

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, February 24, 2016, 3p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Allori, Arado, Baker, Bateni, Beamer, Brubaker, Bujarski, Carlson, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Conderman, Downing, Dugas, Farrell, Glatz, Goldenberg, Haji-Sheikh (for Demir), Hathaway, Hou, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Kidder, Konen, Lee, Long, Macdonald, Manning, Martin, May, McHone-Chase, Montana, Mooney, Naples, Nejd, Novak, Pavkov, Pitney, Riley, Ryu, Saborio, Sagarin, Shin, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Stephen, Streb, Stoddard, Than, VanderSchee

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Anderson, Bishop, Campbell, Chen, Demir, Deng, Gilson, Grund, Jaffee, Khoury, Kim, Millis, Mirman, Moraga, Patro, Penrod, Rodgers, Rosenbaum, Schatteman, Scherer, Staikidis, Thu, Xie

OTHERS PRESENT: Birbirick, Bryan, Builta, Douglass, Freeman, Klaper, Krishnamurthi, Mini, Phillips

OTHERS ABSENT: Doederlein, Gebo, Hoffman, Nicholson, Shortridge, VandeCreek

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon. Good afternoon. Thank you so much. Welcome. Weather doesn't look very nice. At least we're inside. That's good. Try to get this done at a reasonable time today. So like to call the meeting to order and welcome you all here.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: And the first thing we need to do is the adoption of the agenda. And there are no walk-in items. I would, however, like to make a motion that we postpone Provost Freeman's presentation until other scheduled business is done today. We don't have a lot on our agenda, but if we moved her, she would then begin around 3:30. That would give us plenty of time at the end of the meeting to talk to her about budgetary issues for as long as we want rather than feeling constrained. So I need a motion to accept the amended agenda. George? Novak second. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Cool.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 27, 2015 FS MEETING

G. Long: Moving on, the next thing is the approval of the minutes from the January 27 meeting. We need a motion to accept the minutes. Greg, okay.

L. Saborio: Second.

G. Long: All right, any corrections, additions, changes to the minutes? All right, all in favor of accepting the minutes as written say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? All right, we approve the minutes.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: In terms of president's announcements, Provost Freeman will be here later. She's listed there, we will move her down in the agenda. I have two quick announcements I'd like to share. Yesterday was the first official Faculty Club luncheon of the semester, and I have to say that it went far better than the governance discussions we had in the fall. So that was reassuring at some level. So we had a very nice lunch at Ellington's, about 15, 16 people showed up. And I'd encourage you to come to our next luncheon scheduled March 10. No handout, no reading ahead of time, no set topic. Show up and visit with your colleagues is the basic idea with that. So I think you would encourage you to do that. So that's one good point I think.

And the second thing that I would like to share with you, has to do with my role and collaboration with the presidents of the Operating Staff Council and the SPS Council. All three groups including the Student Association feed into the [University] Council where major decisions are reached. One of the things we've done in working closely with Operating Staff Council and SPS Council is recognize the disparity that exists in support for our respective leadership positions. As the Faculty Senate president and executive secretary of University Council, I have a full release. I'm not teaching this semester. My job is this. I will say it's a full-time job, so don't think otherwise. But from the standpoint of my colleagues on the SPS Council, Operating Staff Council, prior to this point, they've received no release time, no clerical support, no office support. Trying to encourage them to participate in shared governance sometimes gets to be a challenge. At the end of last semester, the three of us as council presidents submitted a request to the Provost's office. Found out last week that the operating staff council and SPS Council, the presidents of those bodies will receive three days release per month, one full-time secretary or administrative assistant, and also they're going to be sharing some office space in 103 Altgeld. From my standpoint, I think that's an excellent opportunity for us to increase our collaboration and good show of support from upper administration for that. I view that as a definite positive.

And then the final thing I would just say is you all received a notice from Pat about the faculty alternate policy. I would just call your attention to that so that, if you aren't going to be able to make a meeting and you have a chance to let us know ahead of time or invite someone else to be in your place, like to have the attendance. So encourage that. If you have any questions, you can call us, email us, ask us. But you did get an email on that. That's it for my president's announcements unless anyone has any questions. Going once. Twice. Okay.

A. Division of Academic Affairs – Budget History [presentation](#) – Provost Lisa Freeman

[Faculty/Student Ratio Chart](#)
[Busting the Myths, Academe, March-April 2015](#)

[Provost Freeman's presentation was postponed until all other business had been conducted.]

G. Long: Well, is there anything else from the group at this point? If not, we will ask our guests to come in and have a chance to share their thoughts on NIU budget and history and go from there. I would ask – I know that Provost Lisa Freeman has a formal presentation – and I would ask that we allow her to do her presentation first before we then ask questions. We have an hour left, so I suspect her presentation is going to run close to that. We'll have plenty of time to talk.

L. Freeman: I'm going to call on Vice Provost Mini for at least one slide. Want me to walk with the mic? Good afternoon, everybody. I want to start out by thanking you for inviting me to come and talk to you about issues that are on everybody's minds. And I've entitled my presentation "Responding to Faculty Senate Concerns: Academic Affairs Budget History, which came up the last time I was here to speak about Program Prioritization. But I added an "and more." Over the course of the last couple weeks, people have been calling or emailing me with additional topics they would like to see addressed. I tried to put in a reasonable amount, and I suspect that I'll be back to talk to this body over the course of, if not this semester, next semester to address some topics at hand.

So I'm going to start out by talking about the work in the budget of the office of the executive vice president and provost and the Division of Academic Affairs. Then I'm going to talk about faculty salaries. And then I'm going to talk about tenured track versus nontenured track faculty at NIU, the three topics brought up the most as topics of interest to this group. If we have time during questions, I'm certainly happy to address other issues.

So this is an organizational chart for the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. And you can see that, in this case, I have the Executive Vice President in bold. And that's because the office actually does have two components. The Office of the Executive Vice President, when I wear that hat, I provide oversight to institutional resources, two divisions not properly within the Division of Academic Affairs, although sometimes they are budgeted in that line, because we have not quite gotten everything the way we want it. And in addition to having those two oversight functions, which are clearly executive, the role of the Executive Vice President is really to advocate for the mission of the university, particularly at the academic side in planning sessions and budget sessions, and to make sure that goals are established and monitored appropriately, so measuring metrics.

The Institutional Research Office has a director that reports to it, who has a largely external reporting function for university data, but that data is used by the entire campus. And then if you want to hit, Human Resources. Human Resources Services has the senior AVPHR, who is the chief human resource officer. And there were two associate vice presidents and an assistant vice president overseeing the various core functions of HR. But we've eliminated the assistant vice presidency because we believe that that position which oversaw employee relations and training could be covered – the employee relations piece – by the director of employee relations, who's being hired.

We've given some extra buyout time and resources to support the SPS Council head who can do part of what that position was doing. And I think the training function in Human Resources is likely to be looked at in terms of trying to create synergy across units within HR and perhaps across units like Faculty Development and HR to create more efficiency. But that will be actually one of the tasks that will confront the Senior AVP for HR when she starts on April 1.

I want to focus on – next slide – the history of the chief human resources officer position at NIU because I think, when you look at the history of this particular position, it sort of highlights or embodies a lot of the challenges that we have as a university when you try to take a snapshot of data at any point in time and look at either budgets or reporting lines. In 2009, which was before I came here, the chief human resources officer, which is a position that every university has, was an associate vice president who had human resources expertise and some – but not very many – other things reporting. In 2010, that position was promoted to vice president. At this time the position was still within the Division of Finance and Facilities. In 2011-12, the position was moved to create its own division called Administration. And then in 2013 the individual in that position, with the departure of some others and the accrual of a little bit more under the report, became an executive vice president. In 2013 with the departure of the executive vice president, the arrival of President Baker and some other reorganizations, the position went back to being a vice president, and it was then transferred in terms of its reporting to a division called Operations and Community Relations, which was overseen at that point by Vice President Nicklas. Vice president Nicklas did not have the HR expertise of the previous, Steve Cunningham, so it was determined there would be a chief HR hire at the level of senior associate vice president for HR. But with Nicklas' retirement, that position was eliminated. Some went to – currently held by Phillips.

The model of having the human resource officer report to the provost is one that's relatively new and seen at universities known to be effective in their HR processes, particularly in integrating academic processes with human resource processes. And these moves are also being driven by the presidential mandate or suggestion that the Title IX coordinator report to the executive vice president.

I think the point I want to make is that this has been a very dynamic five years in terms of our organizational structure. But also when you look at this, I think it's easy to appreciate that any slice of budget or organizational chart in time would give you a different idea about whether administrative positions were being increased or decreased. Often when we do a reorg, budget doesn't follow immediately in our budget structure. And so it just is a very confusing scenario.

