and Greg Waas – report – walk-in

W. Pitney: And I think you also have our Compliance, Audit, Risk Management report.

D. Haliczer: Yes, at that session we heard the annual report from our director of Internal Audit who basically says that we had 19 completed audits of the 21 scheduled. We don't hear the content, only the board hears that, so it's like a non-event but she gave her report. And then we had an excellent report from Sara Cliffe, director of risk management, and Tom Phillips our police chief on our crime statistics and CLERY report. And I believe from the things that I've been hearing and from the conversations that I've been having and from the reports that they've been giving, that we are now accurately reporting our crime statistics looking sensitively at what the issues are about credibility and reliability of the reports given that most of them are anonymous. And so it was a lucid report. I'm really pleased with where they're going.

W. Pitney: Very good, thank you, Deb. Any questions for Deb for either of those committees?

H.   BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – no report

VIII.   REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A.   Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – no report

B.   Academic Affairs – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair –
        Open Access for NIU-produced published journal articles proposed resolution –
        Pages 25-26

W. Pitney: Seeing none, let's move on. There's no Faculty Rights and Responsibilities report. We do have a report from Sarah McHone-Chase, chair of our Academic Affairs Committee.

S. McHone-Chase: So, if you turn to page 25, you will see the policy that was written up for the, I can't remember the title I'm sorry, Open Access for NIU-produced published journal articles. If you were on the senate last year, you'd remember that we had something that I think had the exact same title. This is slightly expanded from that last year. If you look at page 26, you'll see that there's this public act 098-0295. That act specifies that as a public university we have to have such a policy. We expanded this policy slightly from last year because whatever task force we have felt that the policy did not go quite far enough especially in what I think was in regards to specifically retaining, as faculty members, retaining copyright for our own published research and research articles and such. So this policy is just slightly expanded from last year and we have a resolution now to adopt that policy and that's what I have here.

W. Pitney: Very good, thank you, Sarah. A large portion of this was put forth to us from the task force that was constructed well over a year ago. And, when Patrick Dawson sent this to me in order to kind of take it through the channels to make it policy, it just made a lot of sense that, since it's likely to affect faculty more so than any other body on campus, that the Faculty Senate have a chance to vet that. So I appreciate your committee taking a good look at that. So page 26 has the resolution and the kind of the pieces of the policy. Are there any questions, comments or concerns? George?

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to ask the committee or the library, this just puts more paperwork that we've got to fill out when we're doing a publication potentially. Could you try to just streamline this as much as possible so we get a sheet of paper to sign and we're done with it rather than having to write letters and draft something every time.

S. McHone-Chase: I believe that the library has a staff member or she might be a librarian now, I'm not sure what her position is exactly, but she will contact faculty members somehow to actually take care of this process for you. That's actually her job is to contact faculty members and sort of take care of this process in terms of taking care of the paperwork and getting your research articles put into the repository.

W. Pitney: Last week I had e-mailed Patrick Dawson just to let him know that I think a couple of issues that would come out is: What are the steps of getting the manuscripts to the library to get into the Huskie Commons and those sorts of things, and I just apologize, I can't remember her name.

S. McHone-Chase: Her name is Jamie Shumaker.

W. Pitney: Thank you. Yeah he identified Jamie who will be the point person to help faculty handle those issues. So I'm confident that they're going to be sensitive to making this as easy as possible.

S. McHone-Chase: I don't know what her exact position is but I do know that she's actually very good at whatever it is that she does.

W. Pitney: Thank you. Seeing that we've had a chance to express any concerns, this is going to go to the University Council in order to vote on it as policy and move it to the APPM, I would

entertain a motion to accept the resolution put forth by our committee. Greg Long moves. Second? Gary Baker, thank you. Any other discussion on the resolution and the policy on page 26? Seeing none, all in favor of accepting this resolution, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? All right very good. Thank you Sarah.

C.   Economic Status of the Profession – George Slotsve, Chair –
      Faculty Salary Report – Pages 27-37

W. Pitney: Our next report is George Slotsve, the man of the hour.

G. Slotsve: Okay, this is a faculty salary report. As I vaguely recall, I wasn't involved with it, but I think in 2011 the Faculty Senate, as I've noted, requested an analysis of faculty salaries across universities to get an idea of where our faculty pay was relative to other schools. Someone was the chair that year, as I recall they tried to get some data, took a look, said this is basically a lot of work, we can't get it done at this point. Then somebody else became chair of the committee and I'm not sure anything was done that particular year. Then finally I got appointed chair of the committee a year ago roughly.

