FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, November 18, 2015, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Azad, Beamer, Briscoe (for Mooney), Carlson, Cefaratti, Shakraborty, Chung, Conderman, Downing, Dugas, Feurer, Gilson, Glatz, Grund, Haji-Sheikh (for Demir), Hathaway, Hou, Hunt, Hurn (for Baker), Irwin, Jaekel, Jaffee, Kidder, Konen, Lichtman (for Than), Lonergan, Long, Macdonald, May, Millis, Moremen, Naples, Novak, Patro, Riley, Ryu, Saborio, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stephen, Stoddard, Un

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Arriola, Baker, Bishop, Brubaker, Bujarski, Campbell, Chen, Demir, Deng, Farrell, Giese, Hanley, Hedin, Khoury, Kim, Lee, Manning, Mogren, Mooney, Moraga, Penrod, Pitney, Rodgers, Rosenbaum, Scherer, Shin, Than, Thu, Xie

OTHERS PRESENT: Adeboje, Bryan, Douglass, Falkoff, Freedman, Haliczer, Kearsing, Klapper, Parker, Streb

OTHERS ABSENT: Armstrong, Doederlein, Gebo, Levin, Nicholson, Shortridge, VandeCreek

I.   CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon. Thank you for coming today. I'd like to welcome you to our meeting and call our meeting to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:04 p.m.

II.   ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: Our first order of business is adoption of the agenda. There are no walk-in items today so I need a motion to accept the agenda. Anyone? Therese Arado. George Slotsve second. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

P. Stoddard: I have a brief oral report from Rights and Responsibilities.

G. Long: I assume we can amend that to the agenda. Thank you. All right. So we have an agenda.

III.   APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 28, 2015 FS MEETING

G. Long: Approval of the minutes of the October 28 meeting. Need a motion to accept.

T. Arado: So moved.

D. Macdonald: Second.

G. Long: Corrections, changes, typos, anything? All right. All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay. We've got them approved.

IV.   PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: Moving on to President's Announcements. I will keep my comments brief. We have a fairly full meeting today and oftentimes I say a few words about shared governance. We will hit that later in the meeting when we talk about new business. I would mention that there are three items as follow-up from prior meetings.

First – would you pull up the safety Web page – I sent you out a follow-up after our meeting with regard to some safety issues and articles and so forth. I was also informed and hate to admit that I did not realize this, NIU also has a safety page. I want to bring it to your attention as a resource for you. It's there. We will also, as I mentioned, have chief Phillips coming to our meeting in January. I would ask that, if any of you have specific questions, please do let me know ahead of time so he could be as prepared as possible for coming to talk to us. I know he's interested and excited to come and answer any questions. As you have anything, please let me know.

Second, last time we talked about -- there were concerns about budget. I did send out an email to all of you with regard to the budget. There apparently was a little miscommunication or misunderstanding. So I did want to reiterate that from CFO, Al Phillip, the basic belief is that NIU will certainly be staying open through the spring semester. We will not be closing in the spring semester. That's not a concern. So if you talk to any of your colleagues or hear any of your colleagues say we're going to close in the spring, please correct them and please don't let that be something that we continue with students. That hurts us from all sorts of different angles. So that was the reason it was sent out. If there was miscommunication there, I apologize for any role I played in that. But please do know that for every indication we have thus far, the university will remain open through the academic year.

And finally, during our very first meeting and then our third meeting of the semester, we spent a fair amount of time discussing various concerns. At our last meeting we came up with some categories. I sent those out to you grouped under categories. Haven't received any feedback on that. I'm assuming you're generally okay with is it and as such I'm going to forward that and share that with Provost Freeman and President Baker so they know what some of our concerns are. That's it for my President's Announcements.

A.   Student Athlete Academic Success – Matt Streb, Faculty Athletics Representative

G. Long: I would like to introduce Matt Streb who's our faculty athletic director and he has news for us.

M. Streb: Thanks, Greg. Every year I appear before this body to talk about the success of our student athletes. And I have great news tonight to share with you. Later this evening we are going to have a football game where we will try to continue our quest to win another MAC championship, but I'm proud to say that, for the third straight year in a row, we've won the most important MAC championship – and that is we have the highest graduation rate in the Mid American Conference. Eight of our sports teams had either the highest, or tied for the highest, graduation rate among their respective sports, including our volleyball program that over the weekend just won a regular season MAC championship; they had 100 percent graduation rate. Our football program had the highest graduation rate in the Mid American Conference by over 12 percent compared to the second place person. There are roughly 125 football bowl subdivision universities in the country. We have the 11th highest graduation rate in our football program. The only institution in the state of Illinois that has a higher graduation rate is Northwestern University. So that means that place down in Urbana/Champaign is not graduating their student athletes the same level that we are. The NCAA uses what's called the GSR, graduate success rate which doesn't allow for apples-to-apples comparison of the student body as a whole. But if you look at our FGR, that does. And I can tell you that our student athletes graduate at a 21 percent rate higher than our student body as a whole. All in all, I think these are very positive numbers. I'm very proud of the work our student athletes are putting into the classroom and very proud of the commitment that our athletic program has to making sure we're not only succeeding on the field but in the classroom as well.

G. Long: Nice to see the scholar athlete concept embodied. Anybody have any questions for Matt? For all of you who contribute to the student success, I would say thank you. I'm very pleased to hear that.

V.   ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A.   Program Prioritization Update – Lisa Freeman, Provost

G. Long: All right. As we move on to Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, I would like to turn the floor over to Provost Lisa Freeman and members of the Program Prioritization team to give us an update as well as answer any questions that you might have on the topic. So with that, Provost Freeman.

L. Freeman: Good afternoon everybody and thanks for the invitation to be here. I brought some of the members of the coordinating team with me so that we can give you multiple perspectives from different levels on where we are in the Program Prioritization process. And when we're done with that, if there are questions about other matters, I'm happy to entertain them to the best of my ability. There was a question raised at the last University Council meeting about possibly rescinding the honorary degree awarded to Representative Denny Hastert and I can give an update on that. Before I talk about Program Prioritization I want to echo what Matt Streb said. I was at the University at Buffalo last Wednesday, not only for the football game but on campus there with faculty and alumni looking at some of their facilities and talking about some of their programs. And they were just astonished at the graduation success rates of all of our teams. Matt told you if you look across our football subdivision, we overall 11th. He didn't tell you, if you look at the teams with a winning

record, I think we're 8th. And Stanford is maybe like right -- the only team ahead of us with a winning record or something like that. It's really pretty good.

In terms of Program Prioritization, I probably don't need to tell anybody in this room and I know I don't need to tell anybody who's a program author there are four weeks left. Most of what I'm hearing at this point in time is relatively positive. The panel of individuals from other campuses who have been through similar processes was very well received. And I think Chris may share a little more detail about that. Very well received by our campus and they were very complimentary of the process that has grown and evolved on our campus.

The last round of data workshops were also well received. And most of the questions that we're getting now have moved really from explanation to coaching. So people are looking at the data, interpreting the trends, running draft narrative statements or formats by various people. I know there's a lot of exchange of narratives and coordination going on at the unit level. And the last couple times that someone has pulled me over in the produce section of Jewel-Osco, it's been to say that they've looked at their data and thought about the narrative and they've actually discovered something about their program that they didn't know and in many cases something very positive. So overall I guess what I would say is I think most people are pretty busy right now working on their narratives and becoming data informed and trying to frame that into a compelling story about their program. I'm going to turn the microphone over to first Carolinda and then John so they can give you a little more detail.

