

FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, September 30, 2015, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Arriola, Azad, Beamer, Brubaker, Bujarski, Carlson, Cefaratti, Conderman, Deng, Downing, Dugas, Feurer, Freedman (for Hou), Gilson, Glatz, Gorman (for Macdonald), Grund, Haji-Sheikh (for Demir), Hanley, Hathaway, Hosmane (for Baker), Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Jaffee, Kidder, Kim, Konen, Long, Manning, Millis, Moraga, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Patro, Pavkov, Penrod, Pitney, Rosenbaum, Ryu, Saborio, Shin, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Stephen, Stoddard, Than, Un

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, allori, Baker, Bishop, Campbell, Chakraborty, Chen, Chung, Demir, Farrell, Giese, Hedin, Hou, Khoury, Lee, Lonergan, Macdonald, May, Mogren, Mooney, Riley, Rodgers, Scherer, Staikidis, Thu, Xie

OTHERS PRESENT: Adeboje, Armstrong, Bjerken, Bryan, Coryell, Falkoff, Klaper, Love-Moore (for Haliczzer), Streb

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon. Thank you for being here today. Would like to call the meeting to order. Some of you may notice that we're going to have a little bit of a technical -- we've got a little technical glitch here. Last meeting we had the open captioning working, we're still trying to get it to work this time. Who knew, the technology gods are not smiling on us now. So we'll hope that it gets fixed. But to let you know, it's going to be a bit of a distraction for at least a little bit.

Before we get started, I would like to recognize we have some visiting professors from Anhui University of Finance and Economics in China. We would like them to stand up in the back. We have Professor Zheng Yaqin, in the School of Business Administration. We have Cao Hurping, Associate Professor in the School of International Economics and Trade. Gao Lili, lecturer in the School of Economics; and Zheng Jie, Associate Professor in the School of Public Finance and Administration. Thank you. Welcome here. (Applause)

They're here for three weeks learning about higher education and governance, they will be attending the University Council meeting next week. We had a discussion next week -- last week to prep them for how governance and all works here, and we'll continue to have that discussion.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: Now the first order of business for us is to adopt our agenda. We do have one walk-in item. It's -- will be included under comments and questions from the floor, related to student

support services. I do need a motion to accept the agenda as amended. George? And second, John Novak. Thank you. Any discussion? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed?

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 22, 2015 FS MEETING and APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2015 FS MEETING

G. Long: I had some nervous jitters the first meeting: If you notice, we had the approval of the April 22 meeting. That was raised as a motion. But forgot to call the vote on it. The first thing we need to do is approve the minutes from the April 22 meeting that we failed to do so at the last meeting. May I have a motion to accept the minutes from the April 22 meeting? I do need you to speak in your microphones.

M. Rosenbaum: So moved.

G. Long: Need a second. Becqui Hunt. Okay. Any corrections, changes, additions, typos, anything for those minutes? All in favor of accepting the April 22 meeting say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay. Good. Takes care of one.

Let's talk about the September 2 meeting, the meeting we had earlier this month. Need to approve those meeting minutes as well. So same question: Any comments, corrections, anything for those minutes? Seeing none, all in favor of accepting the minutes, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? All right. Good. So if we're recovered, I got both minutes set, right? Good deal. Thanks.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. [Faculty Senate: Evolution, Membership, Committees](#)

G. Long: I have a number of announcements to make. Some will be follow-up from things we talked about at our last meeting. I would ask that in doing these announcements we save the discussion on a number of these things to -- toward the end of the meeting simply because we have a number of things to go over and we do have guests in here today. Brett Coryell, Andrew Bjerken - - close. Sorry. I'm not good with name pronunciation. And they're going to talk to us about the acceptable use -- appropriate use policy -- excuse me.

So to get started, could you throw up the -- each time we're going to have a meeting, I'm going to spend a couple minutes getting a little background on our history. So last week -- or last month we

talked about the structure of the University Council. Want to give you just a little bit of background on the Faculty Senate. For any of you who are particularly interested -- I have the details. If you want to learn more about the overall structure of how things got set up at the university, encourage you to take a look at this book written by President Monat, a number of years ago, *The Achieving Institution*. It gives a history of how things were established here at NIU. From a historical perspective it's kind of an interesting read. Not in terms of insomnia solution, but something valuable to us. Absolutely.

So as we talk about this, just real quick, evolution of the Faculty Senate. NIU became a university in 1957. All right? We were prior to that a normal school, normal school had a history of dealing with administration, primarily directly from the president on down; there was not a lot of shared governance in the historic view of how normal schools were developed, the teacher colleges.

As we became a university, we became increasingly more complex. In 1961, the University Council was established. When the University Council was established, there were no student members, no staff members. Over time things developed. In 1985, the constitution was formally reestablished for us, if you would. So the constitution that we're working under is roughly 30 years old at this point.

In 1991 the Board of Trustees was established. Now, one of the important things in terms of the evolution of the Faculty Senate is that we were initially only part of the University Council, we existed as the Faculty Advisory Council that got forwarded to the University Council. What faculty members apparently did, according to the documents, is that we got together and we caucused before meetings. So the faculty would get together, they would talk about what's of most interest to them, they'd go into the University Council and vote as a block, a consolidated group.

President Wingfield at the time wasn't keen on that as a concept, so you know, to make a long story short, the Faculty Senate was then separated out as a caucus body as separate from University Council.

So if we look at the evolution, it's interesting because right now we are primarily a caucus body, not a policy making body. We pass our bylaws and so forth, but any serious decisions we make get transferred up to the next level, right? So we were, like I said, fundamental in the University Council initially; we were seen as a little too solidarity, if you would, a little too much communication between meetings. So then got separated off as the Faculty Senate, and that's how it's remained to today. That's a little bit of the history.

If we look at membership, membership includes one representative from every department and school on campus. So every department and school should have one representative to University Council [Faculty Senate]. There's a provision if you have more than 50 in your department, but we have no departments or schools right now that fit that criterion. Every program -- every school -- excuse me -- has one representative.

And then the way we get our work done is by committee. I want to quickly run through committees. Some of you will hopefully put -- all of you who are voting members will see your name up here. The Executive Committee exists to provide guidance in terms of what we talk about in the meetings, serves as advisory to the Faculty Senate president. We meet monthly and come up

with the agenda and talk about any broader issues and how we want to present them to the group. It consists of the chairs of the committees of the Faculty Senate as well as some additional representatives to get representation across the colleges -- across the university.

Then our committees basically -- what I'm doing here is just a quick summary. You'll see the members. If I've made any misspellings, I apologize. I try hard not to. That's not always my strength. Want to use this to talk about some of the projects that are carryovers and currently underway. For example, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, Paul Stoddard is the chair. Want to -- thanks. Carryover projects that were initiated last year or potentially years before. For this committee have to do with the Family Medical Leave Act, language in the Academic Policy and Procedure Manual. How does that work, how is that playing out, as well as some discussion of online evaluation policies. With our consent agenda -- which we haven't got to yet -- there are three additional topics that group is likely to look at, the rights of faculty who are any sort of investigation; leave policies; and privacy and security and personal information. So that committee has -- assuming we approve the consent agenda, those are topics and activities that they hopefully will be looking at.