We had an RA so we went forward, collected the data, it's IBHE data. Everything is noted in hopefully the write-up that's been provided and we've tried to analyze as best we could. A big problem with this is we just don't have a lot of consistent data available to us and we don't have all the variables that you might like to control for. We felt it was important that you had information on department though because a lot of the salary variation within a university goes across the departments. So if I look at average salaries at two different universities, it's going to matter whether one university's got a medical school or a large business school or a very renown business school versus another university. That information was not available from the IBHE so what we had to do is we had the RA for the Faculty Senate do an Internet search and look for every faculty member that was listed in the IHBE data and try to find out their department. For those that we had any problem with, we had to go in by hand and go to every school, look at their department, try to match up names, in case people had the same name, and try to get all of this in. So this was actually a fair bit of work for what we've done here and it took quite a number of hours to put this together.

We were able to find data for a number of schools, but not all schools could we track down the department. Some schools it was very difficult to find the department information and who was with what department and for a given year. So what we did was we put together the information for Chicago State, Eastern Illinois, Illinois State, Northern, Southern Illinois, and U of I at Champaign Urbana. What you have here is, to the best of our ability, the name of the department and then we've also got the salary by the rank of the individual in the department. So by assistant professor, associate professor and full professor, these are the base salary numbers. So we haven't added in any extra compensation if you taught during the summer, this is just your base salary. Generally it refers to the nine month contract. Although that isn't consistently reported in

the data, so some of the data may have some twelve-month individuals. I've tried to note that where I can.

It also was a problem – or an issue that arose – was how do you compare departments? What we call a department here may not be quite how they define the department at another university. So you will also find information on how we aggregated departments or tried to handle departments. So sociology includes anthropology and sociology. So if you take a look at our notes, we've tried to provide that to the best of our ability. If you just move it ahead a couple of slides Pat.

So now what you've got is by department. You've got the numbers then. So this is basically a count, it's just how many people were in that category. It gives you the average salary by each rank and across department. When you look at the mean numbers in this far right, second column from the far right, that includes that's the mean for that department and rank across all the universities that we have. However, note every school except U of I is below the mean. The reason is the salaries at U of I are higher and they by far outweigh the number of people they're employing. So I just want to note, if you look at this and say wait a minute, we're below mean, well that's cause U of I just swamps everything here.

Whether or not this is the relevant information, this is the best we could do. What I'm going to ask is you could take this back to your department. What's difficult for me to tell as an example is where do you think your department fits in amongst this set of schools. You know I could look at the Department of Economics and I could say I think we fit in here and then I could start making decisions reasonable, not reasonable. On the other hand, another department may feel they fit somewhere else. We weren't going to go and collect publications and where are you published of every faculty member and try to take that information into account because there might be quality differences across departments. So I'm asking you to go back to your own department with this information. At least it's a benchmark, you can see where we fit it, and hopefully it gives you a feel for whether it's reasonable or not reasonable.

The final think I'd like to note is these are all Illinois public universities, so they're all subject to the same budget cuts that we've been facing over the last number of years. When it came to choice, I thought we were better off starting here. If you want to start moving out to other states, Wisconsin, Ohio, the other MAC10 schools, maybe we could track the data down. It will probably be doing something once again similar. It just seemed to make sense let's start with Illinois and use that as your base comparison. If you've got complaints, problems, yell at me.

W. Pitney: Thank you very much, George. Any questions or comments for George? Thank you. I think that completes our standing committee reports. We don't have any unfinished business or new business.

D.   Rules and Governance – Robert Schneider, Chair – no report

E.   Resources, Space and Budget – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

F.   Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

W. Pitney: Are there any comments and questions from the floor? Yes ma'am.

C. Campbell: My name is Cynthia Campbell and I'm in the Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment and I was just wondering if we as a Faculty Senate could take some time maybe this year to process a little of the program prioritization that's going on right now at the university level. I'm not sure if anyone has heard about it. I know our department's been talking a good deal about it. From what I can tell, the process for the program prioritization is not yet in place, nor is the particular criteria that will be used. And so I just want to make sure that faculty's involved in that important process. I don't know if we could have the president come or Lisa Freeman or somebody come to maybe explain a little bit what's going on. I know that they want to roll it out fairly soon. It was originally going to be in December but they've kind of changed that now, looking at summer/fall of next year. So that was just something that I would like to put on the agenda at some point soon.

W. Pitney: Yes, great minds think alike. Lisa Freeman is coming to our January Faculty Senate meeting and the two items I've asked her to speak with us about included academic prioritization, not just academic programs, but also administrative programs and that process, as well as the vacancy hearing process. So she's preparing to do that. The other thing I would note is we had an excellent meeting this morning at 8:00 with the department chairs on campus. And so Wade was there and we presented information to the chairs in terms of where the prioritizing process is at the current time and where we're not at. And we also had a panel discussion with the individuals that went to the October workshop on prioritizing academic and administrative programs. So it was kind of a question and answer piece.