I want to focus now on academic affairs and talk a little bit about the division that we're most familiar with. The provost is the chief academic officer and has primary oversight for the operations of academic affairs and leadership of academic affairs. But even within that division, there are personnel who actually also serve some of the executive functions relative to the rest of the university. So the things that are in red here are the things that are in the Division of Academic Affairs reporting to the provost at pretty much every single university: Deans of colleges, the library, the graduate school. And then sort of the core academic functions: faculty affairs, academic planning, which oversees assessment and accreditation, resource planning, which oversees budget and facilities. And then undergraduate academic affairs. Those are the things that pretty much every academic affairs division has.

How everything else is arranged and how it reports varies from university to university. And to be honest, here at NIU it's a work-in-progress. We're still figuring out what's the best way to arrange things so that we provide the best service and the best value to the faculty, students and staff that we serve.

Now hit it again. This is where I wanted to make the point that even within academic affairs, the vice provost and I all serve – or at least some of the vice provosts and I serve – both functions of oversight for functions that are university-wide over administrative and academic programs and things that are only academic programs. We tried to estimate the FTE that we devote to each of these functions. I split my time probably half and half between wearing the executive vice president hat and the provost hat. The vice provost for resource planning, who has a lot to do with integrating the academic mission into the university-wide budget and who has been working for finance part of the time, 75/25. Faculty affairs is about 30/70 with personnel grievance, HR functions being about that 30, the labor issues and collective bargaining agreements. Academic planning and development, I think before Program Prioritization it wouldn't have been 75/25. Program Prioritization is a campus-wide process and involving academic programs. That's had a major effect.

Our administrative assistants support us, provide their time between the executive side and academic side. They're very involved in responding to information requests, whether from the State of Illinois, whether it's from a journalist, an interested public party. That accounts for the rest of the division on the slide. So one of the questions is always: Is our Provost's Office understaffed, overstaffed? How do we look compared to other provosts' offices. And so this slide shows the number of direct reports to the provost, and then also leadership. So vice provost and dean, deans of colleges, and deans other. At our institution and selected members of our peers. I didn't select these because they make us look good, I selected these for very specific reasons that I'm willing to talk about. When you look – and I can go into more detail with anyone after – when you look at these institutions, their student body looks about like ours in terms of diversity and socioeconomic status; about the same faculty-student ratio; they have a research mission with expenditures reasonably close to ours. Some of them are engaged; some have more of a professional emphasis in their undergraduate programs whereas we have more of a broad liberal arts emphasis. We are actually more complex than most of these institutions if you look at Carnegie classification, research expenditures and student body, but you can see we look about the same in terms of our staffing, in terms of the total leadership team, and in terms of the number of direct reports to the provost. People organize things differently. You'll see that some of the schools have more Deans Other than we have. We have a dean of library and a dean of the graduate school who are deans without students. At some universities there's an honors college instead of an honors program, and they have a dean of the honors college rather than a director of the honors program. At many institutions they tend to put things together related to advising, undecided students, first-year experience, under a dean of a university college. And that's just not a model that we have, but it's a model that's common at some of our peers.

Go back one slide, actually I forgot. So if you looked at this slide – I'm nervous – if you look at this slide and said, okay, these are all about the same, but if you compared this to 15 years ago, all the provosts office have more people in them than they used to. I didn't actually do the research, but

I think that's probably true. And I think part of the reason that's true is that there's a real increasing emphasis on accountability that's been imposed on us not only by ourselves, but by others. And we have a lot of external reporting and tracking and assessment functions related to performance funding, related to student success, related to things like accreditation. And I can give you at least one very concrete example of how these functions developed in the Provost's Office at NIU. So if you want to ask why does NIU assess academic programs – this is a slide I borrowed from a presentation made by Chris Parker to the Board of Trustees – we do it for the right reasons because we want to assure high quality academic programs and also because we want to foster continuous improvement of academic program and support services, and because we have to. We're mandated by the Higher Learning Commission, by 27 specialized accreditors and by the IBHE. And there are consequences that are worse than a bad note from your mom if you don't do assessment well. If you lose your – or jeopardize your – Higher Learning Commission accreditation, your students can't get financial aid. That's a real problem.

So if you look at NIU in specific, in 2004, when we had an HLC accreditation visit, our letter said, while significant progress has been made in the assessment of student achievement at NIU, much remains to be done. And in 2014, our recent accreditation, it says NIU has developed practices and procedures that are developing an institution-wide culture of assessment. Over the course of a decade we went from falling short to being an exemplar. And I'm sure that part of that is because we centralized some of the assessment and accreditation support in the Provost's Office. Would it have to stay there? I don't know. Program Prioritization may make comments on that. The important thing would be if it wasn't there, that it was somewhere. And I think in this case, as in many, things moved into the provost's Office actually in an effort to remove administrative burden from faculty.

Now we're going to move into the budget data. So this slide was generated by the Vice President for Administration and Finance. And what it shows is the university budget in thousands comparing divisions, and this is an all-funds budget. So our total budget for this year, FY15, \$419,475, and you can see the academic budget is just shy of half of that, it's about 45 percent of \$191,000. This includes all funds. Oh, did I say thousands? I'm so sorry. I really am nervous. Million dollars.

G. Long: Do I say something, or not?

A. Phillips: Little point here.

L. Freeman: Three zeros here, three zeros there, what are those between friends? This is why Al doesn't lose sleep at night, because we only have a half million dollar budget. Million dollars. Next. If you look at how we're funded by fund source – and thank goodness these have a percentage on the Y axis so I can't screw up the thousands into millions anymore. The blue bars are labeled as 02. That's our code at NIU for funds that come either from state appropriations or tuition. The bright yellow, which is labeled 04, and so you can see this is actually the academic bar, the only one I'm really going to talk about. The bright yellow bar is 04. And 04 are fees that are related to things like student instructional fees. They're restricted to use in classes. The 41 funds are fees for service. They're generated by things like contract courses, or clinical fees in speech and hearing clinic. And then the darker yellow or marigold, as I believe it's called in the palette, 44, those are sponsored projects awards to support our basic mission of research, public service and instruction.

You can see here that the academic division is largely funded by appropriated funds and tuition, as you might expect.

G. Long: Could you, on that slide, what do the red bars mean on that?

L. Freeman: Red bars are 29. Those are auxiliary fees. So those are fees like Student Affairs and Enrollment Management gets for housing and dining.

G. Long: Thanks.

A. Phillips: Typically those fees go to cover the cost of borrowing the money to build the facilities.

G. Long: Thank you.

L. Freeman: All right. And if you just look at 02 funds, the appropriated funds and the tuition, you can just see that the big purple slice is academic affairs, and that's more than half of the overall university's use of appropriated funds. So to just sort of summarize, if you look at the all funds budget for the university, we're in academic affairs, about 45 percent of the overall budget. We're more than 50 percent of the 02 budget, which is appropriated funds and tuition. And the other sources of revenue that we have in our division are what you might expect. They're restricted funds associated with fee-for-service activities like course delivery or sponsored projects funding.

I'm going to now to switch to the history of the Division of Academic Affairs budget. And I'm going to ask Vice Provost Mini to talk about this slide. First I want to talk a little bit how we generated this slide. When I was last here, people spoke about going through all the budget books and trying to construct data to show the changes in our budget. And so I actually asked Vice Provost Mini to do that. And man, I am so glad we are moving towards a more transparent and manageable budget process, because it was really hard to do. She spent many like sleepless nights, days. And we found errors in the books as we went through them. So I think as she points out to you, what you see here and tries to help interpret it, she'll be talking about what some of the variation is, and she'll be also pointing out some inaccuracies or idiosyncrasies.

S. Mini: Thank you. This is specifically about the 02 funds. And it is in thousands, please note. The first thing I'd like to point out is one of the inaccuracies which is in the graduate school. You can see it looks like it has an enormous increase, but that actually did not happen. In FY13 and FY14, it was hard to find the salaries for the dean and the staff. And, of course, so those weren't included in those two numbers. Those two numbers should be about \$1 million apiece. If you look at FY15, you see a bit of a jump there. That is from GA funding. This had been temporary GA funding that they'd been using for years and years and we finally were able to put it in their budget permanently. You'll see the same thing happening up in the undergraduate academic affairs line, going from \$4995 to \$5638. These were things that had been used temporarily or been part of the temp budgeting process for years and years, and we finally were able to put it permanently into that particular line.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the line I know best which is resource planning. And in that line it looks fairly – let me be a little bit more clear about the kind of things that occur there. We have about \$2.2 million allocated for summer funding coming out of that line. We also take the sick leave

– the Provost’s Office handles a portion of the sick leave when a person retires – and so we’ll do half a million to a million in sick leave generally. And we used to have – or we still do have – core competency and just-in-time seating. Some of you are familiar with those terms. Just-in-time seating is mostly with math or English where we’re trying to get seats open for students but not commit to too many at one time. And we handle the funding for that. But what this is being used mostly for right now is to cover courses that we didn’t have faculty for because of vacancies, and we couldn’t fill the vacancies fast enough, or we decided to wait to fill the vacancies. So we’ll do between \$1 and \$2 million, maybe more than \$2 million this year. And those kind of issues.