Next committee is the Academic Affairs Committee. Jimmie Manning is the chair of that. As far as carryover in current projects, they've been tasked with a review of the +/- grading system. There's discussion of, you know, should you include a C- or an A+. Those kinds of questions. Those have, you know, significant implications, particularly if a decision is reached that, you know, you want to propose a C-. If a C- is proposed as a grade, you're going to have to look at the course repeat policy because course repeat policies don't help us out with a C-. So that -- that's just one of the tasks that the group is looking at. There's also Centralized Disability Accommodation Fund that was recently established. Encourage you to check out the NIU website on that one. You can search for it. There are some implications for that will affect departments potentially differently as far as how they support student accommodations than has historically been done. So our goal with that committee is to pursue that a bit more.

Got couple more committees to run past real quick. One is the economic -- excuse me, the Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession. If you're looking to get off easy, that's probably easiest one. No projects; we don't yet have a chair. But they are certainly -- in the past have looked at issues of, say, salary, salary compression, gender equity in terms of salary, bigger picture issues like that. And with -- some of these where we don't yet have a chair identified, what we're -- what Pat and I will do is call a meeting and put out a duty poll to get everyone organized and bring people in and say, what do we want to do? Some of these things we may not need a chair, but there are certainly some activities that we at least want to consider pursuing.

The next committee is the Rules, Governance and Election Committee. Next week the University Council will vote on that. And I am not anticipating a problem with it unless it's an attendance one. They will be merging with this committee. We'll have a shared Rules, Governance and Election Committee. They at this point have no carryover. Assuming we do merge, there will be a couple of carryover projects, but I didn't want to be presumptuous and put that down until that merger actually takes place. That consolidation will be voted on next Wednesday during the University Council meeting.

And then the last committee that I'll mention is a shared committee between Faculty Senate and University Council; it's the Resource, Space and Budget Committee. Mark Riley is the University Council chair of that. Laura Beemer is the Faculty Senate liaison and spokesperson for us. It's one of our more significant committees, because you know, as I've heard many of you talk, as we've gone through the semester so far, budget and salaries and supports are major issues for us. And historically I think we -- put it this way: There's room to improve on our ability to provide input in this process. And so we are meeting regularly. We have a meeting this Friday.

Dr. Phillips, the chief financial officer, has been very open and forthcoming as far as talking to us. I see there as being some possibilities there of having meaningful input. So as far as carryover projects, they have none other than to keep us on track and provide input as far as budgetary concerns.

So to make this all work, you know, we've got to as a Faculty Senate -- it's important I think to know, A) how we evolved, and that we represent clearly the entire university. But bottom line is when we have stuff to do, we do need people to step up, committees to get the work done. And I am very sympathetic to the workload issues. Understand, I'm not saying -- not casting any stones, not being critical, but do recognize that everyone has a lot on their plate. If we want to make a difference, we need to be seen as responsive. That's just my little info on Faculty Senate today. Any questions on that?

Next month our -- Faculty Advisory Committee to the -- as well as Board of Trustees -- both of those are advisory bodies. And level of advice that those bodies are able to provide is perhaps not as deep as we might like. And so efforts are being made to figure out ways to provide more feedback. So we'll -- Sonya Armstrong as the rep, will share information. I'll share information and talk about how we can make meaningful difference as far as how our input goes. Okay. So any questions on any of this yet? Okay.

I would encourage you -- I've sent everyone -- hopefully everyone who is a member of the Faculty Senate an invite to meet with me. At this point, I've probably met with a third to a half of you, or groups thereof. I found these meetings helpful. It takes a fair amount of time, but I have yet to come away from any of these meetings without some new insight or awareness. I appreciate it and thank all of you who have met with me. If you would still like to meet with me, please coordinate that through Pat. If you don't want to meet with me, it's your choice as well. I'm not going to be persistent. Not send you a note that says, I noticed you didn't catch up. That's not going to happen. I do want to let you know, if you want a meeting, I'm happy to do so. If you want an organized group, I have talked to a couple of departments already on these topics as well. And the point of them is really just to go and hear what people have to say, build relationships, and figure out, you know, how we continue to move forward.

Faculty Club. We had our first Faculty Club last month. Brand new endeavor, because we're doing it a little different, including a social time; we're also including time to talk about a particular topic or a paper. Attendance was not perhaps what I might have liked. But on the other hand, the people that did attend were very interested, enthusiastic, and provided some helpful perspectives. This month we have our Faculty Club lunch next Tuesday and Wednesday, October 6 and 7. And I do have posted -- it was sent out to you an article from the AACU, American Association of Colleges and Universities entitled Academic Freedom and Responsibility. It also ties into the AAUP statement on academic freedom. If you cannot make the lunch, I certainly

understand. But I would encourage all of you in here to read that article, because I think it provides a helpful context for us to figure out our rules -- roles in this very challenging time right now at the university.

Now, I do recognize, however -- and several people have chastised me on this for stealing their socialization, so -- their social time. Because you know, Faculty Club lunches were historically -- we go, have lunch, and just chat and visit. So I intervened; and I accept responsibility. On the other hand, I think that another option that I'm going to offer -- the Executive Committee was in support of it -- is have a happy hour, a 4 to 6 p.m. cash bar happy hour in the University Suite. I'm talking to the director of Holmes Student Center. Next week we have an appointment to talk about the specifics of this. But it may be another option to try. My goal is, as much as possible, to get us to know each other, to talk. And so the lunches were fine, but if I could -- if some of you might be interested in, you know, I'm going to let my hair down and socialize. I'm doing it during a happy hour at the end of the day versus lunchtime. We'll have both options available. I will give you some additional feedback on that. But I did want to let you know that we're trying that as yet another option to encourage people to participate. Anyone wants to get involved or help me out, or help us out, don't ever hesitate. We're open to feedback.

All right. Now I want to provide some updates quickly from our last meeting. If we have time at the end of today's meeting, we have summarized the comments that you shared at our meeting; and I'd like to have us do kind of a categorization task if time allows. If not, we'll postpone that to next week. As far as other updates, in terms of budget, at the university level and state level, there's no change. I have heard the same stories, the same concerns, voiced repeatedly. Met with President Baker as recently as last night. And there's no change in Springfield. We do want to obviously hope to see change, but the general sense is that, until things get significantly worse, it's not terribly likely. So the budget situation is one that is a very sincere and ongoing concern.

