

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT**  
**Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Arado, Azad, Baker, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Carlson, Cefaratti, Chitwood, Chomentowski, Chung, Clark (for Streb), Conderman, Creed (for Dugas), Demir, Farrell, Ferguson, Garcia, Glatz, Grund, Haji-Sheikh, Hathaway, Hou, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Khoury, Liu, Long, Macdonald, Manning, McHone-Chase, Millis, Naples, Nejd, Newman, Novak, Patro, Pavkov, Riley, Rosenbaum, Ryu, Saborío, Shibata, Shin, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stephen, Stoddard, Than, Thu, VanderSchee, Xie

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Allori, Briscoe, Bujarski, Chakraborty, Collins, Dugas, Hanley, Konen, Krmenec, May, Mogren, Montana, Moraga, Penrod, Rodgers, Scherer, Streb, Tan

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan, Coryell, Doederlein, Edghill-Walden, Falkoff, Hoffman, Holmes, Klaper, Monteiro (for Nicholson), Reynolds, Zimmerman

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Johns, Nicholson, Shortridge, VandeCreek

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**G. Long:** Good afternoon. Oh, very nice, thank you. Welcome to our January 25 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Faculty Senate President Greg Long called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**G. Long:** The first item on our agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There is one walk-in item from Professor Beatrix Hoffman regarding faculty support for undocumented students. And then the additional handouts in front of you pertain to the December 22 Baker Report that we've listed for discussion under New Business. Because we have a very full agenda, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee recommended that we take care of senate business matters first. As such, reports from the standing committees were moved immediately following the President's Announcements. So may I have a motion to accept the agenda.

**J. Manning:** So moved.

**G. Long:** Okay, and as a reminder, names too, please. Jimmie Manning moved. Hamid Bateni second. All in favor, say Aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**G. Long:** Any opposed? Abstentions? Okay. And also one thing I would say very quickly, just as a reminder with regard to the use of our captioner here, please remember, as I just reminded Jimmie, when you speak, please do use a microphone and also please state your name. And because she can only record one person at a time, we have to be polite and give each other opportunities to talk. But beyond that, like I said, the main thing is please use the microphone and state your name, because it does sincerely help us with transcriptions after the fact.

### **III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 16, 2016 FS MEETING**

**G. Long:** All right, so moving on to number III, approval of the minutes of the November 16 Faculty Senate meeting, we need a motion to approve.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** So moved.

**G. Long:** Michael Haji-Sheikh. Second anyone?

**J. Manning:** Second.

**G. Long:** Okay, any corrections, additions, change to the minutes? Okay, all in favor say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**G. Long:** Any opposed? Okay. We've got an agenda and meeting minutes. We're moving right along.

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

**G. Long:** On number IV, President's Announcements, and I'm going to keep my announcements relatively short. I want to say basically, welcome back and thank you. And when I say thank you, I sincerely mean thank you. I've been a professor here at NIU for 26 years at this point, and you know my term will end at the end of this academic year, and at that point I also plan to retire. So want to let you know, from the standpoint of how we're approaching things, my goal is to work as best I can on behalf of the university because this is my life, and this is something that's been very important to me. I would say that, over my time on the faculty here, I've never seen or experienced more uncertainty at the federal, state and university levels. And the impact on faculty and staff morale is unmistakable. And this is particularly problematic because we, as faculty, are the heart of the university. Our work and involvement with students is crucial, especially regarding retention. And so really my appreciation to you all stems from the fact that, despite the challenges, we as faculty have risen to the occasion because students do continue to ascribe positive attitudes and interaction and experience when working with NIU faculty and staff. So sincerely, I do thank you for the work despite the challenges we're facing, because I know, I'm in the middle of it, and I hear it most every day. It's a very tough time for pretty much everyone across the university. So thank you very much for the work you're doing.

### **V. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – report

**G. Long:** Okay, at this point, let's move to standing committees. The first report is Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Katy.

**K. Jaekel:** I don't have a formal report, other than we are working on a few things right now to be able to formally report to you in March.