C. Douglass: Thank you for having us today. We are really here to answer questions. But in this few opening remarks, a couple things I'd like to mention: It's actually a little less than four weeks. The narratives are due on December 11. I know people are very hard at work on those right now. People have been working on this Program Prioritization for over a year at various states. The coordinating team has been together for about a year. The data support team has been together for many months. We'll hear a little bit about the data support team from John in a moment. Some of the things that came out of the external panel that was here earlier this year is people -- liked having the panel here, very positive responses to the panel. But they said we need rubrics. I wanted to point out we have both academic and administrative rubrics on our website there. Pat's got the website pulled up so if you have other questions we can point you in the right direction for those as well. That's something we did respond to rather quickly. And also that they asked for people asked for coming out of the external panels, hands-on workshops. John may say a little more about this. There were four open houses well attended where people could get direct answers to their questions regarding data. I think I'll turn it over to John and let him talk a little bit about some of the DST issue, data support team issues. We're here to answer questions.

J. Kearsing: If you can click on that FAQ link on the – my upper right as I look at that. If you click on the author questions, red hyperlink, it's on the bottom of the ordered list there. These are 27, at least 27 last I counted, questions that came out of those four data workshops we had. About 90 authors attend over those two weeks and asked a lot of really insightful good questions, it wasn't always about the data. Sometimes it was about how to even get started. And you know, what we meant by certain things we were asking. And we saw a lot of light bulbs go off. If you spend -- if you're in that same situation having difficulty getting started or making it over the midpoint, you might want to check this out for some possible insight to help you along.

4

So if you missed one of those workshops, there -- we're still open for business. So if you have questions specific to your program, if you think that you and some colleagues have -- would like a workshop-style session, we can make house calls. We prefer to do it to many people at the same time just for efficiency purposes because actually a lot of people on our data support team have to write their own narrations and they postponed those for a little while.

But we get -- we've been open for about two months. Had about 200 calls and well over 90 percent of those are closed and resolved. So if you need or would like more assistance, please call our help desk at 753-8100 or email the help desk and we can help you out. Should we open this up for questions or give it to Chris?

C. Parker: So I'll just make a couple comments about the panel that sessions that we had a month or so ago. Folks in general, we got a lot of feedback from participants and folks in general saw a lot of value in having those folks here. A number of different observations came through pretty clearly. One way -- one overriding message was there's no one way to do Program Prioritization. Everybody that we invited approached it differently with different goals in mind and we're certainly no exception to that. And folks here -- folks that we invited here were complimentary about the process that we established. The amount of support that we're providing for folks on campus for narrative writers and the like through the workshops we've done, the frequently asked questions, the writing tips, and the like. So that's been really helpful or really good to see. They were also very complimentary about the transparency of the process that we've established here, all of which I think speaks really well to the culture that's ongoing at NIU. So...

J. Kearing: Questions? So we'll take any questions if you have them.

V. Naples: I have a question.

L. Freeman: Can you stand up so we can see you? Sorry, the projector is...

V. Naples: I'm used to being height challenged. I have been short all my life. I'm used to it so I forget that it's a problem. One of the things that I am very concerned about and some of this arises from the fact that I attended a national selection -- international meeting a couple of weeks ago and a large number of people whose institutions were also contemplating or undergoing the prioritization process or whatever flavor they were doing, were very concerned about what was going to be the impact on the numbers of -- and categories of tenure track and tenured faculty. I'm wondering if there's anything you can do to address that.

J. Kearsing: Pass this...

L. Freeman: Well, as you know, we have guaranteed that all contracts will be honored and that nobody will lose their job directly as a result of Program Prioritization. And, in fact, I think a campus-wide discussion about the percentage of faculty that are tenure line versus contingent is something that is long overdue on this campus, and that we should plan to have that discussion independent of Program Prioritization, probably starting this spring. So the results of that discussion can actually be merged with Program Prioritization.

Program Prioritization is really about the reallocation of resources, the attraction of new resources. And so as decisions are made regarding the refill of vacancies, the Program Prioritization results will definitely be used to influence those decisions. The exact process for linking the work product of the task forces to vacancy refill, to our five-year budget, FY17 and going forward, to our philanthropic topics, to our investment in communities of excellence or research concentrations, haven't completely been worked out. And part of that is because, as you know, and as Greg alluded to, it's challenging to talk about FY17 and five years beyond when we haven't got a FY 16 appropriation yet. But we will be having a lot of dialogue and time to think about how those things are linked. But I would say unequivocally, Program Prioritization is not an assault on the number of tenure line faculties. There is no secret plan implicit in Program Prioritization to increase the percentage of contingent faculty. I think the kinds of decisions that are made about when to fill positions on a permanent versus a temporary basis will, in some way, be alleviated by Program Prioritization because we'll have a better sense of where we want to go. And so we'll be able to make better decisions influenced by that knowledge.

J. Stephen: Just direct the -- address the idea of proportion -- tenured faculty versus contingent. There are no plans to increase the contingent faculty. What did Program Prioritization come up with as any change in the role of contingent faculty? Did you look at increasing, decreasing, or expanding their role in the future?

L. Freeman: I don't think the question you're posing about the role of contingent faculty is directly linked to the Program Prioritization.

J. Stephen: I disagree.

L. Freeman: I would say if you can let me finish my sentence, I would say I'm happy to hear your disagreement, but I think the specific role of contingent faculty on our campus is more directly linked to the collective bargaining agreement.

J. Stephen: That is true, but I think contingent faculty affect the experience here by not providing a continuity that's available with tenured faculty. That's the point of my disagreement.

L. Freeman: I –

J. Stephen: History and community.

L. Freeman: So tell me how your opinion that you just articulated about the presence and proportion of contingent faculty on campus and I will repeat it for anybody who didn't hear it. What was
said that the proportion of contingent faculty affects the experience and the campus environment because of lack much continuity, is that a fair –

J. Stephen: And history.

L. Freeman: And history. Tell me how Program Prioritization and that observation directly linked to the number of contingent faculty or the proportion? Because I'm -- I think I'm just not seeing it.

J. Stephen: I'm suggesting that an increased role for contingent faculty will affect the interaction with students in the sense that they are not familiar with the culture and the history and they cannot fulfill other roles other than direct instruction. And in general we do it for lower level courses anyway. But.

L. Freeman: If you make that point in your Program Prioritization narrative and you make a compelling argument, then you could say that Program Prioritization would be used to decrease the proportion of the contingent faculty on campus.

J. Stephen: Not necessarily.

L. Freeman: But it doesn't necessarily increase either.

J. Stephen: No.

L. Freeman: I thought that was what you suggested initially. Maybe I misunderstood.

J. Stephen: I'm wondering if you're considering expanding their roles in particular in departments that have small faculties to fill upper level courses so we can offer the catalog.

L. Freeman: So I don't actually make all of the decisions about what courses are offered or how they're staffed. That's certainly a primarily a faculty responsibility and then a departmental and college responsibility. If someone said that by being very rigid about position refill and requiring more temporary refills during these hard budget times we were creating a situation where we increased reliance on contingent faculty during this very stressful and ambiguous period, I probably wouldn't argue with that. But Program Prioritization will provide a better road map for our permanent hiring. And some fiscal clarity from the state of Illinois, God willing, in the next calendar year will also allow us to be more planful. I think Vice President Phillips has said this a number of times and I want to echo that. We will get through this academic year. But part of us getting through it is requiring us to be very, very lean about pizza and water and about swag and about holding off on some permanent hiring. And we don't feel great about that, but we would feel worse if the university couldn't continue to fill its mission and we couldn't continue to employ all the wonderful people who work here.

J. Stephen: Thank you.

K. Lichtman: Foreign languages. One of the things we talked about last week was how low faculty morale is this year at NIU. And Program Prioritization, combined with budgetary uncertainty, certainly is a big part of what's lowering morale. I was curious to what degree that's being considered by the people who are in charge of Program Prioritization.