B. [Advocacy and Lobbying Guidelines](#)

Now, with that in mind, we had also talked about the idea of lobbying. And I know -- paperless meeting, I apologize. I lied. When we talked about this last time, Debbie Haliczzer and I provided a little background in terms of what you can and can't do and so forth. There was a little bit of discussion on that, a few concerns were raised. So in the meantime we have -- I think we should have enough. Hopefully they'll come around. And if not, we'll make more. So I talked to the -- Jim Guagliardo, ethics officer and special counsel; and Mike Mann, the associate vice president and state negotiations, and board liaison to get additional information. The paper I'm passing out right now is a summary of their comments. They both have reviewed it. Both are comfortable with us passing this out. And you know, I don't need to read this for you, but basically there is a constitutional requirement that does, you know, require us to keep separate our public and university work. Same thing goes in terms of the speaking on behalf of the Board of Trustees or any aspect of university formally without getting some prior permission. Do note, though -- and this is important from an individual rights standpoint -- please be encouraged to share your thoughts. I mean, you may write, phone, contact your legislators, government agencies. You have the right to share your opinions. Right? Our First Amendment rights are real. We have the right to share and talk about whatever we want to do. Right? Now, from our standpoint, certainly one area where that might be particularly relevant is related to higher education and our budget

impasse. That's something if you want to write about, please feel free to do so. The only limits -- tried to be specific here -- is that you may not provide the impression that you're speaking on behalf of the university. So even if I'm writing something as Greg Long, I can't say I'm writing it as Faculty Senate president. Right? So you may not say that you're speaking on behalf of the university unless you have some prior approval to do so, which we'll talk about in a moment. Should not be using university resources: the letterhead, copying, email, so forth. These are things we talked about last week -- last time. And then for faculty it's a little more vague in terms of the idea of university time. Because you know, what we -- what is our time? When do we work? I sent out emails this morning at 5 a.m. because I couldn't sleep. Is that -- does that count as my work time? I would say certainly so. On the other hand, officially, it's not. So as it has been interpreted for our standpoint as faculty members, your university time really is most directly related to your office hours and your course time. So you know, you don't want to be sending things, you know, using university resources or even during your office hours, because if audited, you will get busted on it, or you could at least. And the same thing with regard to your classroom. That should not be a place where you're actively lobbying and going in that regard.

Exceptions? There are certainly opportunities to speak on behalf of the university. I'm going to encourage us as a Faculty Senate to write a letter to go forward as representing our views as a body and our concerns that we have. When you're doing this, we are wanting to figure out the most effective way of communicating on behalf of the university. You are required to, encouraged to, speak with Mike Man, if it's a state-level issue. And if it's a federal-level issue, the person that's listed as your contact is Anna Quider. In most cases, the anticipation is that faculty will be writing on their own behalf and not on behalf of the university. If you do write on behalf of the university, that requires prior permission to stay within the boundaries that will keep us safe.

And on the back, just really quickly I've included -- probably need to give you this as an online, because the hyperlink for the contact information probably doesn't tell you much, does it? I apologize. But the Illinois government, just go to www.il.gov, find your legislators, any other information that may be helpful. In talking with Jim and Mike in terms of content of any interactions we have, certainly the biggest impact comes from talking about the impact on students. Talking about our lives, or our frustrations gets very little play. Talking about how this impacts students is a much more profound, much more involving kind of an argument, if you would. So students. Also the idea that universities -- the failure to fund university programs and such, we are economic drivers, we make -- we're important in the economy, important in government, important in lots of ways. It's important to keep that up. Also recommend that when you write, you talk about issues rather than pick on individuals. That seems to have a much more positive impact than saying "I think Governor Rauner is" or "I think Speaker Madigan is"... probably best to avoid that type of approach and focus on issues.

And the final one is one that I'm -- I'm confident is not a problem for us, but want to include anyway. That's be scholarly, be civil when you write stuff. We're representing the university. So write as such, if you would. That's the update on lobbying. Do you have any questions? There were concerns last time. Does this answer them for you? We good? Okay.

One thing I would also like to mention in this regard from a lobbying standpoint is on October the 29, the DeKalb Economic Development Committee is hosting Governor Rauner here on campus. It's not an NIU-sponsored event, but the governor will be on campus the evening of October the 29.

I suspect that there will not be a budget passed before that time. I mean, you're talking four weeks away. And the other part of that is that we have a lot of students on campus -- there's nearly 6,000 students on campus who are dependent upon MAP grants, Monetary Award Program; and the state has not released the money for those. You have nearly 6,000 students who are in a very, very dire position. The universities have agreed to essentially take it on a promise that they'll get it. But that's uncertain; will that happen? Be available next semester? So we've got this first semester students here, they're covered even though the money's not. But is that sustainable for a second semester? That's uncertain. So I would just make a suggestion that certainly if there's no budget in place by the 29th, and if the governor is speaking in the Duke Ellington Ballroom, we would seem to be remiss if we did not at least have some sort of presence or other position there. You know, getting into the event is 150 bucks per person per plate. I'm guessing that we're not going to do that. But certainly if faculty and staff -- I'll be talking to them as well -- students are aware of this. Is there -- may there be a reason to gather together, to have some sort of protest, have some sort of acknowledgment that we're there? Because if I'm in the public and I look at the governor comes to institution of higher ed, and there's no one at the institution who says, hey, wait a minute, this is -- we got some problems here, then at some level we deserve our fate. All right? I'm sorry; I'm speaking from my heart here, but I think if we have the governor come here on the 29th and we are not present at all, there is certainly something to be -- you know -- concerned about there. So I'm bringing that up. If people want to pursue that, something we could talk about a bit later. But just as an FYI, let you know.

Next topic in terms of announcement, Quality Matters and the rubric we talked about on the education concerns. Followed up with staff from E-learning, Faculty Development and the Outreach Office. Updates. As far as it relates to Quality Matters, yes, the Outreach Office is sponsoring courses that use the Quality Matters rubric because it provides a good standard to ensure that what we're putting out there is at least at a minimum level. That the rubric does have a lot of very positive things in it. The other side of this is, though, is that if it's not being offered through outreach, that, you know, you don't have to follow the Quality Matters rubric, but outreach will not promote the course. And outreach has a primary focus on promoting programs and developing online programs versus courses. So you know, any of you are being told that there is an absolute template or standard that, you know, everyone must use, that is incorrect information. That the -- once you get assigned and are working with a designer, you will be able to work on any number of ways of putting your course together. So I did want to at least follow -- let you know I followed up on that. The rumors of mass standardization across all of our courses does not seem to be accurate. Any questions on that? Okay.

Two other items before we turn it over to our guests -- I appreciate your patience on this.

B. Coryell: No worries.

G. Long: We did get a request from the College of Education college council with regard to a need for -- basically reminder within the Academic Policies and Procedure Manual, faculty have the right to have input, even approval of how we conduct evaluations. And so do you conduct evaluations online, or on paper? Those are actually discussions that within the APPM we are supposed to be involved with. I know across the university that programs -- some programs have gone to online versus paper. From a budgetary standpoint, you can see why that -- there's some sense to that. Quality is a question. So I wanted to bring this up to you -- we can hopefully address this at the end

of the hour -- but to let you know that as a body we may want to reaffirm that, you know, decisions on course evaluation should be done with our consultation.