**G. Long:** Okay, thank you.

**K. Jaekel:** Thanks, everyone.

**G. Long:** Glad you had the microphone for that. Sorry. Thank you.

B. Academic Affairs Committee – John Novak, Chair – no report

**G. Long:** John Novak, Academic Affairs Committee.

**J. Novak:** No report.

C. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – Paul Stoddard, Chair – no report

**G. Long:** Economic Status of the Profession, that's Paul Stoddard.

**P. Stoddard:** No report.

**G. Long:** No report? I will say, though, that we had suggested during the Steering Committee meetings that the Economic Status of the Profession Committee follow up with Virginia Wilcox and Kristen Myers with regard to the salary study that was started last semester. So, if I could ask that committee to look into that and maybe give us some sort of an update for next month? Okay, thank you.

D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Rebecca Hunt, Liaison/Spokesperson

**G. Long:** Next I will turn it over to Becqui Hunt, Rules, Governance and Elections. She's got some committees she needs to organize.

1. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the President of Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of University Council – See Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 7](#) – Page 3

**R. Hunt:** Okay, we have two elections today. The first item is the selection of a committee to evaluate the president of Faculty Senate and executive secretary of University Council, who is Greg Long. This evaluation committee consists of two faculty members of Faculty Senate who are not elected faculty members of the University Council, plus one alternate. Then we will select two faculty members of the University Council and one alternate. Then we will select one student

member of University Council and one alternate. Then one Supportive Professional Staff member of University Council. And finally one Operating Staff member of University Council.

**T. Arado:** This is Faculty Senate, non-UC: Laura Beamer, School of Nursing. George Slotsve, Department of Economics, sorry George. And now this is the alternate: Jimmie Manning, Department of Communication.

All right these are from UC: Sean Farrell, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Eric Mogren, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. And now one alternate: Amy Newman, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

All right this is our student member: Kevin Cuautle, Student Association. And now the alternate student member: Christine Wang.

This is Supportive Professional Staff: Jeff Reynolds. No alternate on this.

And Holly Nicholson from Operating Staff.

2. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor – See Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 7](#) – Page 4

**R. Hunt:** Okay, next is the selection of a committee to evaluation the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor, who is Paul Stoddard. This evaluation committee consists of three faculty members from the Faculty Senate plus an alternate. This pool also includes the faculty members of University Council who have automatic dual membership on Faculty Senate. And one Supportive Professional Staff member of University Council.

**T. Arado:** Doug Boughton, College of Visual and Performing Arts. Sukesh Patro, Department of Finance. Vicki Collins, College of Education. This is the alternate name: King Chung, College of Health and Human Sciences.

**R. Hunt:** I want to thank you for your attention.

**G. Long:** Thank you, Becqui, for coordinating that. I appreciate it.

**P. Stoddard:** Didn't you say there was also somebody from Supportive Professional Staff who is supposed to be involved.

**R. Hunt:** Yes I did, but we only have one envelope.

**P. Erickson:** The reason we do not need to draw that person, and I apologize that we didn't explain that, is that there are only two SPS representatives on University Council, Jeff Reynolds and Cathy Doederlein. So since Jeff was selected to serve on the first evaluation committee, Cathy wins by default for the second.

**G. Long:** Okay. Now as we move along, thank you, Becqui, for coordinating that.

E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Jimmie Manning, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

**G. Long:** Jimmie, there's no report here on Resource, Space and Budget? Okay.

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

A. [Preferred Name Option for Students](#) – Page 5  
Vernese Edghill-Walden, Chief Diversity Officer  
Molly Holmes, Director, Gender and Sexuality Resource Center  
[Supporting Transgender Students in the Classroom](#)  
[For Faculty and Instructors: Navigating Gender Identity in the Classroom](#)

**G. Long:** All right now as we move to item number VI, Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, we have three items. One is Preferred Name Option. Second is the NIU Print Project. And the third is the Bob Lane Advocacy Award. To start, it's my pleasure to introduce NIU's chief diversity officer, Dr. Vernese Edghill-Walden. She'll share some background information, guidelines regarding the Preferred Name Option for Students. More description of that is available on page 5 of your agenda packet.