L. Freeman: I think everybody is aware of morale concerns across all of our employment categories, certainly faculty, certainly staff. I think the biggest, one of the biggest, drivers of low morale
is not being able to have a raise in a long time. And I think Program Prioritization will allow us an opportunity to look at where resources need to go, where resources can be recovered, and how resources can be potentially targeted to an increase in compensation. And that will actually help morale in the long run. I think in terms of, you know, if we could add hours to the day and give everybody more time, that would probably increase morale. I think we're starting to see the results of some positives coming, morale changes coming, out of some of the recognition programs that have been introduced on campus. I think people getting thank yous, getting rewards, it's all helpful. And although this is a really hard time, it's a very uncertain time, there's a lot of change and there are a lot of things that we don't have control over and that favors challenges in morale. I think we're also seeing people starting to appreciate how much of their own happiness they can own. And looking at some of the really good things that are going on in this campus in terms of the excellence of the faculty and the students. And trying to go forward. So yes, we wish that Program Prioritization wasn't increasing people's workload and wasn't having an oppressive effect on morale in times when things are uncertain. I would argue that we couldn't have waited to do it for a better time, because there won't be a better time. And if we had done this five years ago, these challenging times would perhaps have been easier to deal with.

C. Douglass: In terms of how aware people are in the Program Prioritization process, I think acutely aware. And also I think we have to be mindful of the fact that the people that are most closely involved in the ranking of this are, in fact, your peers and colleagues. And, in fact, there's people in the room who are part of the coordinating team and part of the task force. Could I get you to raise your hands for a moment if you're part of a task force or coordinating team; there's people in this room here. And I think they're very, very well aware of that. And we're hopeful that some of the planning that goes on from Program Prioritization and some of this multi-year budgeting will help get us out of some of the issues that we've had in the past and hopefully raise morale.

L. Freeman: Two other things I want to add about how we're trying to be sensitive to morale. The first is I think that when people have asked for support, we've tried very hard to provide that support. And to provide it quickly. And I'm proud of the fact that our data support team has handled the number of requests they have, the number of individual coaching sessions they've done. And I think that's at least helps quell anxiety if not directly improve morale. And I wasn't really kidding about what people are saying to me in Jewel. I think there are people who now that they're into narrative writing are seeing some, feeling some, real pride in their programs because of the data that have revealed trends they weren't aware of that are positive trends. I think some of the people who are submitting new programs are actually feeling invigorated by the opportunity to put forward an innovative idea that might actually have some funding. So...

M. Haji-Sheikh: One of the things I don't understand about prioritization: I think the administration should be testing it on themselves first. First reason I say is because the provost's office has increased in budget by $2 million over the last few years. Now, are you guys going to prioritize out those $2 million or are those critical things that you have gone through your prioritization on? This is the type of thing that bothers me when I see the administration increase their own internal budget and then attack – then say we have to prioritize because we need a handle on our budget. I'm sorry, I

used to work in industry, and I've seen this stuff before. And it's always the guys who are on the, on the ground floor that have to do the hard work so that the administration keeps a clean budget on their own end. And so I want to know what are you going to do first?

L. Freeman: Let me address the elements of your question. And, in fact, I would be delighted and thrilled to come back to Faculty Senate and go through a two-, three-, four-, five-year history of the budget in the Division of Academic Affairs and the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost and show you what's grown and what's shrunk. When you look at administrative payroll in our office, I can tell you that, since I've been provost, I eliminated a number of positions and I added back one. I eliminated deputy provost and two special projects vice provosts, another part-time special project vice provost, which was about $300,000 in salary. And I added back a chief diversity officer. And I think in wake of recent events people would think that was not a particularly bad decision to make.

In terms of looking at the overall provost budget, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, you can't really look at what's available publicly and make an apples-to-apples comparison because the things that have reported into the provost's office have been very dynamic over the last couple of years. International Affairs was there. And then it wasn't. And then it was back. Human Resources now reports to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, Human Resources contains a fair amount of payroll and funding so that has gone in more recently. Other things have gone out of the office. And so I think that we are not trying to hide anything. There are some things that moved centrally from out of the units, actually at the request the faculty. This would have been before I was the Executive Vice President and Provost. But some of the sort of the centralized services that support students, those things were actually put into the Division of Academic Affairs, as I understand it, in direct response to faculty requests that they be unburdened administratively and there be somebody centrally who did that kind of paperwork for accreditation, etc., on a more frequent basis to help the campus.

In terms of Program Prioritization, we are participating in Program Prioritization like everybody else. And probably we're a little disadvantaged because none, like John said, none of us are as far along with our own narratives as we would like. But if the administrative task force said we should get rid of functions in the Executive Vice President and Provost's Office, we would heed those recommendations. And if they were not heeded because of something like compliance, you know, if you said we needed to get rid of the Title IX coordinator, we wouldn't be able to do that by law. But if that was what was recommended and we chose not to do that, we will be transparent about why we're not the following the task force decision. So I'm sympathetic to a faculty viewpoint that looks at the administration and just sees bloat. But I'm also willing to be very honest and to go through line-by-line what expenses are up and what expenses are down and what compliance mandates we are are dealing with that weren't there before and what services we're doing to help you. And if you say they were not worthwhile we would get rid of them.

M. Haji-Sheikh: The Rinance and Facilities report that is on their website is incorrect?

L. Freeman: What I'm saying is the line item categories do not always contain the same things rolled up into the same lines. Because we've gone through different -- so we don't have a Division of Finance and Facilities anymore. But for a long time we did. And then for a while we had

Operations and Community Relations. But no longer do we have. So when you're comparing across multiple years and you're looking at divisions with like sounding names, they don't always contain the same components. That's --

M. Haji-Sheikh: The last five years show continuous increase.

L. Freeman: I'm happy to come back here and have this argument with data. I am transparent and believe in being data informed and I respect the Faculty Senate but to keep saying yes or no, black and white, the sky is blue, the sky is gray is not a good use of anybody's time.

J. Stephen: I do have one question. And it's -- I got two, but one is kind of cynical. You said you reduced certain positions that saved $300,000 in salary. Did those people actually move on to other universities or did they move over to the Finance and Facilities, or some other position here?

L. Freeman: Most of them were retirees who were working less than 100 percent of the time. And the one who was not, retired.

J. Stephen: Okay. And one of the things that causes the hostility and morale problems is those of us who have watched budget lines see salaries increasing over there, and people being recategorized and making more of a salary and we don't get one. And I think we all sort of have the notion that if we're going to take a corporate model, we're the assets. And if there's an X percent raise across the academic administration, it should be the same across our range. Now I know that is not your call. That's just my opinion. And I'm not asking for an answer. That's an opinion. About morale and raises.

L. Freeman: Well, I was going to say is that I agree with you regarding the value of the faculty to the institution. The institution is defined by the quality of its faculty.

G. Long: I would actually like to take you up on your offer that in the spring semester, perhaps do come back with resources so we can have more of a detailed discussion of the budget. I know it's hard to do it now, and that was not the major focus of this meeting. But to be able to provide the specifics I think would be certainly helpful.

L Freeman: I would welcome that opportunity. I would ask, just as I brought colleagues with me today, it would be helpful probably to have not only Vice President Phillips but to have Vice Provost Mini, because Al and I have not been in position as long. And so to really have a long view back even five years requires a little more institutional knowledge than two of us might bring and it might be the best use of everybody's time to include Sue, as well.