The other part of this as a follow-up is on the university affairs side of thing. The academic -- excuse me, University Affairs Committee has one of their responsibilities this year for doing a review of evaluation of instruction. So certainly we could have individuals from this body participate directly. But that seems to be a prime opportunity to discuss this overall. How are we looking at online versus paper, as well as if we're going online, do we need to have input in terms of the specific vendor, or is that something that is an issue that's, you know, at a different level?

I'm bringing those up for potential discussion later on but did want to let you know that there has been some concern that some faculty feel as though their voices have not been heard in the selection process of how we do evaluation of instruction.

And then the last thing -- this is -- may very well have some discussion at the end of the meeting as well, as related to the program prior to -- Program Prioritization Task Force. There are two task forces: The administrative task force, and then there's the academic task force. The task forces have co-chairs. All right? They did initially start with just a single chair, but that proved problematic when one of the chairs dropped. And so they now went to a two co-chair kind of format for the task forces. The chairs, just as -- again, a point of reference, the chairs are facilitators, they're not decision-makers. They essentially keep things moving; but the entire process is characterized by quite a bit of transparency and oversight. The chairs themselves are not making independent decisions. I mention this to you because on the administrative side of things, the co-chairs are Michelle Pickett, SPS, and academic advising -- I forget her exact title, but in charge of academic advising, and Matt Streb. Thank you, Matt, for being tenured faculty member on that committee. On the academic side, the academic representative, the -- representative is George Slotsve, our vice president of the Faculty Senate. And the SPS is an instructor from the College of Education, Alan Clemens. So the, the two task forces have been -- the membership is still there; the leadership has changed from the standpoint of having it be a bit more inclusive and also to provide backup in case there's problems with people not being able to show. So wanted to give you that. Certainly happy to talk about these at the end of the meeting when we have comments from the floor. But did want to give you the head-up on that. All right?

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. Appropriate Use Policy – [presentation](#)
Brett Coryell, CIO; Drew Bjerken, Chief Information Security Officer
[Policy on Privacy in the Electronic Environment](#) – Pages 3-6
[Policy on Appropriate Use of the NIU Network](#) – Pages 7-10

G. Long: So, with that, under V, the Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, I'd like to welcome Brett Coryell and Andrew Bjerken, from the Division of Information Technology, to discuss policies and privacy and appropriate use of technology. I'd like to turn it over to you.

B. Coryell: I'd like to thank the faculty for having us in today for this discussion. The origins of the discussion that we'd like to start today really started last summer when we had an intersection between some new networking gear that we were putting in for security purposes and a student who

was blocked from accessing a particular page in Wikipedia. At the moment that he was blocked from accessing that page, there was a display of a portion of a -- of our existing and still current, actually, Acceptable Use Policy that made it appear as though students were not allowed to go to social media pages. And so that really highlighted for us the need to go back and find an update to that Acceptable Use Policy. And it's been a year-long journey to go ahead and give that proper deliberation and work through the shared governance process. Today we're here to bring not only the Acceptable Use Policy but also the privacy policy that has grown out of all of these discussions as well, so that we can get your feedback and consideration and that we can make any edits that the faculty feel are necessary in all of that.

The primary distinction between the old Acceptable Use Policy and the one that you have seen today really is around that difference between what employees of the university are not allowed to do because of the State Ethics Act. These would be things such as political lobbying during work time, and things that students are allowed to do. Students are not covered by the State Ethics Act when they're not acting as state employees. And so the primary difference between the old policy and the new policy really is about making that distinction clear. That students have much -- they have much greater freedom to do things on the network than, say, an administrative assistant or that I can do on the network. We hope that that language is more clear now.

The -- one of the other tenets that I think is present in the new policy -- and I hope will be valued by the faculty, because the new policy was primarily authored by faculty -- is that we've now called out specifically that the protections of academic freedom exist in full force when you're working with technology on a network or with any other type of electronic medium, just as they apply to every other aspect of your academic life. So that language is specifically called out; and it was really missing in the last policy. So that's something that I think is a positive move forward.

In general, I think that you'll find when we stop talking about the Acceptable Use Policy and we really start looking at privacy, I think you'll find, or you might agree with me, that this is what people are really more interested in. As we've gone around trying to talk about what people should or shouldn't do on the network, largely people agree that there are certain things that are -- that would be dangerous behaviors, like visiting sites that are known to propagate malware or viruses, and that we all have an interest in preventing that sort of thing from happening for casual users who don't know that they're going there. And so really nobody is arguing that IT should take a role in trying to protect the institution or protect our data. But the questions that we get much more often are around who can see what and when. And we -- and just to give the simplest example of that, we've had a question like: If I bring my personal laptop on to the NIU campus and I connect to the guest network, can you read my files while I'm connected? And so that's why we've created a privacy policy. I see -- I didn't know until I walked in today that privacy and security of your information is also on your agenda and on your minds. So when we get into that, I hope we have lots of positive discussion about it.

I think you'll find as you read through and as we have some discussion about that today, that IT tracks a lot of information because we have thousands and thousands of pieces of equipment on campus that we need to be able to keep up and running and functional. But in general when we get past that ordinary operational need to keep systems up and running, IT intends, and we hope we've codified in policy, that our action is largely to secure or to safeguard your privacy from overreaching administrative or legal processes. Of course, we must comply with all valid legal and

administrative processes, but our goal in protecting your privacy is to make sure that none of those agencies or managers or -- or actors overstep their bounds. And so we do try to act as a safeguard for your privacy. So with that as an introduction to why we're here and the types of documents or discussions that we're open to today, I'd like to introduce our chief information security officer, Andrew Bjerken. He's going to take you through some of the additional details. And we welcome your questions on this or any other IT topic.

A. Bjerken: Thank you. Thank you for having us here. Brett stole some of the thunder from my slides. We'll go through fairly quickly so we can get to the discussion. We'll go to the next slide.

The background really, in August of 2014, we received negative attention on the AUP policy, and Brett kind of articulated what the effects were. In June 2015 we in the -- when they were talking about the fact that we were revamping the AUP policy. This time it was a much more positive article saying how serious we were taking it. Next slide.

So you know, obviously the AUP had gotten rewritten. There were privacy procedures put into the actual AUP, and subsequently we revamped it again, pulled out all of those processes and separated out the privacy side. That's why you now have two different policies before you. Slide.

So the stuff in red is kind of what I felt was the stuff that is really important to you. When we start talking about it, it's really the intent of the policy to protect all of the students, faculty and staff. And you'll hear me -- if you ever hear me speak, you'll hear me talk about the fact as a university, especially when we talk about network resources, we're one ecosystem. The weakest link in it becomes the foothold for a bad actor to do something bad. When I look out at faculty, the first thing that comes to mind for me is research data. The last thing we want is 20 years of research data to, you know, be stolen by somebody else and published under somebody else's name. So those are some of the things that, you know, when we work to secure environment, those are the things that we're concerned about. And then just protecting the resources in general. We don't want to be listed on the Internet as being the -- hosting bad actors that are doing DDOSes or criminal enterprise activities from our network resources. And then you can kind of see the other one, in black, the other concerns that we have. But may or may not necessarily be, you know, primary for you. Next slide.