You're absolutely correct, the criteria have not yet been decided. What I think the steering committee that I'm a part of and Marc is a part of, but what we've discussed is the steering committee has not yet identified any criteria. We're going to get broad feedback on the criteria and the Resource, Space and Budget and the APC, Academic Planning Council, will be intimately involved and soliciting feedback related to those criteria. And so there will be chances for feedback in vetting that. But the process identified by Dickeson is one that the steering committee thought made a lot of sense, but to think that we're going to use it verbatim at NIU probably would not be neither safe nor appropriate. We've got to work on how we want to slightly modify that. Marc, did I capture that well enough? Yes, Michael.

M. Haji-Sheikh: My big question is why would we choose Dickeson to tell us anything? (no microphone) who's been working as an anti-tenure consultant for 20 years?

W. Pitney: Any individual that is involved with processes like that is going to suffer their fair share of criticism and I think, however, those of us who went to the conference and there was also Larry Goldstein who presented who is an award winning staff, at the University of

Louisville? I can't remember exactly where he's at right now. But the process is put forward and the testimony we heard, for example, at the University of Hartford that has recently gone through that process, was pretty fascinating. We were able to learn a lot from other folks. And we're going to have, I think there's going to be some panels brought to campus of folks who have gone through the process and what they've learned from it, etc.

M. Haji-Sheikh: How about bringing people who've had bad experiences in the process too, not just good experiences, because a lot of the people pushing this program want the people doing the program to be enthusiastic and positive all the time. It's hard to get faculty to be positive and enthusiastic about a lot of things all the time, so boy that's going to be an interesting experience.

W. Pitney: We can choose to look at that however we would like. I think it's a process that is very systematic, it's very thoughtful, and it's also faculty driven. We as faculty will be on the academic prioritizing task force and the faculty on that will have to be stewards of the institution.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I'm going to take that one more shot at this to say that that also gives administration cover to make decisions that they wouldn't want to make in the open on their own. So wait a second, let me finish the thought here. So program prioritization as I've been reading and many have been reading, there are people who have taken logical ways to go around it, but unless you're in complete collapse, why would you collapse 40 percent of programs?

W. Pitney: Nobody said that 40 percent of our programs will be collapsed.

M. Haji-Sheikh: But that's the Dickeson approach.

W. Pitney: That's not the approach we have to take. As I've mentioned before, utilizing the full-blown approach would probably not be appropriate. So I think it's important to note that there's been no priority percentage of cuts that we've got to make, although it would make sense to have targets. Also as you look at the process, it's to re-invest in programs and I think it's a way to do that. Financially, we're not looking good right now and across-the-board cuts is a waste for everybody. It doesn't really get us where we need to be. Everybody suffers.

M. Haji-Sheikh: But we've wasted a ton of money on cutouts for busses and consultants and everything else that I'm seeing. I'm a little upset still about all that. I think the polls have shown that there's no student interest in them at this point. Have you been polling the student paper? I mean that's another half a million dollars of blood and treasure. Every time you turn around, there's some money flying out the door and everybody tells us we have a $14 million shortfall. If we were truly in a $14 million shortfall, I worked in industry, when you're in a $14 million shortfall, structural deficit, there's more things going on than just this.

W. Pitney: Marc.

M. Falkoff: I understand the skepticism and I think everyone should bring a healthy skepticism to the whole process. I'm actually impressed with how thoughtful everyone who's been involved in these early stages has been, but I understand the fear that maybe we all drank the Kool-Aid. But the criteria haven't been chosen, the task force for developing the criteria haven't been

chosen, and all of those questions, all of those issues that you raised, are appropriately up for debate. I think it's going to be important for people to get a sense of the way the baseline approach that we're thinking about and certainly nothing that I've read from the Dickeson material suggests some kind of a bottom 40 percent of programs in some way is going to be cut.

Another thing to consider is that academic and non-academic programs, all programs, everything that you could consider a program, is going to be up for review. So the busses and the shoveling, everything, it could potentially be looked at. But it's very much in its early stages and I actually think it's tremendously important that we have exactly conversations like that and hash it through because, if a large proportion of the faculty really feels that way, it's not going to work no matter what.

W. Pitney: Any other questions or comments? Cynthia, thanks for bringing that up. It's in January, the provost will be here and we'll learn more about that.

XII.   INFORMATION ITEMS

W. Pitney: I'd accept – there's information items listed for your perusal.

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

W. Pitney: I'd accept a motion to adjourn. Please, Virginia.

V. Naples: I make a motion to adjourn.

W. Pitney: Thank you. Is there a second? Joel. Yes. Thank you. So moved.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.