G. Long: That would be great. Thanks. Are there other questions for provost?

R. Feurer: I have three. One is in respect to Buck Stephen's comment about making a case for faculty and the necessity of faculty, where does that go? Because my understanding, or from what I've looked at, which is very minimal, you have 140 words. Are you saying we have to in 140 words make that? Second question: I was privy to an email that, sort of from inside the administration, that indicated that the prioritization will be implemented in March. Is that just bad information? And

number 3, I think the thing that, is more a comment, it is not that we don't know that there's a parallel program for administration, a rubric for thinking about the administration versus faculty, it's just the sense that faculty is withering and there isn't a commitment to increasing that ratio. I think that's the issue, is that, when this gets implemented, how do we have a voice in considering administration versus faculty to ensure that we don't continue the hollowing out of the university?

C. Douglasss: I'll take the first two. The number of words that are allowed in an academic program is 500 per criteria. There's eight criteria, so that's 4,000 words, 125 for program summary, over 4,000 words available. If you're thinking of just the criterion related to faculty, there's 500 words available there.

R. Feurer: All right. That's still the challenge.

C. Douglass: And then in terms of the date, we're actually looking at the results coming out in May of 2016 from the task forces and then it would inform a five-year budget. Obviously there would be some small changes, probably in fiscal year '17 and then larger changes for the following four years after that. Did you want to say anything else related to the website?

J. Kearsing: No. That information that you spoke of is up there somewhere.

C. Douglass: The information is on the website. We think it's under Training, but it's 4125 words.

L. Freeman: I guess I would add I'm not sure where the confusion regarding March came from. But if there was an anonymized version of an email or direct quote from the email you wanted to share with us off line to help figure out where the misinformation or misunderstanding occurred, we'd be open to that.

B. Jaffee: I think I'm the source of Rosemary's confusion about word counts. Each criterion has several subpoints. And say it's an average of five. You get 500 words across five subsections. So it ends up being around, I mean I'm writing it right now and I'm very aware of word counts, it's about 100 or so words. In some cases there's preloaded data that is not tailored exactly to the program you're discussing. And so you first have to discount the data and then pivot. I'm actually quoting one of those frequently asked questions, right? Talk about why the table isn't relevant to your program and then pivot to your narrative. Those frequently asked questions are great, by the way. But it uses up, it eats up those words pretty quickly.

C. Douglass: So two things.

B. Jaffee: Some of the arguments we can make.

C. Douglass: Two things I want to say and then I'll turn it over to John because he has more to say. One is that the 500 words, there's five questions, about 100 words a question. But you can divide them up however you want. And if a question does not apply, we have also said you can say not applicable or even to save words, N/A. And then move on to another question. And then as far as the data go, I think you've got it exactly right. There are some institutional data that are challenging. We know that, that's why we had the open houses. And we'll be sharing that as well and have shared

11

that already with the task forces, they know what some of those challenges are. We are asking you to upload some of your own data to talk about maybe how things have changed. As the provost was saying earlier about how different the provost's office looks now and the reporting to the provost's office, executive vice president looks now, we know your units have changed a lot too. And the data captured at a specific point in time may not reflect accurately what's happening now. So you do need the continuity or the transition between what's happened before and what's happened now. You can load table, you can load images.

J.Kearsing: Well, there are a few little tricks to save words. You can use bullet points. Dashes, slashes, underscores, string words together. If you're repetitively refering to your department, you might want to use a dash or slash or a table name so you're not consuming words unnecessarily.

C. Douglass: The task forces have actually indicated that bullets would be very helpful for them in terms of reading. And other thing I just got asked earlier this week is: Can I abbreviate, you know, so Office of whatever. Can I just call that by four letter acronym later? Of course. I mean, you don't want to keep spelling things out. People, the same individuals would be reading them over and over again they'll know what you're talking about.

B. Jaffee: On paper, unlike in person, I'm very concise. So, I'm not concerned about saving words. The issue is how many types of arguments can we make in such limited space? The question that Buck raised is what inspired that concern. There's a limited number of arguments you can make in those small sections.

C. Douglass: There is.

B. Jaffee: Prioritizing them.

C. Douglass: Right, there is. And you can put your best arguments in there. You want the quality of the narrative to best reflect your programs and the task forces are going to be looking at all of these and they need it to – it's equitable, everybody has the same number of words, etc. But we also want the task forces to be able to do this in a rigorous and also feasible way. So again, we have to limit it. I will say from the panel of experts that came to our campus, we've limited it less than many other campuses have. There was a third part to your question. Would you mind repeating that?

R. Feurer: The hollowing out of the university.

L. Freeman: I mean, you said it was a statement more than a question. And I'm willing to accept that.

R. Feurer: In other words, there's nothing new there.

L. Freeman: I can say what I've already said today and that is that I think our faculty are very important. I think we need to have a campus-wide discussion about the right fraction of tenure line and contingent faculty. And I think as resources become available, and some of that will be from increasing enrollment and I'm very proud of what a number of units, faculty, staff, others are doing

to work on our enrollment. Because when we have more students, we have more resources. And it's easier to fill faculty positions with tenure line faculty.

R. Feurer: Could I respond to that? I think, you know, I understand and what's happened over the years is that people just aren't replaced when they're retired or they leave. And that's the issue is that if this facilitates that, and we also know historically what austerity does is give the opportunity to make these kinds of changes. And we're in that phase right now. It's very troubling I think to faculty when they see in the midst of austerity a prioritization program being discussed. Because we know that management uses that as an opportunity, historically, to really reduce faculty. And so I think we would like to just hear from the administration an absolute commitment to increasing faculty ratio.

L. Freeman: I think that in six months actions will speak louder than words. There's nothing I'm going to say today that will make some of you believe me. So, I'll say stay tuned and, hopefully, we will act in a way that will give you confidence in this administration.

G. Long: We also have -- in the back of the room?

T. Pavkov: Tom Pavkov, FCNS. I know for some of us the data has been challenging but I want to say a thank you to Jeff Reynolds and his group for being very accessible and being very responsive to any questions we've had. I think I can speak for certainly my area and also the college. As it relates to that.

J. Kearsing: I will pass that on to Jeff. He's been busy today. I've seen at least 20 emails going back and forth between his office and program authors. I'll pass that on to him. Thanks, Tom.

B. May: Brian May, Department of English. I've been struck by the emphasis of the process, the prioritization process as it is planned, on what Steven Mayu, the literary critic, calls rhetorical power. Anybody else is struck by that? Is it the case that you are your narrative? We say that -- we say that to our dissertation advisees, you are your dissertation. Your you are your narrative. In other words, is there any measured plan to ensure that a worthier program written about less cogently, less ably, narrated or represented less well will not suffer unduly? Is there, or indeed priority to be given to those departments which best rise to the rhetorical occasion?

C. Douglass: I just want to say this is certainly something that we've talked about at great length. We understand that a narrative that's well written might be viewed as a better program than a narrative that's not well written. Obviously it's in everybody's interest to write their narratives clearly and concisely and explicitly. However, we've also been told by individuals who have done this process in the past that they can see through a narrative that's well written when there actually is a program that doesn't have great substance. So we are trusting the colleagues that we put on the task forces to take that into consideration as they review. I'm not going to ask them to speak, but both Matt Streb on the administrative task force and George Slotsve who co-chairs on the academic task force, I think, are also well aware of these issues and they'll be talking at a later point about some of the ways in which they are scoring and utilizing data at that and utilizing words as well.

B. May: Could I ask, do you have a measure in place, a process in place to ensure a fair process of seeing through the document so that every document is seen threw as clearly as every other document?

C. Douglass: Before Provost Freeman takes the mic, I just want to say that's still very much in process. We have the academic and administrative rubrics that are up there. But both the task forces are very hard at work at the moment. They just met last week again, I think the administrative ones meeting this Friday as well, t really think through these issues. So I don't have an answer for you to tell To tell you exactly how that will be done. All we can tell you is what has been disclosed thus far, which are the academic administrative rubrics. I don't know if you want to press on that, Pat, for us. But that is the academic rubric that's going to be used. And then the link above that was the administrative one.