So again, when we look at it, it's to bring consistency and order. Why do we have governance? Up until this point, the reality is the university has been going in and doing investigations when they have a valid reason. They have been going into people's emails, and there's been no policies, no process -- excuse me -- or procedures that are written down and documented. So what we're attempting to do is to actually put some controls in place that safeguard everybody, myself included, Brett included, because we're part of the -- the staff just like everybody else. So that everybody can see what's going on when we're going to do this, how we're going to go about doing it, who has to be involved. Because the last thing I want is to think that folks from my office have anything better to do than just going into people's email and randomly read stuff. I can assure you if that happens, that person will no longer probably be working at NIU, definitely not in the capacity of security. Which is why I highlighted the fishing. We don't just arbitrarily go into anybody's emails, files. It's essentially the same as if it was your office. There has to be a valid reason for us to do it. And we'll talk about that in some of our use case scenarios as far as when we do it and why we do it. I can tell you everything is set up on predesignated, thought out,

rational, logic-based alerts. When we see an anomalous activity, it will trigger something, then it will cause us to do a cursory investigation, and we move forward from there. And then, of course, just best practices. I listed just a few of the universities that I looked at in terms of their Acceptable Use Policy. There's ten there. Every single one of them has a policy that is similar to the one that I'm presenting today. Next slide.

So how do we measure success? You know, that's always a good question that people want to know. For me, my biggest thing right now is transparency. You know, I don't want to have an information security program that isn't transparent. I will tell everybody on this entire campus, if anybody's curious, how we do things, what we are able to see, what we're able to look at, you know, how we do our searches, I welcome to -- welcome to come by my office and we'll show you on your own email, of course, what it is that we do and how we do it so you can get a better sense.

Even when there is a FOIA request or investigation, we don't literally look through each and every one of your emails. We do word searches. It's always parsed down to the absolute minimum of what we need to get the information. And that's the only thing that comes back in our return. It's not like we're manually looking through anyone's emails. I barely keep up with my own email, I certainly don't have time to read through anybody else's. Just to give you kind of an idea. And ultimately we're reducing NIU's risk. So you'll hear me talk about brand protection, making sure that we've got -- no potential lawsuits. And just security in general. When we start talking about brand protection, at the end of the day any brand publicity on NIU ultimately could affect enrollment rates. That's what we strive to stay away from.

All right. So kind of jump into the discussion. Some of the things that have been of interest to other folks around campus are notifications. Key issues to discuss, whether or not we should notify individuals before or after we've been in their email or potentially their files that they store online so -- and in monitoring versus reviewing, versus inspecting and investigating. Overall if you've read the process -- or the policy, you know, the goal is that in any time there's a request for any type of data, be it a legal request, you know, an administrative request, or a FOIA request, we always try to notify the individual first and let them know prior to actually going into their files and data. Now, there are occasions where understandably you don't want the individual to know about it because, A) a judge has said don't inform them, and we don't want to, you know, tamper with an ongoing investigation; or B) that there's an administrative action and administratively somebody has said, you know, look, we want to look and do this review first. But at the end of the day you should always know at the outcome that somebody has been in your actual email or gone through your data files.

And the decision -- when we start talking about who's involved in that decision, it's not a decision that's made by a single person; it's a decision that's made, you know, by committee, for lack of a better terminology. And the case of faculty, the provost would be involved, that's the VP that sits above probably your department chair will be involved in that particular decision. General Counsel is always involved. Potentially HR, one of the ADPs from HR. Myself from my office. And then it depends if it's an ethical violation or what the -- the specifics are, you know, it may be the ethics officer; the chief of police may be involved.

But essentially when we have these discussions, there has to be agreement, a consensus amongst the group, you know. And we're going with at least two people have to feel that there's a valid reason

for this action to take place. So if there isn't that consensus, then the action doesn't occur. So -- and the big thing to remember is that anytime we take that action, that information, it's not usually reviewed per se by the entire group. It's a very small subset of the group that's actually working on the investigation. So even though they approve it, they don't necessarily review all the information. Because they're not the investigating official. Whoever handles that particular case will give a report as to whether whatever claim was made was substantiated or unsubstantiated.

So that's kind of how we talk about when we start talking about going in and on notification. If it's the case of a FOIA request, in FOIA request we always give the -- the faculty member the chance to provide whatever information is being requested first. There shouldn't be a FOIA request that you don't know about ever that goes in and looks for your information. And for the majority of you, that's probably the more likelihood of, you know, what would cause us to have to go into pulling emails.

The normal process is the FOIA request would come to you. If you say you can't find the information, or if, you know, you need to retrieve it, it's in an archive, you would send that back to the FOIA officer, and they would come back to us and say, hey, is it possible you can look into archives and pull that information? So you should always know on a FOIA. And anytime you provide that information, I encourage you all to redact the information, you know, that's private. So anything that's a personal nature to you, you don't have to just arbitrarily hand in the information; you should review it and redact what information is in there that you feel is private.

Unidentified speaker: Actually, I think the FOIA code says specifically that you're not the arbiter, it has to be -- has to be the -- the FOIA officer that arbitrates what's private necessarily. Because there is a specific area in the FOIA code, if I remember correctly -- I think I have a little experience with this -- that the FOIA -- that what's private information to you isn't necessarily considered -- it's what a reasonable person would think is private. In other words, if you -- it says if a reasonable person -- you might not think -- you might think a phone number is private. Okay?

Then they pull that out. But maybe -- it would have to be something like -- I know legal guys can jump in if they want -- if you have a strange communicable disease or something, and you don't want anybody to know, that's private information. Okay? But if you had a -- a private conversation about public stuff, that's not private information.

A. Bjerken: Correct. But you still have -- you still need to redact your information. So to your example, for HIPAA, if you have something that talks about a strange communicable disease, you should redact that. There's no reason the FOIA officer needs to know that that's there.

Unidentified Speaker: How would the faculty member know those rules to FOIA without somebody informing them?

A. Bjerken: They can always contact the FOIA officer.

B. Coryell: It ends up being a separate non-IT question about how to respond to FOIA requests. When you redact information for FOIA and send it off to the FOIA officer, they'll more than likely have a conversation with you about what you redacted and why. And then they may -- that's their

opportunity to say, although you consider that conversation to be private, it's not; and we need to -- we need to undo the redaction.

Unidentified Speaker: That was my point.

B. Coryell: Exactly. So I'm agreeing. Your strange disease, when you say I have a personal medical condition I've redacted, they would probably say, I agree that needs to remain redacted. There's the possibility to remain redacted. But as the records officer, being responsible for your own privacy, have the first opportunity to do the first redaction even if it gets undone later.

Unidentified Speaker: If any of us get in that situation, review the FOIA code yourself before you start redacting.

G. Long: I would just mention that one of the reasons we have them here is to encourage the information. And so take this information back to your departments. Because that's one of the bigger issues is so now we're aware of these issues, the policies, but I suspect many of our colleagues are not. Part of our responsibility is to take this back. So that's the other part of dissemination.