We also do things like smart classrooms: the upkeep of a smart classroom, equipment, bringing smart classrooms online. We didn’t do that particular piece this year simply because we knew the funding would be so tight. We also do a lot of legal issues that might cost money, and that would come out of my office. It might be an issue generated by one of the colleges. And so that’s kind of unpredictable, but I would guess we’re doing on the order of \$250,000 to \$500,000 a year in that. So there are lots of things in there even though it just says resource planning, you know, that’s not a very good description of what we do.

Over here we have the FY16 reductions. You will see we don’t have an FY16 budget. We’re spending like we do, but we actually don’t have one, and that’s why we didn’t put the numbers up there. There was a cut in FY16. It occurred over the summer, so in August. Our unit, the academic division, Provost pointed out, it is the biggest unit – offered up a \$.3 million out of their 02 funds, \$1 million in non-02 spending and also \$2.3 million in cash. Now, the greatest percentage of that will probably come out of the resource planning unit. So that budget looks like it’s \$6.6 million now, but it won’t look like \$6.6 million when we finally are able to put up the FY16.

L. Freeman: Library – capital (inaudible).

S. Mini: Sorry, okay. There are lots of things that have moved in and out of the budget, a lot of the capital stuff, as Lisa was pointing out. We have had a slight decrease in library, as you can see going forward, the cost of the journals are just astronomical. What they can buy – or can’t buy – has become a big issue for them as well.

Also units moving in and out of the academic division, of course. So graduate school has always been in the academic division, but we lost the research piece, and that’s what you’re seeing here in the FY15. Institutional research has bounced around a little bit in the university and has finally landed in the academic division, and human resources has joined us as well. And that’s pretty much the reason you’re seeing the increase from almost \$24 million to the \$28 million, that and a little wobble from the graduate school.

L. Freeman: I think that we’ll continue on. But at the end, during the question-and-answer period, it would be probably useful for Vice President Phillips and I to talk a little bit about how we don’t want thumbing through books that look like phone books, finding account lines, and trying to add them up to be the way that people have to figure out what’s going on with our budgets. We want to be as transparent as possible, and we want to be very honest and open about what’s going on. And budgets are going to be changing as we move into a process where we try to assign actual

expenditures to the units that make them. The academic units have always been extremely responsible fiscally. We've always had budgets and always had good budget discipline. Some of the units that you can see are much smaller across the university when you look at either those red bars or the pieces of the pie, never had their own budgets. They were all sort of run out of a central fund. And some of those things that came to us in the academic division even on an annual basis – presidential professor awards, HLC accreditation funding in those years – those kinds of things are now going to be moved into our budget, so they're there, and there are examples like that across the university.

All right. So Sue told you what was in most of the functional lines, but I know that people are very interested in talking about compensation of academic administrators and also about faculty compensation. And so I thought I'd start talking about salaries. My annual compensation which makes up part of the Provost's Office budget is \$280,000 a year. And here you see it compared to previous provosts, Ray Alden's compensation, and to what we use generally as comparators from the University Human Resource Association. We generally compare to universities with enrollments greater than 9660. We compare to MAC institutions and we compare to Carnegie doctoral institutions. And I think you can see my compensation is not particularly out of line.

If you went to look up my compensation on the IBHE website, you'll have a hard time figuring out exactly what's going on. That's because of the way we report things to the state and the way the state reports things back to us. So when we look at the NIU compensation structure, all of us have a base salary, and then there are basically different flavors of additional compensation. And I've tried to list the main components here. There's administrative adjustments, there are extra compensation for various duties that are assumed, there's supplemental compensation that does not require extra duties, and then there are contractual performance incentives, and that's really in athletics.

When you're talking about administrators, you're talking about two components of the salary: the base salary and administrative adjustment. The administrative adjustment is contingent upon continued occupancy of the administrative position and then it's forfeited on return to the faculty. And I will say I don't think we've used these very well at NIU. And I'm going to talk about problems with them that I recognized when I came here.

So if you look at the IBHE website and you look at compensation data for the NIU Provost, and it goes 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, going from now my right to left, you can see that in 2012, when I came as the Vice President for Research, it said I had a base of \$201 and an additional comp of \$35,000. You can see that Provost Alden was always paid with 100 percent in base. And the reason for the variation in numbers has to do with when people transition from one position to another. I have heard people say that I've gotten bonuses, that my salary was always 200 [\$200,000], and I just want to say to people that I can prove that my salary and compensation was never \$200,000, and that \$35,000 was not a bonus.

Pat, if you want to move. I actually found my appointment letter, and my appointment letter says that I came in as the Vice president for Research with a base salary of \$200,000 and administrative adjustment of \$35,000. When I negotiated with the current provost at that time, Provost Alden, I negotiated for \$235,000, and this is what I got as my offer letter. And I have to tell you it didn't

make a lot of sense to me, but I figured that was how they did salaries here. But I also see that there's a problem with it, and a number of problems.

So, Pat, if you want to switch. When you have...you want me to go back?

J. Stephen: You said you didn't get that.

L. Freeman: I did get it. When I said I didn't get it, I meant I didn't understand why the salary was structured this way, because it made no sense.

J. Stephen: I thought you said you never got a salary of \$200,000.

L. Freeman: I didn't. My salary was \$235,000.

J. Stephen: I wish I didn't have a \$100,000 salary.

L. Freeman: I'm going to continue the talk. So we can talk about whether our administrative salaries are appropriate or not. I've showed you where it was benched marked. I can assure you, when I negotiated for my salary as Vice President for Research, I looked at salary of every vice president in this institution, I looked at all of the ??? data, and I knew what I was making at my previous job, which was also public, which was actually \$200,000. So I negotiated for an appropriate salary to come. I wouldn't have come for less. And I'm sorry if that offends anybody here, but that's the facts of the marketplace and the employment.

Okay. So moving to the entrance and exit pathways for academic administrators, I want to say that the administrative supplement structure works well in some cases and poorly in others. And I want to try to use this diagram to show that. When we're talking about a college, and we're talking about someone going from the faculty to be a department chair, the administrative supplement structure works very well because you have someone who's on a nine-month salary, they're going to go to a 12-month salary, and they're going to get an administrative supplement. And you assume that within that department people are generally paid appropriately, they get additional for being an administrator, and then when they go back, they get their faculty salary. That makes sense.

It doesn't make sense when you do things in other directions. So if I come in as a Vice President for Research, and I'm making a salary which is actually, when you add everything together, \$235,000, and that's an appropriate salary – at least in my mind for the Vice President for Research – what happens when I go back to the faculty? Or what happens when Provost Alden goes back to the faculty? And the fact that we were both from biology made this a relatively easy comparison. So if you look and you see that – this assumes a return to the faculty in 2013, and it looks at how our salaries are structured, and this was a year when both of us were fully employed at those salaries, I would have gone back from the vice presidency for research to the biology faculty at a salary of \$203,000. And Provost Alden would have gone back at a salary of \$300,000. That doesn't make any sense. That is not the equivalent of a department head or department chair going back to the faculty because, when you look at what the Oklahoma State comparator is for a well-paid professor of biology at a doctoral institution, it's \$98,000. You look at the chair of the Biology Department at

NIU, it's \$150,000. And I don't think that that's an appropriate way to reenter a disciplinary department.

Can we go back to the previous slide for a second? When you look at all the arrows here, if you never have people going back, it works. But that's not really the case. The average tenure of someone in a provost position is four and a half to five years. And so if you leave the institution, that's fine, but if you want to go back to the faculty and you want to teach and you want to remain an active member of the community, you need to have a mechanism to go back and be an appropriate member of that community. And so that's one of the things that's changing.

Another issue that I'm going to address in a few more slides is what works when you're going from your department to be a chair may or may not work when you're going from your department to a college office or to a university office. I came here from a College of Veterinary Medicine. We were all on 12-month salaries. When I became an associate dean, it worked very well for me to get an administrative supplement that would go away when I went back to the faculty. That's because we all made around the same amount of money. Whether you came from clinical sciences or pathobiology or anatomy and physiology, the administrative supplement made sense. The administrators made around the same amount of money, and, if you went back, it was okay. And that would be true in a number of our colleges, especially our smaller professional colleges, to become an associate dean or go to the Office of Provost. It doesn't work well in a large college where you have a mixture of humanities and social sciences and physical sciences, because you have people with disciplinary disparity in their salaries who are then going to do the same job and go back.