And then the other thing, John just mentioned, is the task forces are going through a norming process that they'll be going through. The administrative ones going through it on December 15, and the academic one is going through it on December 16. And after they've done all of that, we do want to encourage the co-chairs to come and speak to you more about the process. We want it to be a transparent process. But we don't want – it's their process. They own it and we don't want to rush them in terms of making some choices when they're really still thinking that through within their own groups.

L. Freeman: The only thing I wanted to add to what Carolinda and John have said about the task force process, the training, what they are thinking about is: Even before the narratives are submitted permanently, in addition to the primary author, there's an opportunity for secondary authors to look at it. And then there's an approver. And so I know that within all of the units that I'm familiar with, there's a dialogue going on right now among the authors and at the author approver letter. And things are being sent back or suggestions are being made to improve the narrative, to improve the use of words, to change the interpretations. So, I think that those steps will also help the quality and the consistency of the narratives that go in.

G. Long: Let's do two more question, Karen and Mitch?

K. Lichtman: Is there any sort of guidelines for how departments are supposed to be communicating the Program Prioritizations goings on within them? For instance, I don't think this is happening but suppose my department proposes to cut my program, I'd have no way of knowing that. So to what degree are the faculty within departments actually in touch with what is being submitted?

C. Douglass: So chairs of academic departments were listed as authors, and they have the opportunity to add additional authors. And many did. They added program coordinators, for example, is a very common one. They were also encouraged, and we continue to encourage them, to discuss program narratives with a faculty. So I guess it's a local decision, basically. And we've not instructed anybody to do it in a particular way. It's a local decision. I think if there's concerns about that, that's probably a discussion that we should have. But at this point, basically we let people handle it the way they wanted to handle it knowing that there was at least one author and one approver for each and every program.

14

K. Lichtman: I guess if there's one author and one approver per department that almost by definition those people don't teach in or aren't involved in all the programs that they might be writing about.

J. Kearsing: One author per program.

G. Long: Would you say that again please in the mic?

J. Kearsing: It's one author per program. So there's multiple authors per department. So that same author could be the same person.

C. Douglass: The sharing --

J. Kearsing: A lot of times the chairs asked for additional authors. There's 380 authors right now across 476 programs, administrative and academic included. So close to 400 authors.

K. Lichtman: Last part, we did talk about contingent faculty and I would assume that none of the authors are contingent faculty. So, supposing our Chinese program, I believe, is not a tenured track faculty member so that person could not be an author.

C. Douglass: No, they could be an author.

J. Kearsing: Do you know who your author is?

K. Lichtman: No.

J. Kearsing: If you

K. Lichtman: I have some ideas.

J. Kearsing: If you're curious, if you go to that programs link in the middle, in the bottom one, program assignments, and anybody with NIU can sign into this. If you want to go ahead and sign in.

K. Lichtman: My point is that that should be communicated to all the faculty because there certainly are among however many hundreds of faculty we have some people who have no idea what's going on.

C. Douglass: How would you suggest that this be communicated?

K. Lichtman: All campus email.

J. Kearsing: Select all programs. Anybody has access to this. If you want to type in your program name, and see who's your author, you might want to, that might be a good start to know who to talk to.

C. Douglass: This is what you'd like communicated in all campus email?

K. Lichtman: Yeah. I think that should be sent to all faculty because there's got to be people that aren't informed.

C. Douglass: I think we can do that.

G. Long: Thank you. Mitch?

M. Irwin: Anthropology. A different aspect of some of the questions people were asking earlier: The division of the programs into academic and administrative, of course, makes sense, you need different criteria. But the only quantitative aspects of the strategy that I'm seeing are within the two pools. They're going to have a barrel of academic and a barrel of administrative and they're being forced into quintiles, presumably 20 percent of the apples in each barrel are rotten and they're going to have to be thrown away or resources are going to be reduced, maybe. But what if the bigger picture is that one barrel is bigger than it should be and the other is smaller than it should be? Is there a quantitative structure in place? Do you have a plan for the comparing across? They're very different task forces, different people.

L. Freeman: I think that's why we've been very clear from the beginning that what comes out will be used to inform the budget process on the campus. And that means that there'll be information sought not only from a student panel, because students weren't on the task forces, but from the shared governance groups, the Faculty Senate, the University Council, Council of Deans, the cabinet. And ultimately discussions and decisions about how to link those to the budget, to our philanthropic strategy, to our research and investment strategy will happen with input from various people and at the cabinet level where people are experts within all of those things. And some of what will be suggested is this is an essential administrative program that is run horribly inefficiently. It needs to be run more efficiently. And that will allow a decision to be made about how to do that. That might allow resources to be used elsewhere. Obviously there's going to have to be cross talk and it's going to be qualitative as well as quantitative. It's going to have to be.

M. Irwin: That was a great answer and I think that yeah it would go a long way to assuage people's fears that that final step would only be the cabinet and you wouldn't have input from the rest of us. I think that would be a fear that a lot of people would worry about.

L. Freeman: I think we've said consistently that we have the intention of seeking feedback from all those groups. It's probably up there in the presentations. But reiterating it at this point in time cannot hurt. You can't overcommunicate. And I appreciate you sharing that.

G. Long: All right. Buck caught my eye for one last question and if you would address the Hastert issue.

J. Stephen: Turn of phrase that I may have misunderstood. You said, "use to inform the budget processes." As far as I know we're not part of the budget process. Do you mean illuminate the decisions coming from your office's budget decisions?

L. Freeman: Going forward from FY17, the university really is committed to going to a multi-year budget process. And we have not yet constructed that process. But we see the outcomes of Program Prioritization as being significant influencers of how the allocations are made and what the benchmarks that are established are. And so right now I believe the Resource, Space and Budget Committee of the university makes recommendations to the administration regarding the budget, and the university administration recommends a budget to the Board of Trustees who are the fiduciary, have the fiduciary responsibility for the university. So I would say that right now there is a mechanism for shared governance to, including Faculty Senate as part of that, to influence the budget. I would say that historically the budget has not been influenced strongly by that committee because the budget process was not as transparent as it could have been. And the budget model was sort of across-the-board base minus. So if there was a cut, the cut was distributed equally. And

J. Stephen: My take away from this is that it's used for recommending bodies to influence a future budget as opposed to illuminate budget decisions you may have to make in the interim period.

L. Freeman: If only we had an FY16 budget so I could make budget decisions in the interim period we could have a vigorous debate about that and I'm happy do come back in the spring but really

J. Stephen: Somewhere over the rainbow.

L. Freeman: Yeah.

G. Long: So for purposes of time certainly I feel confident that provost Freeman and team would be willing to come back and talk to us again. I would like if you would a few moments about the Hastert issue.

L. Freeman: Certainly. So at the last University Council meeting I think some of you may remember, I think it was Eric Mogren who asked what the university's position was going to be on the honorary doctoral degree that was awarded to Denny Hastert in the early '90s. And we had a trustee who was asked about whether or not the university planned to rescind that degree. We've been contacted by a Survivor of priest sexual abuse organization who's asked the university to consider rescinding the degree. And as a result of that, we did some research on what our policies say. And we also looked at the most current situation of a rash of honorary degree decisions made. And that's actually not around Representative Hastert but around Bill Cosby. And we looked at what other universities had done.