B. Coryell: Thank you.

J. Stephen: From math. What if you get the improbable thing of an FISO?

B. Coryell: Well, we can't talk about that.

G. Long: When you say, FISO, what do you mean by that?

J. Stephen: A security --

A. Bjerken: Foreign intelligence security. So it's essentially what happens is you'll get a notification, and it will depend on the notification. My recommendation is unless it says do not share this with anybody, you probably want to contact general counsel.

J. Stephen: They may tell you not to tell us.

A. Bjerken: That's what I said. Unless it says otherwise -- I mean, and we have gotten those in the past where it says don't notify anybody, don't share this with anybody. And we're legally obligated to be bound by that. So --

J. Stephen: Point out their exception. We may not know we're being searched. Before or after.

A. Bjerken: Correct. That goes not just FISO, but for any legal request. Any judge -- if there's any kind of case that's going, if the judge says don't share and don't notify, we can't notify you. But it's not our rules or our regulations. It's out of our control. We're just providing the information at that particular time.

B. Coryell: Do you think we should include a statement or two in either one of the policies saying that there are exceptions and FISO is one of them? It would be good just to notify people of that? We would take that back as a comment.

J. Stephen: Yes, as a comment.

B. Coryell: Thanks.

A. Bjerken: Any questions about the difference between monitoring and reviewing, inspecting versus investigating? Some folks had heartburn at other councils. Next slide?

V. Naples: Virginia Naples from biology. I have a question for you. When you talk about the university looking at, say, the contents of emails, clearly the niu.edu address and an email there is on the University server, which means that they automatically can go through any of that if they choose. Does that apply to people who have separate emails on different servers, such as gmail or Yahoo or anything like that? If your computer is on campus connected to the NIU or regular connection system, can the University go through those email systems as well?

B. Coryell: Great question. Want to take it?

A. Bjerken: I'll take it. In general -- and I'm going to -- going to answer it in two different ways. So A) we don't have access to the actual system for yahoo, Hotmail -- Google's a little different because we have students who use Google, and it's our student-based account. But the normal user such as yourself that would use gmail, we don't have access to that. The only way we would ever get access and -- I can't imagine that the University would ever request it, per se. A legal entity could subpoena them and pull that information. So to that note, I will switch gears a little bit and say that anytime you send any information over the wire, whatever network you're on, there is always the potential and ability not just for us, but a bad actor to be able to intercept the 1's and 0's flying through the air and decipher what your message traffic is. So you know, it is...I don't want to say that we couldn't do it, because we could. We wouldn't do it, though, because that's not -- that's not what we're about.

B. Coryell: The technical answer is, yes, lots of things are possible. But the practical answer is, no, that doesn't happen. And the exception to that is student email in gmail is our email just like your office 365 account is our email. When I say "our," I mean it's the university's, so we can look at student email just like we can at faculty and staff email. We do so only with a valid or administrative reason to do that.

V. Naples: That's a question a variety of people have asked me about, because I'm on University Council and they know I'm on Faculty Senate. And it has presented a lot of angst from people.

Although I don't know exactly why they're so upset. My policy is you really should not put anything on email that you don't want published on the front page of the New York Times or the Washington Post. But that isn't necessarily true for everyone.

R. Moremen: Robin Moremen, Sociology. Can -- can you give us as faculty members some idea of what percentage of the faculty have been subjected to FOIA or FISA requests? I mean, to what extent is this an issue?

A. Bjerken: So, you know -- and I don't see -- I don't see all the FOIA requests, because most of the time the faculty themselves, you know, are able to fulfill the request. I will say the majority of requests that I see are usually on the administrative and staff side, not the faculty side. Doesn't mean that it doesn't happen, just the ones that I've been privy to have almost -- I'd say in the high 90s in terms of percentile have been staff.

B. Coryell: And again, I don't know that I have a number for that either. But if I were to guess, just to give -- the worst answer in the world is "I don't know." Because we all have some idea, right, just based on what we see or don't see. And if I were to guess how many faculty had been FOIA'ed in the last year that we have had any involvement whatsoever with, I'd guess less than 50, probably less than 20. Does that --

A. Bjerken: Less than five.

B. Coryell: Less than five. It's small. Right? It's small.

R. Moremen: Okay. So if that's the case, and this body is faculty, are you going to be discussing this with University Council where there are staff and administrative personnel represented?

A. Bjerken: Building up our tolerance. They'll be next.

B. Coryell: We've already been to operating staff counsel twice and received really good feedback, thoughtful feedback from operating staff counsel whose primary concern is about managers who want to look at their email. And maybe in an overly broad way. So that was a lot of the discussion we had with operating staff. We've been to SPS Council already; had good interaction and dialogue with them. Slightly different than operating staff counsel. We wanted to meet specifically with Faculty Senate so we could hear any concerns from the faculty and incorporate all of that before going to University Council as our next step. And the last step will be a discussion and consideration at the president's cabinet.

A. Bjerken: The only thing I want to add is I want to make sure that university business, though, is supposed to be conducted on university email. Because the State of Illinois is really coming down on people doing and using outside media to try to conduct business. Sir?

M. Falkoff: Marc Falkoff. Maybe a hypothetical: I -- really hypothetical, actually. One of my research projects right now is on extending the ability of habeas corpus to sex offenders, people convicted of sex crimes who have done nasty things. That involves occasional research and writing into Word documents and sending Word documents over email and so forth. You can imagine all that kind of thing. So I just have a question for you: Is there any kind of a filter mechanism, screening mechanism; is there any way that you all are searching through any of my University files in a way that something is going to be flagged which is going to kick off some kind of attempt to figure out what's really going on in my emails?

A. Bjerken: It's a good question. So I will tell you that, you know, if I were to equate where our program is right now, where -- a freshman team right now. I've been on staff now for the -- about 100 days. So we're building up. We did just get the capability for DLP, that's data loss prevention.

So for example, if you're sending ten Social Security numbers out of the system, I could theoretically alert on that and know that you're sending out information. And at some point in time we will come up with those policies and rules of which -- you know, some of the stuff that you're dealing with, you talk about sex offenders, there will probably be a policy on that. We don't have one yet in place. We're not looking at any of that kind of stuff. But then we'll also build in an exception to the use policy. So my background is I'm a criminal justice major, I did sociology of sexual deviants and we had to study various stuff. My master's degree, forensic science and I had to do sexual assault stuff and all that stuff that comes with it. You can imagine back in the day what my computer may have looked like, you know; and if I had taken it to a civilian organization, I probably would have been arrested until the university said, no, he's doing legitimate research. So I can certainly understand and -- you know, I've been in that plight before. We will have a policy that, you know -- or a policy for exceptions so folks who are doing legitimate research on that can continue on with that. That's important. That's the only way we get smarter and learn about -- about things.