So let's talk about how I've structured my contract and how I'm structuring the contracts of the deans we're hiring so that we don't have that problem of \$200,000 and \$300,000 professors going back to the faculty. So this is a quote from my contract, you can FOIA it if you'd like. It says exactly this: Effective May 19, 2014, the annual salary for duties employed under this agreement will be \$280,000 payable in seven monthly installments. Under the expiration of the term of this agreement or termination of this agreement, the employee will be entitled to return to her academic department in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Department of Biology. Following any applicable professional leave, the employee's annual salary shall be adjusted as determined by the president to a nine-month base salary with consideration given to the salaries of comparable faculty members within the same academic department, external market value, and university economic conditions.

I go back to the faculty, I don't want my colleagues to resent me because I make twice as much as them because I used to be a provost, because I will be doing the same job as them. Next slide.

So this is the personnel budget looking at only base and administrative adjustment because we have people who teach and do other things, and I have taken that out to make sure that this is a comparable comparison of administrative salaries. It's a comparison of 2013 to 2015, actually the bottom isn't really showing. Let me talk a little bit about what I found when I became the interim provost. I think it's important to say I found this when I became the interim provost because my charge at that time was to try to figure out what to do to set the Provost's Office up for success for an incoming provost, who I had no idea would be me since I didn't apply for the position.

So in 2013 we had undergraduate academic affairs assigned to one person, one vice provost, academic planning and development spread over two people, one full and one part time. We had faculty affairs, academic personnel, resource and space arranged in sort of everyone sharing everything over three people, two part time, one full time. Graduate education, we had one academic leader. And then there were two people who were responsible for direct support to the provost, an administrative assistant and a deputy provost. And I thought that was not a great structure. I thought, as a consumer of the Provost's Office service, that it was confusing to have so many part-time people involved in key functions, and that I really wanted the new provost to come in and have a Provost's Office that was aligned to what was best practice other places. And I also really didn't know that we needed the position of deputy provost. The deputy provost was sort of a chief of staff. It was someone who wrote and spoke for the provost, and I didn't feel that I wanted that. And I felt that, if an incoming provost wanted that position, they should be able to negotiate for it. So I changed the structure and the compensation to what you see on the right. I'm going to go into more detail on this on the next several slides. I did it for an overall savings of \$117,000.

P. Erickson: I can show that.

L. Freeman: All right. And so what does that mean, and how did I do it, and why are some of the increases that you see there. So when I came in and I looked at the Provost's Office compensation, and I looked at vice provosts who were doing essentially the same job, I found great variation in pay. And I looked at that variation in terms of the portfolio that was managed, the number of direct reports, and there was anything but a correlation, there was actually, in fact, an inverse correlation. And then I looked at what the comparable salaries were, both in national databases and across the state of Illinois. And I found that we had two individuals who were making substantially less, and I felt that this was an inequity that would not be a good thing to hand off to an incoming provost who would have to confront that on his or her first day. And I felt that retaining people with institutional knowledge was very important with an incoming provost. I did due diligence and looked at why those salaries were different, and the salaries were different because the disciplinary origin of the people in those positions. So if you started in a STEM field, you wound up with the same administrative supplement as someone who started in a humanity, and you wound up making less money even though, as a vice provostm you were essentially doing the same job.

I didn't think that was appropriate. I decided that it was important to make the recommendation to change it. I forwarded that recommendation to the president. I said it should be enacted before the new provost took office. And when I became the new provost, I was true to my word and I did what I said that someone else should do. And so you can see that that's how those salaries currently line up. And the faculty affairs salary is comparable. So we now have four vice provosts and, when you compare to our normal comparators, their salaries are in line.

So this was one way of addressing salary equity for administrators. And it's not that I don't recognize that there is salary equity issues all across the faculty. When I made these changes, I was under the impression, for good reason, that we would have the opportunity to do increments for faculty and staff and to also start addressing some of the larger faculty issues. I did not predict the budget impasse that currently exists in Springfield that has paralyzed our ability to move forward

with that agenda. If I actually was that clairvoyant, you would probably want me managing the university's endowment rather than being provost, but I didn't see it coming. We've had a much more prolonged timeline to do the things that need to be done.

Before we talk about the things that need to be done for faculty, I just want with to talk about the preferred practices going forward for academic administrators because this is how I believe we should handle things. It's how I'm handling things with the deans we're hiring. It's how I will eventually redo all the vice provosts' contracts once I'm sure coming out of Program Prioritizations how things are going to settle out. I think that compensation should reflect the current job; that internal and external candidates for academic administrative positions should generally be given equivalent compensation; compensation of academic administrators should reflect the responsibilities associated with the position and the market value of the position; compensation of an administrator, assuming or resuming a faculty appointment, should allow for fair placement into the department salary structure; and an increase to base linked to the administrative appointment is generally preferable to an administrative adjustment delivered as additional compensation as long as you have a contractual agreement that allows base to go up and then readjust it appropriately. And that's for transparency as much as anything else.

Do I think we need to have those type of agreements at the department chair level? No, because I think we all understand that formula. But I think when you're talking about deans and when you're talking about provosts and presidents, you absolutely do have to have that type of structure. Getting contracts done takes longer than you would like. Legal is very busy, and so once we had a template, it was easy to use my contract as a template for the deans; and we will be able to use deans' contracts as templates for the vice provosts, but everything takes a certain amount of time to get done, and we are short-handed in administration just as everyone else is short-handed. Vice Provost Mini showed you the cut. All the divisions have people who are working very hard to get their jobs done as well.

So let's talk about faculty compensation issues. As I said previously, I came in and thought this is going to be an opportunity for the university to start doing a better job with budget. We certainly needed to focus on retention. We certainly needed to think about spending. We certainly needed to do Program Prioritization for the long game, but I think everybody thought, and I'm going to look at Vice President Phillips here for a nod, that it was going to be a lot shorter time frame than it has been before we could consider practically and politically the additional compensation that faculty and staff deserve. And when we do have an opportunity, because we have an appropriation, and we figured out where the boundary limits are, and we have a political situation that allows us to compensate faculty, which hopefully all will happen quickly, there will be a merit component, and There's always the potential for that to be retroactive.

The middle two bullets are something that I'm also very attuned to. I co-chaired with Greg Waas the Vision 2020 Task Force that looked at faculty work and rewards, and a component of that report was looking at the salaries of our incoming assistant professors as well as the salaries of our associate and full professors. And we found that we were competitive in most disciplines at the assistant professor level, but uncompetitive and very few disciplines at the associate and full professor level because of salary compression and inversion. And in that report of the Vision 2020 Task Force, there was a reasonably modest goal set for trying to improve those conditions over

time. An, obviously, we didn't expect the current budget situation, but the other sort of regrettable thing is that, instead of having a conversation about how do we reallocate resources differently, where are our growth opportunities, what should we stop doing, all of the changes in Vision 2020, including the compensation increase, were linked to an audacious and relatively unrealistic goal of a 30,000 student enrollment. That swamped a lot of the other work that was done in Vision 2020, including this problem. Another thing that we need to think about is redoing the salary equity study. The last salary equity study was done in 2008, and as a university we need to do another one. And one of the conversations that we have to have – and this is a conversation where Faculty Senate has to play an extremely active role and, in fact I invite you and Greg Long and I have talked about this – we need to think about do we want to do the salary equity study exactly the way we've done it before? A lot of work went into creating that methodology. A double-blind study was used. And that study that we've done has actually stood up well in EEOC and OCR, like legal lawsuits in terms of things. But 2008 was a long time ago. There's a lot more contemporary research on how things are biased or unbiased. And the other thing is it costs more money to do the study externally. It has the advantage of a double-blind experiment. But if we increase our data transparency so everybody can actually have confidence that the data are legitimate, should we be doing this on campus? Should it be a function in human resources? Should it be planned to be done on a regular basis? I think these are genuine questions for us to explore together. If you look at how other universities do their salary equity studies, there are different methodologies, and some of them do them in house, and all of them have faculty advisory committees, at least to my knowledge. I think this is an important discussion to have because we need the data. Data don't lie. When I say that I want to be informed by data, they're not data that support my opinions or biases, they're data that let us know how to run the university better from all aspects.

All right, we're almost at the end. I was asked to comment on tenure track versus nontenure track faculty, and I've distributed to Pat and Greg a much more detailed table that was produced using our IPADS reported data. And the reason that I used our IPADS reported data is because then it has standard definitions, and the definitions go for tenure track and tenure line, nontenure track full time, which on our campus are largely instructors. Nontenure track part time, which is kind of a mixed barrel, it has returning retirees, it has people who choose to work part time, it has SPS who teach a course here, it has visiting assistant professors, clinical professors. And we on our campus don't really capture the graduate teaching assistant in the instructional context with real fidelity so I didn't put that.