**V. Edghill-Walden:** Good afternoon. I'm Vernese Edghill-Walden. I won't be before you long. We wanted to come to you this afternoon to talk with you about the Preferred Proper Name Option that was launched November 15. Many of you may have recognized that in your rosters. Has anyone seen that on their rosters, that they now have a column for preferred name? So I wanted to spend a little bit of time talking about what this means and the significance of it in terms of us helping to provide more inclusive options for our students and our community.

The NIU launched, as I said, the Preferred Name Option in November after, I would say, several years of trying to figure out how in our systems we can allow for people who would like to go by names other than their legal name to be able to be listed in their class roster, in Blackboard, in the directory, and also to have that on their OneCard. And I have to thank IT and the Registration and Records Office. There are several staff members on campus who have worked to really get this system up and running in MyNIU.

What this allows is for anyone that has hyphenated last name, like myself, or an international student who came to the United States with two first names, or a transgender student whose proper name is something other than their legal name. And so today we wanted to talk a little bit more about how this option really does help to support our transgender students and ways that we as a community can help to support these students in and out of the classroom. So Greg asked that we come today to talk about that.

In a few days, hopefully a few days, I will be sending out a letter, a faculty toolkit/resources that we've created, a web page that will allow us to be able to share, not just information about preferred proper name and pronoun usage, but also other inclusive syllabus statements for undocumented

students and a series of other information that you should be receiving on culturally responsive teaching. I want to thank you all for the work that you already do in this area. We're just wanting to make available these resources to everyone.

At this point, I'm going to turn it over to Molly Holmes who is the director of the Gender and Sexuality Resource Center, who will talk more specifically and provide context for the proper name usage option in MyNIU. Thank you.

**M. Holmes:** Good afternoon. Thank you for having me here. As Dr. Edghill-Walden said, my name is Molly Holmes. The pronouns I use are she, her and hers. I'm the director of the Gender and Sexuality Resource Center. We do many things on campus, and I've work with several of you in the room on a lot of initiatives. And today I'm going to talk to you more about how we support trans students in the classroom.

So just to give a bit of context. A survey that was done by the Williams Institute this past June stated that pretty much the age group that we see here on campus are amongst the highest to identify as trans. And coming up behind them, those are in high school and younger right now, are three to six times higher than that. So trans identity is not a fad, it's something that we, if you haven't encountered in the classrooms already, it's something that's going to be more prevalent.

So many of you already know that the Gender and Sexuality Resource Center offers trainings. Up here I mentioned Ally training that's been offered since [pause to fix television screen]. The Gender and Sexuality Resource Center has offered LGBT Ally training since 1998 and has offered Trans Ally training since 2004. And at present there are about 700 active current NIU folks who've participated in these trainings.

Transitions is a student group on campus for trans and gender non-conforming students. And the GSRC currently maintains an online resource guide called Trans NIU to help students navigate different systems and processes. I share this context with you because, up until the Preferred Name Policy, there was no self-directed way for trans students to identify their proper name and how they want to really navigate this campus and be seen, how they would like you as their faculty to see them. So this was a really big get for trans students in addition to the populations that Vernese just mentioned.

Another component, just for context, is that in my role I get from other folks on campus, "well wouldn't it just be easier if a trans student would legally change their name." And we'll get into some of that a little bit later. But that's not something that all trans students want to do. In addition, it's cost prohibitive for some of our students. And so because of that, they become experts on how to navigate systems, how to make contact perhaps with their faculty to ask to use a different name. And so they have developed a strong sense of resiliency. That doesn't mean that the support that you've already provide students isn't going to be critical in moving forward with this Preferred Name Option and just support in general.