And we found, first of all, that NIU does not have a policy regarding rescinding, the rescinding of honorary degrees. And our policy for recommending honorary degrees comes through a subcommittee of the Graduate Council who make the recommendations for honorary degrees to the president and provost, who make those recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

We've looked at what was done by others in the Bill Cosby situation and in other situations, and there's really excellent defense of both viewpoints written. And you can Google this and find it. There's probably the most compelling defense of not rescinding an honorary degree when the

17

actions of an individual, admitted actions of an individual, are inconsistent with a university comes from Tractenberg and from George Washington University. I will not do justice to the quote but it's something like, you know, "Mr. Cosby doesn't need us to rescind his degree to know that we are -- our mission and our values do not align with his admitted actions and degrees are given at a given point in time without hindsight and for that reason, you know, our support for survivors of sexual misconduct and assault are shown in other ways than the rescinding of a degree which would be a trivial action," or something along those lines. Other people say and other universities have been honest in saying: We do not want the brand of our university tarnished by an honorary degree with our name being associated with an individual whose now known actions are so inconsistent with ours.

And so, in the absence of a policy and the presence of compelling action, you k now, arguments on both sides, what we've decided to do is ask the subcommittee of Graduate Council that manages the honorary degree process to, in the spring, look at our policy on rescission of honorary degree, since we don't have one I'm saying do we need a policy and consider the specific case and make a recommendation up to that. And in the interim we will, you know, respond to groups that come to us suggesting that we rescind a degree by saying we don't have a process. We're taking it under consideration. And in the meantime our support for people who proceed ethically in terms of their, you know, banking and in terms of sexual misconduct comes from other things that the university does. So you know, Denny Hastert, unlike Bill Cosby did not admit to sexual misconduct although certainly there's circumstantial evidence that suggestts that something untoward occurred that he was willing to violate the anking rules of the United States to cover up. And he did plead guilty to a felony in terms of the banking violation. So we have a convicted felon with an honorary degree and no process to make a decision. And so we've gone back to our shared governance process that manages honorary degrees and asked them to help us create a policy that would guide a decision in this and future cases. Does that make sense to everybody? I'm kind of tired and I think I'm not making sense.

J. Stephen: Yes, except Bill Cosby I don't think has admitted, I do not believe has admitted wrongdoing.

L. Freeman: Bill Cosby – I know this because I read all of these honorary degree things. He may not have admitted wrongdoing but he admitted certain types of sexual acts on people who are arguably unable to consent. How's that?

G. Long: Thank you. I would just say thank you very much to the Program Prioritization coordinating team and Provost Freeman for coming in and talking to us today. I have a sense certainly as a senate if we want them to come back, they're more than willing to come back. And we'll also follow up with regard to the budget discussion.

L. Freeman: Absolutely and I want to thank you for your commitment to the university. I'm sure everyone could be doing something other than serving on Faculty Senate and it's not really probably just worth the cookies, so I appreciate your commitment to the excellence of this institution. And I appreciate it when you ask hard questions like you know, absolutely appreciate it. So thank you.

G. Long: Thank you very much.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A.   Approve FS/UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee roster per NIU Bylaws Article 2.2.1 – Page 3

G. Long: All right. As we're moving on, we've got one item on the consent agenda and it's approve Faculty Senate/University Council Rules, Governance and Elections Committee roster per the NIU Bylaws. It's just the one item on our consent. We need to approve this roster, the members have already been contacted. And a special thanks to Therese Arado for agreeing to chair the committee. Unless there are any objections, I need a motion to accept the consent agenda?

J. Stephen: So moved.

J. Novak: Second.

G. Long: All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Excellent. Okay.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G. Long: Moving on, we have no unfinished business.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A.   Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 2,
        Officers of the Faculty Senate –Pages 4-5
        FIRST READING

G. Long: As we look at Number VIII., New Business, there's proposed revisions to the Faculty Senate bylaw, Office of the Faculty Senate. Basically what we're going to do with this -- and this is a first reading so we don't need a motion on it. But the goal of this bylaw change is to accurately reflect what we've been doing in terms of electing officers and who the officers are of the Faculty Senate. We've been doing this process since 1999. So we have a long history. But if you look at the document itself, our document doesn't align with our practice. And so this is a bylaw that really is just to put things in line so that, you know, in the -- basically the second meeting of the spring semester is when we solicit nominations for Faculty Senate president. Third meeting of the semester is when people submit their nominations. And that's in the agenda packet. And in the fourth meeting of the semester is when we actually make the vote. Those are all reflected in the document that you see that suggests the changes. So we just ask that you know, when we bring this back in our first meeting in January, that we vote to certainly make our processes in line with actually what's written down.

The other change that's being suggested here is that in our bylaws there is a statement that we have a Faculty Senate secretary. There are, however, no duties assigned to this person nor do we have any awareness of anything -- anyone who's been in this role or done anything with it. So the thought is why don't we just eliminate that as well. So that the whole point of this is to basically put ourselves in line with what we do and eliminate a position that's never been filled. Any questions on this?

J. Novak: I had been the secretary so it has been filled. It's just that I didn't do anything. I wasn't asked to do anything.

G. Long: I apologize. I did not mean to be offensive there.Yes. Or make you admit you didn't do anything.

G. Long: Paul?

P. Stoddard: 2.1.4 does look to be an actual change, not just a modification to go with current practice. Your faculty senators are choosing the executive secretary or is it the entire University Council that's choosing the executive secretary? Originally it was the senators who is a subset.

G. Long: Right.

P. Erickson: The senators nominate and the entire University Council

G. Long: The entire University Council votes.

P. Stoddard: This represents a change. I mean, or well

G. Long: It represents what we've been doing. You know, so I mean all of this represents a bit of a change just in terms of dates and such. But it represents our current practice for the last 16 years. So I mean that's the point of this is that how it's written is incorrect, and so we're trying to make it accurate.

M. Haji-Sheikh: What would be the difference between the voting members of the University Council and the voting members of the Faculty Senate? That sounds like a big change.

P. Stoddard: One includes students and faculty and staff. Students, faculty, staff and administration. Right? And the other includes just faculty.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Right.

G. Long: As Faculty Senate, we nominate the Faculty Senate president who is nominated to the University Council. At University Council then the entire council votes on that. I grant you within 2.1.4 it says the Faculty Senators are the voting people but as practiced it's the entire University Council.

P. Erickson: 2.1.1 covers that first step of nomination which is what they might be thinking of.

G. Long: Right. So if we're looking at 2.1.1, it talks about the nomination of the potential president. So here's the issue. If we want to look at this -- go back to the old way that's one thing. But this is how we've been operating for a lot of years right now. And so the point is looking for some consistency. Let's have our bylaws be in line with our actions.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Our actions or the University Council actions?

G. Long: All of our actions. It's been both Faculty Senate and University Council. We have operated in this way as has University Council. What's represented here is how we have been doing it for the past 16 years, this has just not been brought up for discussion. And we went back, Pat looked at this. We've been doing this particular process since 1999. So... we're just asking that, you know, we codify it so it's current. And accurate. Rosemary?

R. Feurer: The concern, though, is that what's happened with the University Council is more people or groups have been added to University Council so it dilutes faculty. You know, when I, just in the last year we've added more representation as a formal voting. Isn't at that true?

G. Long: No.

R. Feurer: It's still static you can, the same way it's always been?

G. Long: We still have the same apportionment of seats and numbers, no overall change in the numbers of participants in University Council.

R. Feurer: I thought that, I just remember some change in which we had added. So you're certain that that's not the case?

G. Long: Yeah. I have no recollection of that.

R. Feurer: I must be. But the point is that the reason this was voted is so that faculty could be choosing. I mean there are two bodies, right? And you have to, in order to even go up for this position on that ballot, you have to be a member of both, which really whittles down the number of people who are eligible for that position. And so here what you're doing is further constraining, I think, by not having, not following. I think there was a reason, in other words, that this was the way it was supposed to have been done. So I just question why don't we start to follow the rules that were implemented which make a lot of sense to me, compared to what's being proposed here.