What you see here on the left are, as a percent of total faculty, the top line is tenured/tenure track so that's all tenure line, tenured and tenure line faculty. Middle line is all nontenure track faculty. The bottom line is full-time nontenure track faculty, which on our campus will largely be instructors. And you can see that we've had a decrease in the tenured/tenure track faculty, and we've had a trend to increasing in nontenured track, but it's been relatively stable compared to the national situation. And the national situation is shown in the bar graph on the right. The red and the purple together make up tenure and tenure track faculty. And then that middle kind of gold band is the full-time nontenure track faculty. So you can see when you compare us to the left bar, which is universities that are primarily baccalaureate programs, the middle bar, which is research universities that have instruction, research and public service in their mission, and then the far right bar which is the combination of all those institutions, we still have a generally larger fraction of tenured and tenure track faculty. I think one of the conversations that's going to have to occur at the

disciplinary level and within the colleges in response to Program Prioritization is what's right for each discipline and department because there isn't a one-size-fits-all answer. And in fact, we're seeing in some of the accredited professions a preference for a certain number of professors of practice or people with clinical experience to be part of the teaching force. So this isn't a decision for us to make. We haven't been trying to drive this one way or other. We've been filling more faculty positions that are vacated with temporary help, but that's to provide nimbleness in these times and to wait for the outcomes of Program Prioritization so we can decide where to allocate tenured-track positions. But even once we've decided that and we're using that informed by Program Prioritization, I think these are still discussions that are going to have to happen at the disciplinary level, and I shared there with the deans this morning. I shared the AAUP reference that has this graph in it. It's an IPADS graph that you can also download from the Web, but I wanted you to have both versions of it. Next slide.

So this is my second to last slide. And it's just a reminder that we live and we work, and we need to work together, in these very interesting times. We are all concerned about the Illinois budget standoff. It's a tragedy for all of us to see a sister institution like Chicago State put in peril by the budget impasse in Springfield. We are all concerned about administrative bloat; we are all concerned about unfunded mandates; we are all concerned about public perceptions that paint the faculty as other than dedicated and committed to their students. And no one in this room is the enemy of higher education. And things are never going to go back to the way they were when the state funded 50 percent of our university. And we're going to have to figure out how to get through this together. And we're not going to agree and we're going to have tense conversations, but I think we have to have respectful conversations because I don't want with the faculty and administration at NIU to look like Governor Rauner and Speaker Madigan look in that picture. That's not to the benefit of our students or our state.

The next one is just an invitation for questions, and I'm going to stop there.

G. Long: Thank you so much.

J. Stephen: I don't think we think you make too much. I think that we're not getting rewarded with...

J. Novak: Can't hear you.

J. Stephen: I don't think we think you make too much. I think that most of us who have been here 20 or 30 years and have to wait eight to ten years for a decent raise, are just somewhat surprised to see that they kind of regularly roll around more you guys' way than ours. However, you were very specific about how much money you saved in the reorganization of one of the programs, but then we took a look at that interesting chart that saw a vice president go to an executive vice president, an associate back down to assistant, and we saw this curve go up and then an back down. What did the curve of the salary for that person look like, and how much was saved when an executive vice president became a coordinator of human resource officer? How much savings were made in those two administrative changes from presidential cabinet level to other level?

L. Freeman: If you have the data in front of you, share them. Because I have

J. Stephen: I have absolutely none. Those were high points of your talk.

L. Freeman: The name, chief human resource officer, is a designation, just like senior international officer or chief financial officer.

J. Stephen: But you assigned a vice presidential rank

L. Freeman: I agree with you that designation has been at many different ranks. I didn't make those promotions, I'm not here to defend them. When we lower a title, we generally lower a salary. And I will also say that at NIU, I think we have had two types of inflation. First let me say, I agree that, whether or not you think I make too much money, I think you all don't make enough money. There's no question about that. And I want to be clear: I think it's something we can't address with a flip of a switch overnight, but it is my job – and everybody's job here – to pay attention to.

Moving on from that, what I will say is we have two types of inflation in our organizational structure. We have title inflation, and we have sometimes administrative salary inflation. And I think sometimes those go hand in hand, but sometimes they actually don't. Sometimes title inflation is used when we don't have enough money to give somebody a salary to retain them, and we increase their title just to give them a sense of more importance. Sometimes we increase titles when people's jobs flip from more internal to more external, because having a better title helps the university if somebody is out representing the university in the state or national or international level.

But when you have title and salaries that go up, and especially at the lower level, you can't push the position above it down quite as easily. It takes time. At NIU when we look at positions and we make the decision that they're not the correct classification and we're very familiar, all of us, I think, when this happens when a position that's a supportive professional staff position gets flagged by the Civil Service system to go back to Civil Service, we don't demote people in place. When we reorganize units, we don't demote people in place. We don't pick up the phone and say, I'm changing your title and cutting your salary. But when that person vacates the position, we readvertise it at the lower level. And in our unit, we had an associate vice provost for honors. We don't have an honors college, we have an honors program. Most universities have directors of honors program. And we're advertising that position and, in fact, we designated the acting person in that position as the honors director. In terms of the chief HR officer, because that person has to oversee two associate vice presidents, that person can't have the title that was the original title of associate vice president. So it had to have some other title, senior associate vice president. That's better than making a cabinet level, better than making it an executive vice president. Over time, things may be organized differently, but these are the constraints that we all work in when we're trying to manage and reorganize a workforce, or an administrative unit in particular. And administrative units turn over a lot faster than academic units do, so that has a positive and a negative. You're constantly rehiring closer to market salary, but you also have the opportunity to think about doing things differently on a more frequent basis.

G. Long: There's been some recent information in the news that the Higher Learning Commission has contacted all the Illinois state public universities and asked them to provide some sort of report, a dooms day report, so to speak. Could you address that for us, please?

L. Freeman: Absolutely. So, Vice Provost Douglass and I forwarded a copy of our response to the Higher Learning Commission to Marketing and Communications just before we walked over here. So I suspect that it will be public for everybody very soon, but I can give you the background. The Higher Learning Commission sent out two sets of letters: One was to the governor and the legislators saying stop trying to destroy higher education in Illinois, it's not good. They did that for political reasons. They also sent out a set of letters to every institution, public and private, in the state of Illinois, asking us about our financial conditions. And they, frankly, did that to cover themselves. Public and private institutions in Illinois both get MAP funding, so even the private institutions have been impacted by the budget impasse. The way those letters were phrased and I'll ask you guys to chime in, and Carolinda, chime in. The way the letters were phrased were, if you are in danger of imminent failure within the next several months, it's obligatory for you to provide detailed information about your cash flow, your teachout plans, your closure determinations, your enrollment projections, all that kind of stuff. And we looked at it, and we were really, really happy that we were in the good position of not being in imminent danger of closing within the next several months, not only because we're all happy we can get through this year and probably next academic year, but we were also really happy that we didn't have to do teachout plans for all of those programs in a 48-hour period because I think that's pretty hard to do. The HL – this is like gallows humor – the HLC was on the Chicago State campus on Monday. They've announced they're cancelling their spring break, they're trying to get through the semester as quickly as possible. And so you'll all be able to see our response. The IBHE has requested that every university in Illinois share the response with them. And I don't know if they'll make all of those public or not, but I would assume that those could be gotten if you want to see it. But ours will be up, I would assume, very shortly.

G. Long: Thank you.

L. Freeman: Absolutely.

J. Stephen: Yesterday Gov. Rauner unequivocally said that he would not sign a stand-alone MAP grant bill. Are we really in the position to enter next fall if no budget and no MAP comes along?

L. Freeman: I'm going to let Al answer that one.

J. Stephen: And how much MAP comes our way?

L. Freeman: \$20 million.

A. Phillips: We have about \$20 million, just shy of \$20 million comes to our students.

Unidentified: That's yearly, correct?