I imagine that many of you know some of this terminology. And I'm going to share because it will be used more frequently, I think, along with this Preferred Name Option and as people become more aware of students navigating their class. So trans, or transgender is for someone whose gender

identity is not aligned with their sex assigned at birth. Cisgender is a complement to that for someone who identifies their gender with the sex they were assigned at birth. Cisgender has been around, especially in academic circles, for a while. But it also was aimed at not othering trans people.

The next two bullet points really fall under the umbrella of transgender. Non-binary, someone who doesn't ascribe to the either or concept of sex. And so we'll get into pronouns in a moment, but this person might not use pronouns. They might just use their name for their pronoun.

And gender non-conforming, or GNC, is for someone whose gender expression or their internal sense of their gender doesn't conform to the sex assigned at birth. I include gender non-conforming because certain national surveys about college populations, most recently one about sexual assault, started to include GNC as part of their data. So it's just something you might see as well.

So paired with a name a student might ask you to use for them, it's good to also follow with an opportunity for them to identify the pronouns that they use. Many of us were taught and understand the typical she, her, hers, he, him, his. But more of our students are starting to use gender neutral pronouns, especially in the trans and non-binary community. So there's a few listed up here on the chart. They, them, theirs might be the most common that you might see, as well as someone using their name for their pronoun. But there are many beyond what I've shared up here. One of the things I do, like I did for you all today, is to introduce myself with my pronouns. And it's something that you can model. Some might already do that in your classrooms to indicate that it's okay for students to share their pronouns.

I've had experience where, if a faculty member might not provide this opportunity, whether in their syllabus or in the beginning of a class, and students aren't sure if they can approach you. And so this is a good opportunity for you to invite them in to how you want to be inclusive in your classroom.

At this time, I have to acknowledge that one of my students who holds several student leadership positions on campus helped with this next component of the presentation, and he was not able to be here due to class followed by said student leadership position. But here are some things that he, in his role, he compiled about what he and his peers would like faculty to know.

For the first one, using an inclusive syllabus statement. In Vernese's tool kit, a link to an example of this will be provided, and Pat has examples in hard copy form available to you after today's meeting. But basically, it invites students like many accessibility-type statements to speak with you. And for a lot of our trans students who they've developed great relationships with their faculty because that door has been opened.

Here are some other ideas about how to write the name that they go by next to ZIDs. Some students won't engage with this Preferred Name Option now that it is available for several reasons. If you have questions about that, feel free to contact me.

And more than anything, students want their privacy respected and protected. They don't want to be known as the so-and-such, the trans student. They want to be in your classroom like any other

student. So that's a great way to connect with them and help them fully function in your learning environment. And you might see mid-semester, because students can change their name at any point using this Preferred Name Option, that someone who's been in your class potentially through the drop/add date and their name changes. It's a good opportunity to kind of pull them aside after class to make that connection and find out if it's accurate or something else happened.

The last one, and this happens a lot in my work. If you make a mistake. If you accidentally use a wrong name or pronoun for the person, just making a simple apology, correcting the mistake and moving on is the best way to recover from that.

I acknowledge that many of you are probably already fulfilling these tips and know these things. And I just want to kind of go through these last bits quickly, and I'll have you ask me questions. So trans students, unless they volunteer, ideally don't want to be tokenized. So this is a good opportunity to find out how you might advocate for them. For example, with a student who you know is trans, saying, "If someone mis-genders you or uses the wrong name or pronouns, how would you like me as your faculty member to address that?" Some students might say, "Yes, interrupt the person who did it and do it on my behalf." Other students say, "No, I don't want you to draw attention to that, and I'll contact them after class." So that's an example of how you can kind of find that balance with the student.

Correct language. There's a lot of terminology out there. I shared some earlier, but some key ones from the students: transgendered or transgenders you don't want to use. People who are transgender or transgender individuals is ideal. And even now that you have been utilizing your rosters with the Preferred Name Option and even though it's been effect, you might still have students who still don't want to disclose that they've utilized this option. They might have that barrier. And I don't think that the expectation by the student is that you read their mind or that you know everything about their particular story or identity. I think that they expect just keeping the door open for communication and dialog with you.