B. Coryell: One final comment. I wanted to thank Marc for sure because he was on the group that helped us draft the original version of the AUP. It's morphed a little since then -- a lot since then. Marc's comments about whether or not to filter and what to do -- sexual deviancy, child pornography, sexual abuse -- we're reporters -- I'm missing the term; if we have any knowledge of it, we have to report it; versus having a legitimate research interest. Those were some of the really complex discussions we have had, and taken all the notion of filtering out. Although it -- you know, at some point if anyone wants to bring it up again, or if there's a -- ever a desire or need to say now we want you to take a stronger stance, the IT capability exists; it's not implemented and there's no policy requirement for it at this time. There's always the question of what's the policy, is there technical enforcement, and are you capable of it? And right now, we're -- we're, yes, capable; no technical enforcement and no policy language around the filtering for that. Okay? I'm happy to answer questions as long as you like.

G. Long: Let me ask the group: There are certainly some additional items for us to deal with today. We can also have Brett and Drew back. We can continue this discussion. I know we try to end at 4:30. I'm happy to go a little longer. But on the other hand, we can have them back. But how would you like to proceed at this point? Do you want to pose questions, final statement, or continue the presentation? What's your call on this one?

B. Coryell: We can take questions by email, and send answers back too, if that's convenient for people. So you can let us know.

G. Long: Would that be acceptable to people? Okay. Well, thank you very much.

A. Bjerken: I did want to just hit on --

G. Long: Any last really important things?

A. Bjerken: The next slide is pertinent to a lot of folks. We start talking about personal devices. A lot of folks want to know what we can and cannot see. Now that we have a new cell phone stipend policy in place, what does that entail when we start talking about that we're handling business transactions, text messages, whatnot. First of all, on personal device, personal laptop, computers, we

can't see the files that are on your computer. Again, the answer that I gave of anything that transgresses the wire, you know, just be advised, you know, we can potentially see that. But so can anybody else. So it's just something to keep in mind. When we start talking about FOIA requests for phone records, if you have a stipend, that's something that you'll have to provide those records. It will be up to the individual who has that cell phone to provide that; and then to your point again, sir, if it's text messages, you have the option of redacting not just the phone numbers that are there -- quite frankly, nobody needs to -- has to know what your mother's phone number is. That's not their business. And the FOIA officer is going to have to take your word at that. It's still -- it mixes that between business and personal because it is your personal device. A BYOD device. I want to bring that up because it is a one that a lot of folks are curious about.

G. Long: Any last question from the floor?

S. Kim: I heard from the email or accounts -- someone suspect that there's some information that is not supposed to be leaked. And they can auto-erase the emails. Is that true? And then also would that function affect my other email on my device?

A. Bjerken: If I understand your question correctly, if there's -- if it thinks that there's data that's leaving that's not supposed to, will it auto erase it? So currently right now we don't have -- that's part of the DLP. We don't have that in play. What we would do once we do -- and it's a crawl, walk, run-type process -- is it would pop up an alert and let you know, hey, you're sending out information that's, you know, Privacy Act information; do you want to override this? In other words, we're going to say are you really sure you want to send this out? And then you can say, yes, I do. The similar concept is if you got spammed, you know, and it came in, you might -- and it wasn't spam, it would go into your spam box. So we don't really want to delete anything. We want the user to make that educated decision. As far as your other emails, no, it doesn't affect anything else on your other email accounts on your device.

J. Stephen: You guys manage reporters; you must flag certain things. Do you also block a lot of like TOR browsers?

A. Bjerken: So -- come from a different background. I would love to be able to block Tor, at least in certain segments of our network. So for example, PCI is payment card industry. Where we take our charge cards, our book store has it. We have a specific VLAN, a specific section in our network that handles all of our credit card transactions. In that particular instance, once we're up and running full speed again -- we're at the freshman level. I want to get up to the grad level. We would want to block Tor: No viable reason, and it's a security concern. The network as a whole when we start looking at the academic mission and the research committee, I use Tor, I would expect others to. There are viable reasons for it. And again we need to understand how it works, how it operates. So in that aspect for the general network, I wouldn't.

J. Stephen: Okay.

G. Long: I would like to thank you. I feel confident that we have a lot more questions. I would certainly encourage people to send email. As you're comfortable, anytime you send something or questions, feel free to copy me or send me a response. Because I -- it's helpful to know what's going

on and what your concerns are if I'm going to be trying to represent us. If there's anything that you're willing to share with me as you ask questions, please don't hesitate. I'd like to keep up with that. And thank both Drew and Brett for giving us the time today.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Rights of faculty who are under investigation – refer to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee
- B. Leave policies (FMLA, sabbatical, 9-month contracts) – refer to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee
- C. Privacy and security of personal information – refer to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee
- D. Centralized Disability Accommodation Fund – refer to Academic Affairs Committee

G. Long: All right. I have to say, based on my years of being on Faculty Senate and University Council, it's probably the first time we've gone to 4:15 before we got to the consent agenda. For those of you -- I would like to apologize on that one. This month consent agenda includes some items that we're referring to committee. Mentioned those earlier when we were talking about the overall structure of the committees. You can see there we've got rights, faculty who are under investigation, leave policies, and privacy and security. Those all refer to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. And the Centralized Disability Accommodation Fund, that is being referred to the Academic Affairs Committee. As the consent agenda, all I need is a motion to accept.

J. Stephen: So moved.

G. Long: Second? Richard? Okay. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? Okay. Good.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate Bylaws [Article 3.1](#) – Page 11
Faculty Senate Executive Committee revised to Faculty Senate Steering Committee
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

G. Long: Unfinished business. Do you all have clickers? And only one per, Richard. While people are getting clickers, the one item we have as an action item under unfinished business, under VI., Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate bylaws, Article 3.1. If you look on Page 11, very, very straightforward. Request. Right now the Faculty Senate, their leadership group is called the Executive Committee, at the University Council it's called the Steering Committee. Kind of

confusing because they both do the same thing. The proposal is to rename the Faculty Senate committee as a steering committee so that they're both steering committees. It's just one versus the other. This was brought up at our last meeting. Didn't have a lot of discussion. I'll open it for a motion at this point to accept. Tom Pavkov and George Slotsve. Any discussion on this? Okay. We should have checked –

P. Erickson: I apologize. I'm having trouble getting the polling device to open. So I think we have to count. I apologize.

G. Long: Since we are -- the clickers aren't working on this. Voice vote, or hand vote?

Unidentified Speaker: Voice.

G. Long: All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? My, do we work quickly. Love it. Thank you.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – [report](#) – Page 12

G. Long: We have no new business specifically.

G. Long: In terms of reports, we only have one right now. It's from Sonya Armstrong.

S. Armstrong: So the faculty advisory council to the Illinois Board of Higher Ed met a couple weeks ago. You have the report. There's not a whole lot of new news, as you might imagine. There are issues starting to rue, if you go to the online complaint system. You can see that is now live online. The other items that are reported there are really just committees that are being organized. So nothing really urgent yet. But I'll entertain any questions about the report.