A. Phillips: On an annual basis. We're actually in a much better position than most of the universities in this state. We actually, recently in the news, you saw stories about Eastern and Western and Chicago State doing layoffs and cutting back and a number of things. We actually started this about two years ago. We've, as you well know, have done position pull-backs; we've been very selective about how we fill positions. As a result, rather than layoffs and furloughs, we have managed through attrition so that we've not had to do that. We've reduced our cost structure just through being very careful about what positions we filled by several million dollars over the last couple of years. We also have cut back and stopped most all of our projects except those that are critical, because we haven't received any capital, capital renewal funding from the state for the last five or six years. Many of our projects, the day-to-day projects, repair, maintenance, and even new projects, come out of operating funds. We have stopped pretty much all of our projects pending the receipt of a budget. And last but not least, we spent on an annual basis around \$110 million in products and services. If we can reduce the spending on that even 10 percent, that's \$11 million that we are not paying out. Last year, you saw the chart, our expenses were \$400 million – we spent \$419 million. Our proposed budget this year was \$394 million. That was based on the governor's initial recommendation to cut higher education by roughly 30 percent. To us, that was about a \$30 million cut from what we received last year. Last year we received \$91 million from the state. So we were looking at a roughly \$63 million proposed budget based on the governor's initial recommendation which, of course, did not get through the General Assembly. So wanting to be conservative, we based our budget this year on the governor's initial recommendation of a 30 percent cut from the state. We talk about not having a budget, but we really have a budget. What we don't have is an appropriation. What we get from the state, our funding from the state is about 20 percent of our total funding. Most of that goes into payroll. So it's more like 40 percent of our operating funds, but it's a much smaller portion of our budget than even at some other institutions. They only represent about 20 percent of our budget. So our initial budget was based on 30 percent cut, an estimated 30 percent cut, in the hopes that what we eventually ended up with would be less than that. So by cutting back on position fills, by cutting back on projects, by severely restricting spending. And I do want to say even though we have, as most of you know, really tightened up on spending, it's not absolute. I have conversations every day where people come back and say, can we take another look at this, this is really important. We have those conversations, and in many cases we approve the request. But we're holding very tight, and that's helped us get through this. So, so far this year in actual spending so far, halfway through the year, we reduced our actual expenditures by \$15 million. We're on track to reduce our expenditures by another \$15 million. So even though we started with a budget that was 30 percent less than what we had last year, we are currently underbudget, because we were very conservative. On the other side of the page, revenue, we're very conservative with revenue. And so our revenue was \$394 million, but we will probably come in higher than that. Tuition's holding pretty firm. It's doing better than, it's exceeding expectations, actually. And we had a warm winter so we've actually saved so far this year \$600,000 in utility costs, and we may actually get to a million dollars in utility costs. And I'm really, really happy the snow is that way today so we're not spending more money with the trucks and salt and all those kinds of things.

So budget-wise, we're actually underbudget. We've cut our spending in real dollars. Now, we still don't have funding from the state, but we do have sufficient cash flow from current operations, from this year's operations. And we did get some funding this year from FY15. The state stays behind three to six months in payments from the previous year so we were still receiving payments

in July, August, September and October from the state so that helped. We have sufficient cash flow from current operations to get us into May. And I have a presentation and I've had conversations with trustees because they are rightly very concerned. Every time I have done my presentation, the numbers are better. We've gone further without having to dip into our reserves so we can get into May. I have sufficient reserves to get us through to the end of the year and into July. At that point in time, we start to receive our fall tuition and fees. That's when we actually receive the majority of the money that we get during the year is mostly from tuition fees, room and board from fall semester. That will give us enough funding to get completely through the fall semester into the spring semester. And so we're now working on as we develop the budget for FY17, working on getting us all the way through fiscal year 17, even if we don't have state funding.

We are in much, much better shape than most of the other institutions. I would say probably the only institutions that may be in as good a shape or better are University of Illinois – obviously they have deep pockets – and perhaps Illinois State. I have been in a phone call; one of the wonderful things I get to do – I spent a lot of time recently with Moody's on the phone. We're good friends now. You can probably anticipate a little later today hearing something from them, as they are very concerned, much like the Higher Learning Commission is, about accreditation. They're very concerned about universities being able to pay their debts. So we've had a lot of conversations. I anticipate we'll be downgraded, but not nearly to the extent that some of the other institutions are.

J. Stephen: CPS level downgrade?

A. Phillips: No. Just one level. And in all fairness, in the report they have a lot of very good things to say about us. One of the things in our conversation, they've said that we are actually more aggressive than almost any of the other public universities in working to address these issues. We started earlier. We're doing Program Prioritization. We're doing process reengineering. We're putting in place a much better and much more transparent budget process. We have tightened up on our spending, we're developing capital development plans. We're developing capital renewal plans, IT plans. We have a task force currently looking at institutional aid and how that will feed into making sure we make the best possible use of every financial aid dollar. And so all these things are – they're very impressed. It's just we have a lot of debt, and we're in Illinois.

J. Stephen: That's more than I was looking for but thanks. That sounds very aggressive on your part. One thing I worry about talking with students is, first of all, I have students who say, what's the point of even filling a FAFSA? There's a point, you might get some money. And then they said, well, are there going to be MAP grants next year? I said I don't know. And now they're asking what's going to happen, what's NIU going to do to me if Gov. Rauner doesn't pay the MAP grant? That's a question today.

A. Phillips: We've been very upfront with the students. We don't have the \$20 million to cover the MAP funds if they don't come. Now, having spent time in Springfield, MAP is a priority above most other things. Currently there have been three budget bills put on the table. The encouraging news is that for eight months nobody was even talking about funding higher education, not a word. And then recently in basically hours within each other you had a Republican bill on the table and you had a Democrat bill on the table. The Democrat bill funded MAP at 100 percent and community colleges 100 percent. It did not fund higher education, or I mean the public

universities. Since then there's been another Democrat bill that funds public universities 100 percent. On the Republican side, there's a bill on the table that funds MAP at 100 percent, community colleges at 90 percent, and the public universities at 80 percent. The governor's clearly in support of this bill. Unfortunately, there's a companion bill to go along with that that would enable him, give him the authority to move money around, which of course is not acceptable to the Democrat side. However, every bill that's been put on the table funds MAP at 100 percent. And my guess – and actually, you've seen other bills put on the table in the last day or so trying to figure out how to fund MAP.

J. Stephen: Well, if they don't get this done within about six weeks, I think it's going to affect our retention severely.

A. Phillips: I would agree. But once again, we're still going to be here in the fall. And we're probably going to be here in the spring. And we're working with the students to cover – if we don't get MAP – find other financial aid to try to help them through this. The other problem we have is we have to walk a very fine line with Springfield. On the one hand we want to let everybody know we're going to be okay. On the other hand, in Springfield they're looking for reasons not to fund us. It's a very delicate balance. I'm still optimistic that we'll receive MAP. I'm still optimistic we will receive a budget. Even at the 20 percent level, that's still 10 percent better than what we've budgeted to for this year. All things considered, we're at a pretty good place. This is something I wrestle with most every day, most of the day. And to some extent it's my responsibility to help figure out how to get us through this. And I'm not having trouble sleeping at night. I think we'll get through this.

J. Stephen: Thank you very much, Al.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I have a question. The Core Campus Program that you had – not you personally, but Jim Hyde was hired on. That was – it says – I was told that all the money for redeveloping the area around Holmes was going to be coming from bond money. But the only thing I see on the accounts are all 41 accounts. So one of the things I also notice about these contracts, one of these contracts actually was almost completely spent before the contract was even written. So this is a transparency issue, and it should be something that should be on the website. It shouldn't be something we have to look up. All contracts, all contracts and what accounts they came from, when they were implemented, when people spend it. Now, the other interesting thing about the same contract was that Jim Hyde helped write the QBS document and also the RFQs. And then he end up subcontracting. These type of things are what make faculty uncomfortable on this campus over time. These are the things we've have watched happen, and they're still happening. This was 2015.

A. Phillips: First of all, that was before my time. I don't know

M. Haji-Sheikh: Your signature.

A. Phillips: That was all done before my time. The work was all done. Actually, signing contracts after the work's been done was a problem when I got here, it was an audit finding, and we're working

M. Haji-Sheikh: I agree.

A. Phillips: I agree. And that's not what should be happening. The problem was that's a process issue. The problem was we had more work that had to be done and we didn't have enough resources to get it done.

M. Haji-Sheikh: What was the paid out, that's the question.

A. Phillips: What was the what?

M. Haji-Sheikh: It was paid out before the contract was

A. Phillips: Right. Once you sign the contract and then, well not always. But the challenge was to fix the process. And many of you have seen my chart that shows the 74 steps in the procurement process that it takes to get a contract in place. The average time currently to get a contract in place, average time is 18 weeks, which is four and a half months. What we've done since then, we've hired an additional contracts attorney, in the general counsel's office to fix that. We are in the process of creating a contracting function within Procurement. We have started a Lean Six Sigma or a process reengineering effort to fix that process. That's had a process problem, because we had more contracts than we had people to get through. And the other problem was that all the contracts went through the exact same process. For instance, I would – at the end of the day, I get a stack of contracts every single day to go through and sign. It could be multi-million dollar construction contracts, or it could be the \$200 contract for the NIU booth at Corn Fest. Why I need to sign off and approve the contract for Corn Fest I'm not really sure. And so part of the process is to stratify the approval process so we can streamline it. But we are making every effort to fix that problem and that was an audit finding and we've been working to resolve it.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well, I don't believe this particular contract was found by the auditors. The reason I am bothered by it, this is an another Idaho guy who is a friend of Ron Walters. As you know, we've all had our fill of him. So the question is, how are we still bringing in people from Idaho and Ron Walters affiliates, pay them all last year?