And with that, I yield, or I open it up for questions.

**J. Novak:** Molly and Vernese, both of you use a term which sounds synonymous, but I'm not certain, and that's "preferred" and "proper." Is there a difference? At one point, you said a proper preferred, which I thought was also something...

**M. Holmes:** Thank you. A proper name is, like so for trans students that they don't see their name but they go by as preferred. Like my name is Molly, and I don't want you to call me Jennifer. My proper name is Molly, and that is also my legal name. If my name was Jennifer and I went by Jenny, I'm not going to necessarily be offended that you called me Jennifer. I might prefer to be called Jenny. So we're using preferred name to be inclusive of someone who might feel it's their preferred name. But for trans students, it's generally regarded as their proper name even if it's not their legal name.

**J. Novak:** Okay, thank you.



**V. Edghill-Walden:** I've used both terms to make sure that I'm inclusive of both. The students that see it as their proper name and the students that see it as their preferred name. And so you'll see in the documents that are on our website, as well as in the frequently asked questions, that there are areas that we say proper/preferred. So it's either proper or preferred, and it's really to help the person that's looking at the FAQs or reading or trying to figure out how to navigate the Preferred Name Option to know that this is something that you can do if you think it's your proper name or if you think it's your preferred name.

**J. Novak:** Okay, I have another question. First day of class I always ask the students what they want to go by. So if Elizabeth wants to be Liz and James wants to be Jim, are they going to fill this out or is that not appropriate. How far does this go?

**M. Holmes:** It's their choice to do that in that scenario. It's up to them.

**V. Edghill-Walden:** My son's first name is Charles, but we call him Darius. My thought is that, if he were in college, he would probably want to be called by Darius. And if that's the case, he could go through the MyNIU system and change his name in the system to Darius, because that's what he would prefer.

**M. Holmes:** I wanted to add, one quick moment for that. So it is not just students who can go by a preferred or proper name. There is an option for faculty and staff in case you didn't know, and I can answer those questions through email.

**J. Stephen:** On our database, we have MyNIU, Blackboard and those names are automatically populated by Records and Registration. To be honest, this can cause kind of a problem to keep track of 180 students in a section if I give them a name that does not – you know, if I identify them on Blackboard with a name that does not correspond to the legal name that comes up on MyNIU when I give their grades. In particular, this happens for my students who have hyphenated last names and choose to use the second name of the hyphenated last name. Do we just work around that if they don't want to change it?

**B. Coryell:** Good question and thank you for that. We have over 100 different systems on campus, so you can imagine the issues we have with names. Some of the systems are all across the university, and some of them are local. And right now, if a student changes, or an employee, if you go and change your preferred name in the system, then that starts in PeopleSoft either HR for faculty and staff or the student system for students. Then that gets pushed to kind of a central repository where all systems can take a name from. Blackboard is taking that name. All PeopleSoft systems are taking that name. Blackboard Transact, which is how the OneCard works, that's taking that name. And email is taking the name. To my knowledge, no other systems are taking the preferred name, so we will have a period of time where you'll see only the, let's say, legal name or full name sometimes it's called. You'll see only that in a system. But you'll see the proper name, preferred name in a different system. And that coexistence will be with us for a couple of years.

**J. Stephen:** That's not what I'm worried about, though. What I'm worried about is changing say the first name on Blackboard to match to a preferred name as opposed to the name that Records and Registration uses and then perhaps forgetting that I did that or something.

**B. Coryell:** So I actually have to confess that I wasn't aware that you can change a student's name as it appears to you in Blackboard?

**J. Stephen:** Well actually I'm not sure.

**B. Coryell:** But if you see it in Blackboard, it's all handled. So that student, when they set their preferred name, Blackboard knows their legal name and their preferred or proper name both. And it reconciles on the back end. So as long as you know which student you're giving that grade to, it'll show up on the transcript correctly. It'll count towards credits. It'll be used by Registration and Records. It's handled.