G. Long: Okay. Paul?

P. Stoddard: Obviously, since I used to sit up there it was done this way when I was there. But I was unaware that the bylaws said otherwise.

G. Long: So we can blame you. Thank you. I was worried here.

P. Stoddard: Feel free. I didn't start in '99. But actually I think it would be useful to try to figure out why that change was made. Was it just somebody didn't know what was going on and that -- I mean, that's how a lot of stuff happens.

G. Long: Sure.

P. Stoddard: Or was there actually a reason for doing it and somehow the change slipped through the bylaws committee? I mean so it would be useful I think before next time to figure out

G. Long: We can certainly look into that.

P. Erickson: I also believe that if we go with what it says here [current language], we will not be doing what the constitution says. We'll be in conflict.

G. Long: Pat brought up a point that if we do it, this will be in conflict with the constitution which is a point I want to bring up in our next item of business. But that's a few -- hold off on that for just a moment. Anything else on this particular item? Buck?

J. Stephen: I think the wording of 2.1.4 reflects the custom that Faculty Senate members are nonvoting members of the University Council and can attend University Council and the only change there is you don't, that wording didn't mean you had to be separately elected to the Faculty Senate and the University Council. It just meant if you were elected to the Faculty Senate and attending the University Council you're not a voting member of the University Council.

G. Long: Correct.

J. Stephen: And the only real change that's going to make is the nonfaculty members on the University Council who can now vote, that's SPS and such, representatives.

G. Long: Right. And also if we think about this from a kind of a logistics issue, we've been doing this for a lot of years. We've never had the University Council reject a Faculty Senate president nomination. So I mean we can talk about the details of this. But the reality is the University Council is going to endorse whoever we send up. I would be incredibly surprised. There's no history, no precedent of that. It's more or less a formality. That we have the vote in here to identify the individual. And they go up and it's more of a rubber stamp at University Council. So again, historically that's -- that's what we've been doing. But I appreciate the concerns that are being raised as the vote issue. So we'll come back and discuss this again. At our first meeting in January and have it be a second reading at that point. Okay? We don't need a -- all right.

B.   Review of NIU Constitution and Bylaws – refer to Rules, Governance and Elections
        Committee

G. Long: Then next item of business. Excuse me, just a moment. And I know Paul has a report so I will do my best to be brief on this. And it's going to be hard for me to sit down. I'm sorry, I'm going to stand up. I feel like I'm kind of in a -- hi, my name's G. Long, and I have -- I've been Faculty Senate president for five months. And I will tell you in those five months I've learned a lot. One of

the things I will admit prior to assuming this office I had not read the Constitution and Bylaws thoroughly. I don't know if I'm the only one in the room that has that experience. I suspect there may be others of us who have paid some attention to it but perhaps not read it cover to cover. Now I have. That's not a pat on the back, but what I would say on that is that we have problems. We have significant problems. One problem that I have mentioned to you a number -- before has to do with voting. All right? As you know we've got this two-tier system. Whereas Faculty Senate we don't have a lot of power, what we do goes up to University Council and that's where the vote goes. Now in University Council you have to have two thirds of the entire membership support a bylaw revision. All right? So at this point, we have 62 people on University Council. That means 41 people have to vote aye to have something passed as a bylaw. This is a problem because typically as we've looked over the last several years our attendance runs 45 or 46 people. If you have 45 or 46 people attending a meeting out of the 61 or 2 that are part of the University Council, you're already starting with 15 nos. And that means that we have very limited opportunity to make changes. So for a long time that's how I've looked at this. It's been a voting issue.

Having looked at it a bit more seriously now I would say that I was shortsighted with that. That the voting issue is one that is absolutely critical and I really -- if there's nothing else that I accomplish in my role here, that is the one thing I would like to see us do is within University Council, you know, have some sort of a change where we look at, say, hey, we get a quorum in place and then that quorum we listen to what they have to say. Because we've had a number of things go down over the years that have missed out by one or two votes that have had exceptional support and yet because we didn't hit that 40 person or 41 person threshold did not happen. So that's one thing that I would like to refer to the committee.

But from my standpoint the bigger issue has to do with our bylaws. All right? I have spent a significant time looking at other constitution and bylaws and other universities. And let me just give you a quick example here. Okay. This is the University of Virginia constitution and bylaws. This is Kent State Constitution and Bylaws, ISU Constitution and Bylaws. North Carolina. NIU. We have 171 page Constitution and Bylaws. We have 20 plus pages of bylaws devoted to grievance policies. And I say policies because our bylaws really are a mixture of policies and bylaws. The majority of other universities that I've looked at, when they talk about having a grievance policy for example it's a line or two that's linked to a policy document. We not only have bylaws that are 20 pages of grievance issues, but then we have links to APPM and there's certainly Academic Policy and Procedure Manual that's not always consistent with the Constitution and Bylaws. Basically it's kind of a mess. And I would say we've got the voting issue, you've got the specificity of the bylaws that no other place that I'm familiar with has the detail that we do. Plus the structure that we face. Because right now as we've talked about, Faculty Senate, we're a caucus body. We don't have power to make curricular decisions. If you look at other universities, curricular decisions stop here. Curricular decisions stop with the Faculty Senate. They may have an undergraduate senate or graduate senate they may combine but several models out there. But it is very, very rare to find a situation like ours, I was not able to find another university – Chris McCord, tip of hat to him, he helped me investigate this as well. He's been somewhat of a resource for me and mentor for me in looking at this. The two-tier system that we have is unique and incredibly inefficient. So we as Faculty Senate – there's a reason we're pissed. I'm sorry to use the language. As I learn about this stuff, it makes me angry too because we sit around and we're frustrated, say we don't do things, we can't make a change. And yet – yeah. It's true. We can't because 30 years ago when they put this

together, it was a politically motivated act. And I've talked to the authors of it who did it 30 years ago. We were concerned about being subsumed within a regency system. When they put the constitution together, they made every effort to make it as explicit as possible and resistant to change as possible. They were really good at what they did. Except that we did not get subsumed within a regency system and we're now in 2015, 30 years later and incredibly handicapped by this document because we can't, we have no power as a Faculty Senate and as relates to University Council from a voting standpoint, the vote makes change difficulty and when you've got 171 pages of bylaws and such, we're stuck.

Here's my proposal. It's not one that I'm particularly keen on personally just from the standpoint of workload but I really do think there's great value in having us as a body look at the Constitution and Bylaws in a bigger picture kind of thing. I'm willing to commit the rest of my time as Faculty Senate – and if you want me to continue the second year of my term I'm willing to continue doing this. Because it's not going to be a quick fix. But I think if we do not seriously look at the Constitution and Bylaws and its construction, we're in a bad situation, that we won't ever be in a position to have some of the authority, some of the control – I mean, I've talked to many of you. And many groups. And I hear consistent themes of feel disempowered, of the encroaching corporatization of the university. I appreciate the issues we're dealing with. But the governance documents that we have to operate under right now, limit our ability to make any change whatsoever.

So, I would ask, I probably should have started this with a motion, damn it. But I would ask that we have a motion to refer this broader issue to the combined Rules, Governance and Election Committee. It is nice because that committee does include both Faculty Senate and University Council representatives. So just throw that out. Can I have a

G. Slotsve: So moved.

G. Long: Okay. Can I have a second? David Lonergan for second. Any further discussion on this? Willing to take a vote to refer this to committee? All in favor of referring this to committee, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? All right. Let's – I know this is an issue people have talked about before. I feel like we need to try this. If we don't try it, we don't have any position to stand on. Virginia?

V. Naples: Might this be an opportunity to draw into service the position of the secretary of the Faculty Senate to assist with this process? I'm getting hate looks.