A. Phillips: I don't know that we are.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well we did through 2015. This contract ended somewhere around late 2015.

A. Phillips: I can't speak to things that happened before I got here. All I can tell you is since I got here, we've been trying to improve all of our processes. We've been trying to be more transparent. And we've been trying to make things

M. Haji-Sheikh: Oh no, I'm not disagreeing. I have seen you take the P cards out of the airplane business.

A. Phillips: I have done a lot of things that some people aren't all that excited about. We are working to be more transparent, trying to put a budget process in place that makes sense where

people have real budgets. They know what they have to work with, the money's there, we have the discussion, dialogue, and collectively we figure out how to go forward in a much better way.

G. Long: One or two more questions. Virginia?

V. Naples: I would like to be the first – is this on? I would like to be the first person to volunteer for any faculty salary equity task force study. As Vice President Phillips knows, because I showed him my spreadsheet, I have done a faculty analysis which has now expanded to more than on a single-page spreadsheet. There are clearly the results of a variety of different practices that show unequivocally that there is gender inequity in salary at Northern Illinois University. Because I looked at the 12 years, I looked at assistant, associate and full professor levels. The discrepancy between female salaries for assistant professor level overall – this is for the entire College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, all 17 departments, is about \$1,000. When you go to associate professor, it is about 2,000. When you go to full professor, it is at least \$8,000. In addition, when you look at the number of women who make it to full professor rank, there are no more than I believe, in the maximum in that 12-year period, 29 in the entire College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, which is between 350 and 400 faculty. There's a major falloff between associate and full professor. And I completely disbelieve what is said about faculty salary gender equity in Northern Illinois University, as is the case with many other universities. And I believe that there are flaws in the way the study was done, that they were not asking the questions that would reveal this information, which is why I would like to be in any kind of a steering committee involved with asking the appropriate questions because this is one of the major sources of dissatisfaction and low morale among the faculty, as well as low salaries overall. Also, I'm sure that the same issues apply to salary equity for minorities, my data on that are only anecdotal. But all of the data I have analyzed for the college of liberal arts and sciences, which I am going to expand other colleges, come exclusively from the IBHE website and the Illinois University working papers. All of mine come from public sources and I'm not breaching anyone's confidentiality. Both Provost Freeman and Vice President Phillips have seen my first five years of data, I will be glad to send them as anyone else my two-year spreadsheet, which by the way I coded pink and blue, pink for girl salaries, and blue for boy salaries. You can see it for yourself. We're also in the process of running a variety of regressions, although when you can see the results visually without doing any regressions, there's really no need to do it. But I'll do it anyway for those who like statistics. Thank you.

G. Long: Okay. As I'm understanding, we are going to be looking at that. I would strongly imagine that anyone who desires to be a participant on a task force and wants to volunteer their time would be welcome to participate. All right, well, I would like to personally thank Lisa and Alan and Sue for coming here today. I know it's a difficult thing. I appreciate the transparency, particularly with regard to your own salaries. I know it's public information, but it's also a little bit awkward and uncomfortable to talk about that publicly. And I would also say I recognize many, many of the issues we're talking about, I think they're all very real. I lose sleep over them as well. But I would say that certainly from my experience and working with the Resource, Space and Budget Committee that, at least in looking at past iterations of that, that we have a strong committee. You've got people on that committee who have good economic and business backgrounds, and we are getting a greater degree of, I think, collaboration and data from the CFO's office. So while at this point we may not be satisfied with everything we've got, I can say unequivocally that there's progress being made, and I'm cautiously optimistic as we go forward that we'll continue to see

movement in that direction. So I just wanted to say thank you for coming here and being as disclosive as you were.

L. Freeman: I want to say thank you for inviting me. I hope now that we've looked at the history, we can spend more time looking at the future and ways to go forward and ways to make it less difficult to figure these things out.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy [Award](#) – Page 4
Faculty Senate will vote on the recipient during the February 24 meeting.
Recipient will be honored at the March 30 Faculty Senate meeting.

1. Nomination for [Therese Arado](#) – Page 5

G. Long: Now in terms of number V, Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, last month we talked about the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award, and that's the idea that we identify one of our members who has provided ongoing service and advocacy and has some subtlety and recognition of what goes on in the world of the university. If you look on Page 4, there's a very brief description of the award. And then on Page 5 is the actual nomination for Professor Arado. So I need a motion to – Therese, put your head down, okay? How do we do this subtly? I need a motion to accept the

J. Novak: So moved.

G. Long: Second? Bill Pitney. All right, all in favor.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Do we need the clickers. Any opposed? All right, congratulations to Therese. I'm going to take an extra minute or so and read the letter, George Slotsve and I put this together:

It is our pleasure to nominate Professor Therese Arado for this year's Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. Dr. Arado is a long-standing member of the university community and has devoted significant effort to support and advocate on behalf of faculty. She has served on and/or chaired multiple Faculty Senate committees. She has served on the Faculty Senate Steering Committee since 2010 and joined the University Council Steering Committee this spring semester. In addition, Professor Arado currently chairs the combined FS/UC Rules, Governance, and Elections Committee and has served on, or chaired, its predecessor, i.e., FS Elections & Legislative Oversight Committee, since 2011. Professor Arado also represents faculty interests on the University Benefits Committee and the Graduate Council.

In addition to her work in Faculty Senate, Professor Arado is a member of the Academic Program Prioritization Task Force. This commitment represents a significant investment of time and energy. It is yet another example, however, of Therese taking a pro-active role in helping create a better university.

Finally, we would like to note that Professor Arado exemplifies what it means to be a member of the Academy. She is an outstanding professor who understands the importance of education, advocacy, and university politics. We also see her as a bit of a card shark who recognizes any perceived administrative “bottom dealing.” We encourage you to give her nomination sincere consideration. Professor Therese Arado is deserving of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award.

Congratulations, Therese.

J. Stephen: I understand her name will be put on a plaque because mine is, but I don't know where that plaque is, do you? They moved it with the HSC refurb, but I don't know if it's up again.

P. Erickson: First floor Holmes Student Center just outside the Capitol Room.

G. Long: First floor Holmes Student Center just outside the Capitol Room.

J. Stephen: So they got it back up? I went over there to take a picture of my name on there for my sister and it wasn't there.

G. Long: Let's find it, exactly.

J. Stephen: My one piece of immortality.

G. Long: Very good.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

G. Long: All right, moving on along, we have no items on the consent agenda.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G. Long: In terms of unfinished or new business, we have no unfinished or new business to consider today.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

G. Long: We do have a couple of reports, and the first report is from Paul Stoddard, the FAC to IBHE report.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. The FAC to the IBHE met last Friday at the University of Chicago. This was the February 19th meeting. I was able to go to it without a jacket, which means global warming

is taking full effect and we're doomed. That's my plug for environmental responsibility. Scientist. A hoax, I know. The beginning of the meeting started with financial report from the IBHE, basically going over the governor's FY 17 budget proposal. It was not a happy one. For higher ed, he's looking to cut 16 percent from the Fiscal Year 15 levels. They're not worried about what's going to happen this year yet. That's a 20 percent cut to operating budgets, and then they're going to withhold a \$15 million pot for the IBHE to award as performance funding. I think they're going to look at reward the programs that are doing particularly well. So some programs will do a little bit better than the 16 percent cut, but if you're not one of those, you're looking at a 20 percent cut.

Yes, there's no new news at all regarding this year's budget. That's no surprise to anybody, I'm afraid. There's no plans to scrap this year's budget or to not fund higher ed. There are no funds to actually fund higher ed this year, so they're still working on it. The atmosphere in Springfield is still very confrontational and, almost as a side note, it was mentioned that IBHE Chair Lindsey Anderson has stepped down. They're in the process of looking for someone to fill that slot.

We then got a talk from the University of Chicago on how they sort of shepherd their students from undergrad all the way up to faculty. They're looking at increasing diversity. They're particularly aware of the lack of diversity in certain fields. Among the faculty, what they're trying to do is get their student body to be more representative, and then usher those people on through. So at some point in the future, their faculty will look a lot more like the student body in terms of diversity.