G. Long: Does anyone have any questions for Sonya? Thank you very much.

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

G. Long: As far as other advisory committees, the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees is a body that includes three faculty members, it includes the Faculty Senate President, and two other faculty members -- Rebecca Shortridge and Dan Gebo -- and also includes the chair of the SPS Council and the Operating Staff Council. It's been my experience thus far in my short term in this position that the University Advisory Committee does not necessarily have a lot of opportunity to provide advice; that the idea of providing feedback to the board and so on and so forth is

something that we're trying to improve. I had a meeting with board chairman last week about this, followed up with President Baker. Right now the committee tends to be a one where you go and you make a prepared statement and sit there for the next three hours with nothing to say. From my standpoint that's not a good use of our time and our advice, our expertise. So while there is no report, I would let you know that we are trying very diligently to try and establish some mechanisms through the president's office as well as through the Board of Trustees where they can ask us questions, we can provide information in ways that perhaps heretofore we have not been doing. So it's on -- it's in process.

X. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

G. Long: We have no reports from standing committees. I suspect -- we'll start seeing you. You saw the committee structures and some of the carryover projects. As we move forward I will expect those individuals will start meeting.

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Paul Stoddard, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs – Jimmie Manning, Chair – no report
- C. Economic Status of the Profession – no report
- D. Rules, Governance and Elections – no report
- E. Resources, Space and Budget – Laura Beamer, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- A. [Student Support and Services](#) – Virginia Naples

G. Long: Then under new business -- whoops -- excuse me. Sorry about that. All right. Comments and questions from the floor. I do have something from Virginia Naples, to talk about student services. I also have a handout for that if you like.

V. Naples: Wonderful. Yes. I'm a new member on the Presidential Commission On the Status of Women. We had our first meeting a couple weeks ago; and I really enjoyed the first meeting I attended. But one of the things that I particularly liked was I learned of the availability of the statement that people are free to use, to add to their syllabi or put on Blackboard as an announcement, or something of that nature, about the services that are available to students: Mental health services, services for people with disabilities, and all of those kinds of problems that students face. This statement you are free to edit as is appropriate for your course or for your students. But it is emphasizing that these are opportunities that students can avail themselves of to address difficult issues they're facing in their academic careers and in their lives while they're here at the university. I took that statement and made a few modifications to it and added it to my website for my class the same day I learned about it. And I would very much like to encourage everyone else to do the same and to pass this on to other faculty who are teaching courses this semester. Thank you.

G. Long: Thank you very much. Appreciate that. Okay. At this point -- yes?

J. Stephen: Virginia, could you email us all a copy of this in soft form so we don't have to type it?

G. Long: We can distribute it. And this will also be in the minutes too.

J. Stephen: Great.

G. Long: Anyone else have anything for Virginia on this one?

V. Naples: No, I don't have anything else to add to this.

G. Long: Anyone have any questions? Okay. Then that would take us down to No. VI, comments and questions from the floor. Presented a lot of information today. Would like to -- and trying to recognize and respect your time, would like to open it for any particular comments.

I do want us next month to hopefully get into the smaller group work, but I don't want to make you do that at 4:25 in the afternoon. But I do think we have talked about a number of issues today: Appropriate use, program prioritization, budget issues. I would like to at least provide a few minutes here at the end for any comments, questions, discussion. I'm opening it to the floor. If any of you have any -- yes?

M. Haji-Sheikh: I have a question. I was asked this by a person who had been an administrator and was under investigation, was also asked to be put -- the administration and the board put him on leave of absence. What's the policy for all of administrators and faculty including in -- not excluding the chief executive of the school for both criminal and ethics investigations, as far as leave of absence?

G. Long: I have one answer -- Sara, do you have anything that could --

S. Klaper: Sara Klaper, University ombudsperson. What specifically are you looking for? What information?

M. Haji-Sheikh: A policy university-wide for people who are under investigation for either ethics or criminal investigation?

S. Klaper: As to how they're handled and get paid and all of that?

M. Haji-Sheikh: And whether they go on leave of absence or not?

S. Klaper: In any current handbook that is currently online and available through human resources, I don't believe that there is anything written. But I will look into it and get back to you. But the general practice, though, is that if somebody is -- if an investigation of any type, whether it's Title IX, sexual harassment or assault, an ethics investigation or anything else, the decision-makers would be the -- whatever vice president or associate vice president, human resources, the general counsel, the provost, and whoever -- if it's an academic unit, the dean or whoever is over that academic unit would get together and determine the seriousness of the investigation and whether it's something that requires an immediate response, like if somebody's in danger, then they want to

remove the person. Or somebody's accused of doing something that's really horrible, administratively -- embezzling money, whatever -- we've got a lot here to embezzle -- levity. So it then -- they would remove the person immediately. But my understanding is that while the person is on administrative leave pending the investigation, that person would be on paid administrative leave. It is after -- if there's a determination that the person violated the law, and then what the sanction is, or violated a university policy -- and depending what the sanction is -- then that person could be terminated, depending on how serious it is.

M. Haji-Sheikh: What if it is -- it's not a faculty or staff but say a vice president or president?

S. Klaper: Same thing.

G. Long: I have looked into this as well, and the feedback I've got is there is not a uniform policy, that they do look at that on a case-by-case basis, depending on the severity of the potential crime and the potential impact. So there's -- there are a number of variables; it's not a one-size-fits-all approach.

M. Haji-Sheikh: What if it's the guy at top, who is going to make that decision to stand up?

S. Klaper: The Board of Trustees.

G. Long: Some level that's where we also come into play. I've talked to so many of you, and the one thing I hear consistently is want to have a voice. When there comes a point you want to have a voice, you want us to say something, I'm your representative, and I'm happy to share things forward or otherwise figure out with your help how to -- how to talk about these things and how to get feedback or how to provide input. So...

S. Klaper: Just very quickly, to clarify. All administrators are SPS. So they might also have a faculty appointment. But they are SPS in their administrative capacity. So SPS staff member can be terminated immediately for cause. You know, violating the law. But -- or an NIU, serious NIU policy. Otherwise that person, especially if they've been here for three years or more, has to be given one year's notice before they can be let go. It's basically your contract is not being renewed, and we're giving you a year's notice to find something else. Now, that has happened at NIU where administrators have been given that one-year notice and -- but then said don't return to NIU. And we paid them to be somewhere else until they found another position, and then we stop paying them. But that's happened in the past. Does that make sense?

M. Haji-Sheikh: I was more curious about the uniformity of the application of such things. Because I know people who were at different levels accused of different things, from minor to greater. And there appears to be no -- it seems to be more related to how much power you have and less about how much what the issue was. And that's why I asked the question: Was there uniform standard. Because I was asked that.

G. Long: And I --

S. Klaper: No, I will look into it more and then get back to Greg to get to all the rest of you.

G. Long: Fine. Other questions or comments from things we have talked about today? You're a lot more talkative when we're in small groups. That's a good thing to note.

G. Long: Anything else?

B. Program Prioritization Academic Task Force leadership

C. Discussion of faculty concerns raised during the September 2 meeting

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. [Alternate Policy](#) – Pages 13-14

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

V. Naples: Move to adjourn?

J. Stephen: Second.

G. Long: Virginia and Steve. Okay. Any opposition to move to adjourn? All right. Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.