J. Novak: That was years ago.

G. Long: I'm willing to have anyone help with this project. When I took on this role, this wasn't on my bucket list of things I wanted to do in life. I'm enjoying it, it's interesting, but also pretty intense and the learning curve on this is pretty significant. And so I don't in any way, shape or form profess to have all the answers to this or have a model in mind of what we might go to. I can just say that

given my experience thus far in the five months I've been doing this, I'm consistently struck with we have no ability to make change. Based on how our governance documents are structured. So if we want to potentially make change, we want to have an input, we need to deal with it systemically rather than just whine. Mike?

M. Konen: Geography. I have been to last couple University Council meetings and I looked for the Faculty Senate minutes on their agenda. They're not there. And I just went back and looked at the last six years of minutes that have been posted for agendas for the University Council. And under Information Items, the minutes from Faculty Senate are nowhere to be found. So in theory they don't even know what we're talking about.

G. Long: Right. I think that's started under Paul if I'm not mistaken. Nice thing about being the new guy I can blame it on someone else. That's unintentional and we can correct that. There was no intention of that. But that's a good point. Anyone else on this? Okay.

IX.   REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A.   FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – no report

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

X.   REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A.   Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Paul Stoddard, Chair – report

G.Long: We do have one report. Paul?

P. Stoddard: So Faculty Rights and Responsibilities met yesterday afternoon. We met with Greg Brady who is in the legal office here on campus, who was helping us understand how much flexibility the university has and certain things that it does. That's an ongoing discussion we're having on the committee. But one of the things that did come out which was a subject that I think we've talked about once or twice in here has to do with cell phones and privacy issues and so forth. There are a couple of subissues in there. But the main one that Greg talked about was: What on your cell phone is subject to a FOIA request? If the university gets a FOIA request, what information are they allowed to grab from your cell phone? He said that it made no difference whether you are getting a subsidy for that phone from the university or a stipend; if you are using that phone to conduct university business, anything on the phone that relates to university business is subject to the FOIA request. Anything that is not related to university business is private and will not be released or used by the university. So that's really all I wanted to say. He seemed pretty keen on getting that bit of information out since there has been some concern.

G. Long: Thank you. Thank you. Does anyone have any questions for Paul on that? All right.

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 – no report

E.	Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Laura Beamer, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

## XI.	COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A.	Continued discussion and problem solving regarding faculty concerns

G. Long: Well, at this point it's 4:28, and we do have an opportunity for questions and comments from the floor. Does anyone have anything? Buck?

J. Stephen: Were you able to find out the extent, cost and reasoning behind the electric car charging stations which is still covered in the canvas and sign saying coming soon?

G. Long: Actually, Sarah did some checking on that.

J. Stephen: I have another one too.

S. Klaper: I checked on that and rationale, I do not know. But it came out of parking services' budget. And so I thought that maybe there was a grant or some reason I had it in my head that environmental studies or somebody had gotten a grant for those but I was wrong. So the parking services confirm that it came out of their budget. And their operating budget.

J. Stephen: No rationale.

S. Klaper: I didn't ask for rationale either. I can ask for that.

J. Stephen: Do you know how many there are and the rationale?

S. Klaper: No, but I can find out for you.

J. Stephen: I would love to know the rationale and how many there are and the total cost. And then I have another general question.

S. Klaper: There -- I think there's a related

J. Stephen: Yeah?

D. Macdonald: Department of English. Is it my understanding that parking services is self funded? Aren't they funded through our -- but they don't have a budget line? Am I correct or not?

S. Klaper: That's a good question. I will ask all of these questions and get back to you.

J. Stephen: They wouldn't have their own budget for capital matters. The cost of electricity is going to have to be a capital matter so it must have come from some budgetary thing.

G. Long: We can certainly look and find out more information and bring that back.

J. Stephen: Okay. My other question, there are some private individuals and think tanks such that are offering grants to particular universities. Examples that I can think of involve economics departments. And in the contracts for some grants are clauses which say the granting party or person has input or say over who the department's going to hire. I think that's just egregious and I'm wondering whether we have a policy that says: Don't take grants if they want to tell you who to hire.

G. Long: This is the first time I've been made aware of this issue. What I would ask is that you would share some information that we bring it up as a point of discussion at our next meeting.

J. Stephen: Certainly.

G. Long: Thank you. Virginia?

V. Naples: I wanted to mention that I have been getting interested in trying to help people figure out what is going on with the budget. And so I went to publicly available sources of information from NIU and put together a little graph displaying the actual dollar amounts of the total budget of the university from 2000 to 2014. If you will notice, we are not likely to go extinct because we have zero dollars, because we have a fair amount of money. I don't know where we are in the level of expenditure for this year. But for all of the years from 2000 to 2014, we had a budget decrease only in three of them. So our budget has been continually going up. And I printed these out at home
and that's why they're a little uneven in size. But if anybody would like a copy of this to make you feel a little better that the university does actually have money and has had money on an ongoing basis, I'd be happy to give you the remaining copies.

G. Long: Thank you. Mike?

M. Haji-Sheikh: I want to bring up one other thing. Since February, Baker has been under investigation by the OEIG, and up to this point, the university spent about $150,000 on his lawyer and we haven't been told anything about this as faculty. Second, the Board of Trustees has spent about $80,000 on a law firm called Drinker, Biddle & Reath, to investigate Dr. Baker to verify whether or not there's merit in the investigations. Now, most people, and I brought this up earlier this year, most people in this university, including everyone in this room, if the OEIG came after us, we'd probably be home. Okay? They have budgeted $225,000 for last year and this year for the law firm. The law firm's name is, oh, gosh, I'm trying to remember, Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, PC. And they're out of the east coast. As far as I know they're not even$ licensed to work in Illinois. But they're budgeted 175,000 for this fiscal year alone. We've never had a president of any university, in this university that's ever had this level of investigation and this level of legal bills, as far as I can tell. The entire, what do you call it, the problems we had with the coffee fund, I believe the whole legal cost of that was under $70,000 for all the defendants.

So I think at some point – we don't have a lot of power in Faculty Senate – but one thing we can do is basically ask the Board of Trustees. We work for them. Everybody has to remember we still work for the Board of Trustees, so we need to be able to ask these questions of our official bosses. I think that is where we need to go. I'm increasingly concerned because of this, because of these legal issues that this man has brought in this whole Program Prioritization process and was going to be ethically inspired and the first thing he does is have $300,000 of legal fees. So I would like, if anybody wants to talk to me about it later, I can share some of the data. Some of this stuff's made it on the Edgar County Watch Dogs online. You can pop it up. Called Edgar County Watch Dogs. And state one people are looking at us right now. So, that's my word.

J. Novak: What does that acronym stand for?

M. Haji-Sheikh: When you do your ethics test they say the Office of the Executive Inspector General.

J. Novak: Thank you.

G. Long: I would say at this point there has been no official findings on that so we ought to be cautious about making assumptions. I mean from the innocent until proven guilty standpoint.

M. Haji-Sheikh: That's fine but what happened to Jeff Gordon and Albanese? They had to sit out didn't they, even before the charges.

G. Long: I've actually even talked to Mark Strauss, Board of Trustees, on this. Their perspective would be that these decisions are reached on an individual basis. So that the decision will be reached when any sort of decision comes out. Whether you like it, I mean, I'm just the messenger here.

M. Haji-Sheikh: That's where we are as faculty, should be more forceful because, Just because Mark Strauss – and I can tell you a little about that – just because Mark Strauss says it doesn't mean the world turns around it. He's just one member of the board.

G. Long: Okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: That's just coming out of it. But that's it.

G. Long: Thanks. Anyone else?

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,]() Office of the Ombudsperson

## XIII.	ADJOURNMENT

G. Long: All right. Can I have a motion to adjourn?

J. Stephen: Adjourn.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Second.

G. Long: Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.