They're also very concerned about affordability, about college prep. They're working with inner Chicago students who normally have a lot of trouble trying to figure out the whole college application process. They're working with them, they're working to provide free applications for them. They're also looking, I think if I heard this right, free tuition for everybody who gets in. They have a large endowment, they can get away with that.

We got a nice tour of the Oriental Institute, which we walked through without jackets. And then our caucus meetings – again we're part of the public caucus, Northern is – and our caucus meeting was dominated by stories of what was going on on other campuses as a result of the financial situation. It's all – well, CSU, Eastern, Governor's State, Western – are all having severe problems. There have been layoffs; EIU had a third wave of layoffs, laying off 177 people. They were non-instructional people. That's still quite a large layoff. Talking about furloughs, 24 days between now and the end of the fiscal year. So that's a rather significant situation, and so on. The other institutions are saying similar types of actions. And that really was most of what we did at the meeting. So are there any questions?

Oh, I'm sorry, I did take some handouts. The afternoon discussion also was concerned with HR 477 which was a law that was passed and set up a set of advisory committees – the legislature wants to improve the transition between high school and college. There are five committees that they've set up that are supposed to be looking at these. These committees are making their reports. Committees are looking at things such as competency-based high school graduation requirements and fixing of misalignment between those and requirements for colleges and universities, their entrance requirements. They're looking at college readiness and transition courses, they're looking at career pathways if somebody at the age of 15 doesn't know what they want to do with the rest of their life, they can go ahead and plot their high school courses and get ready to follow that all the way through

until they're ready to retire, apparently. And also post-secondary and career expectations following along on that. Once again, kids in grades 8-12 and get them thinking about what careers might await for them and what to do once they graduate college and whether they want to go to grad school, etc. etc. So on the whole, I think probably a pretty good idea. Some of the specifics, let the legislature get involved, that's what happens. Anyway, so there's a lot of time being spent on that, a lot of the IBHE has been spent time working with that. And we might see some changes to the way things happen in the state as a result of all that. So probably bears further watching. And that will conclude my report.

G. Long: Thank you.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Greg Long, Dan Gebo, Rebecca Shortridge,
Leanne VandeCreek, Steve Builta, Holly Nicholson

X. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Paul Stoddard, Chair – no report

B. Academic Affairs Committee – Jimmie Manning, Chair – no report

C. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – no report

D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Therese Arado, Chair

G.Long: Okay, with that I'd like to turn it over to Therese Arado on Rules, Governance and Elections. She's got a couple of things to go through.

1. Nomination for Executive Secretary of University Council/
President of Faculty Senate – 1-year term
See [list](#) of University Council members eligible for election – Page 6
**NOMINATIONS TO BE TAKEN FROM THE FLOOR DURING
FEB. 24 FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

Letters of acceptance are due in the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by noon Friday, March 18, and will be included in the March 30 FS agenda packets. Election of final nominee will take place At the April 27 FS meeting.

T. Arado: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you very much, I appreciate it even though I was turning red. It is time now to take nominations for the position of executive secretary of the University Council and president of Faculty Senate for the next academic year. That would be the position Greg right now holds. The list of members who are eligible to be nominated is in your agenda packet, I believe on Page 7, and Pat has it up on the screen. I will now accept nominations from the floor for executive secretary of University Council and president of Faculty Senate. I will stand up so I can see people. Richard?

R. Siegesmund: I'd like to nominate Greg Long for a second appointment.

T. Arado: Do I have a second?

G. Slotsve: Second.

T. Arado: George is the first multiple second. Do I have any other nominations? Okay, hearing no more nominations, I now close the nominations. All nominees are to submit a letter of acceptance noting your qualifications and desire to serve to the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by noon Friday, March 18. Those letters will be included in the March 30 and April 27 Faculty Senate agenda packets. Election of the final nominee will take place at the April 27 Faculty Senate meeting. Okay, that finishes our nominations for that position.

2. Self-nomination for NIU representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – 4-year term
See [excerpt](#) from NIU Bylaws, Article 16 – Page 7
LETTERS OF SELF-NOMINATION DUE BY MARCH 18

Letters of self-nomination are due in the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by noon Friday, March 18, and will be included in the March 30 FS agenda packets. Election will take place at the March 30 FS meeting.

T. Arado: Now this is also the official announcement that self-nominations are being accepted for the position of NIU representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE. Currently Paul Stoddard is doing that. He just gave us our report. The bylaw and other information related to this position is included in your agenda packet. Letters of self-nomination are due in the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by noon Friday, March 18, and will be included in the March 30 Faculty Senate agenda packet. Election will take place at the March 30 Faculty Senate meeting. Paul, I'm going to put you on the spot if you want to say anything about the position.

P. Stoddard: Sure. If it's an excellent position, I think. I enjoy doing the work. There's a bit of travel once a month, the third Friday in the month, an FAC meeting held around the state, well the plurality of them, anyway, are held in the Chicago area since that's where the plurality of our institutions are. You may find yourself in Carbondale or Edwardsville. They're held at the community colleges around the state also. They are a great opportunity to get to meet educators, higher ed folks from all around the state, from the community colleges, from the private institutions, from the other four-year public institutions. Really helps you keep in tune with what's going on statewide in terms of higher education. The people that are there now I think – the ones I know are good people. A lot of them have been there for quite some time. Since I was actually president of the Faculty Senate and occasionally had to fill in in that role, there's people I recognize from 10, 15 years ago still on that committee. Far away meetings, generally go down Thursday evening, there's dinner with the other people who have to travel to the far distance. So it's a nice social opportunity as well. I think they get together early and play golf. Not my thing. But that aside, the real purpose of the council is to provide input to the IBHE. That's really the most important part of it. This is where the IBHE hears what's going on on the campuses, what ideas are making sense, what things are working, not working. You have proposals or things you'd like to change, this is where we get

to voice them to the IBHE. There's usually one or two staff members who meet with us. They used to actually always meet with us in person, but as their budget has been slashed, they're now meeting with us by conference call unless we happen to meet in Springfield that day. Hopefully, if the budget situation ever eases any, they will be meeting with us again in person. They are always very appreciative of everything, of what we have to say. They do listen. They can't always enact what we suggest, but they are there. So if you think your department needs more of a voice or you personally would like more of a voice on how higher ed gets done in Illinois, this is a great opportunity. I'll take any questions if anybody has any.

G. Long: All right.

T. Arado: That concludes the things I had. March 18 is the date for your self nominations.

E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Laura Beamer, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

G. Long: And then our final report today is from Laura Beamer with regard to the Resource, Space and Budget Committee.

L. Beamer: Hi. We have a limited amount of time, so I will try and do this as fast as I can. We've met as a group four times during the year. We had Al Phillips at three of our four meetings. In addition to that, our committee chair, Mark Riley, I and Greg Long also met with Al Phillips. The RSP met as a group with President Doug Baker and Provost Lisa Freeman. We collected information from the deans by meeting with them and just asked them about how the budget situation was impacting them. And they gave us a lot of advice about the ability to have travel cards to facilitate things, and have a little more control over replacing vacant positions.

The library said that there's a need for outside storage to accommodate materials that have been relocated in an effort to make more room for students to meet and use the library. The prices of journals has been a problem for them because of inflation in that area, but subscriptions are needed to help faculty do their research and help our students with their learning and coursework. And the library reported having difficulty hiring personnel due to an inability to offer sufficient compensation.

From students support services, they commented that there were cuts in student support services and that was a concern to them. Our committee understands that one area of concern, the Writing Center, that efforts were undertaken to restore sufficient levels of service. However, student support services continues to be of concern, especially as we attempt to improve our retention rates.

Staff and faculty compensation, there's a concern that it's been several years since faculty and staff received regular annual compensation increases. And the recommendation from our committee is the committee believes that reinstating such increases would significantly improve the morale of both groups as well as NIU's ability to recruit and retain staff and faculty. And we understand that the administration sees the reinstatement of annual staff and faculty pay increases as a priority; however, we would be remiss if we did not reiterate our concern about the issue, especially where many lower-paid staff members are concerned.

And then the last thing is the committee discussed the need for financial and budget information to enhance our advisory role. So for example, it would be helpful for the committee to review budget to actual information on a regular basis; and the committee understands that the CFO's Office is currently working to improve NIU's reporting systems in a number of ways, including improvement of budget to actual reporting and the creation of dashboards of relevant financial information. And we support these efforts and look forward to receiving more financial information as the CFO's office improves NIU's financial reporting process. And we really appreciate the fact that Alan Phillips has been open with our committee. Any questions?

G. Long: Thank you very much.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- I. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- K. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum 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
- R. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- S. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- T. [Annual Report](#), Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

G.Long: Thank you. All right, may I have a motion to adjourn?

G. Slotsve: So moved.

G. Long: Unanimous. Okay, done. See you next month.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.