**J. Stephen:** And I just thought of something that would fix this. If they have a preferred name but they don't want to go through the process, I can just add a field on Blackboard.

**B. Coryell:** Yes, if you were going to do that, then you would have to then keep track because you're the only one that knows.

**J. Stephen:** Yeah, I figured out how to deal with my problem, add the new column.

**B. Coryell:** If the student does it, it's all tracked on the back end for those systems using it.

**J. Stephen:** Thank you very much.

**V. Edghill-Walden:** I have to say that one of the things that we really wanted to make sure was that, once we did it in one system, that we were able to do it in enough systems so that you're not seeing different names when you go into Blackboard and then you go into MyNIU and then they go to OneCard. Right now all of those are synced and, when it gets changed one time, you will see it in Blackboard. The student will see it in MyNIU. You'll see it in the roster and the directory.

**J. Stephen:** Advising notes come off of MyNIU, so I'll get the preferred name there too?

**V. Edghill-Walden:** You should, and that might be another system that I'm not aware of [off mic].

**B. Coryell:** I have to correct that a little bit, because currently there are over a dozen different advising systems across all the various departments and colleges. Many of that is coming into a system, oh what is the acronym for that, campus ssc?

**J. Stephen:** SSC, I think that's the one that gives me grade histories.

**B. Coryell:** Yep, for anyone who's coming into that, I don't think we've populated the preferred name into that system yet unless it's taking it from the student system. But if we haven't, we will by the end of the semester.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, I'd put that as a priority.

**G. Long:** May I make a recommendation. We've got two people that have had hands up, and I'll certainly let you ask both of your questions. But after we get done with these two questions, when we discussed this issue in the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the recommendation was that we refer this to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee for additional discussion so we can figure out how to disseminate the information, how to compile some of the questions that are being raised right now. Because, I mean, we could spend a significant more time talking about this today, and we've got things to go. So, as a group, I would like to recommend that we refer this to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, but I do want to recognize Mike and Jimmie who've had their hands up.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Just really quick, I don't want to take much time. Some of you don't realize that, it's probably the numerical tag of the ZID that's really what they're moving around, am I right. It's the numerical, the identifier tag, the ZID, is what you're actually moving around, not necessarily the names. So you have to give a name tied to that ZID correctly when you move from system to system?

**B. Coryell:** Very close, but not quite right. The ZID, there's something in PeopleSoft called an EMPLID [employee ID], full name and proper name. Many of those, they're all tied together. It's actually EMPLID for those who care. It's EMPLID that is the real key in PeopleSoft, and we do transfer from system to system not only the ZID and EMPLID, but also the names themselves.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Yeah, I just wanted to make sure we have people realize that the names follow the numbers more than.

**G. Long:** Thanks. Jimmie?

**J. Manning:** First of all, thank you for doing this. This is really appreciated and much needed on campus. Thank you for that. I followed this issue closely, and I know at other campuses there have been students who kind of trolled the system by entering a name such as Your Royal Highness or something profane like Shit Brick. How would you suggest we deal with that, because I'm at a loss of what I would do if that happened to me.

**M. Holmes:** First of all, there are systems in place already at the university for a student if they've misrepresented themselves such as Student Conduct. So if you feel like that. If the examples that you gave would indicate that that's not their proper name. So it's a good opportunity to have a great engaging dialog with your student using that name over and over perhaps. And then also remind them about the systems in place about misrepresenting themselves. It may be an opportunity to share that this policy centers around communication. Also, I follow this closely as well, and I did see that most of the time the students who benefit and utilize this policy, especially over time, are the ones that really need it. And the examples that you gave are the ones that makes the headlines and whatnot. But the real answer is you can always utilize the systems in place such as Student Conduct, you can call my office or Vernese's office and Registration and Records to help the student. And I'm happy to have an educational conversation with them as well.

**G. Long:** Thank you very much for coming and talking to us about this. And we'll follow up through the committee and as we have additional questions or concerns, we'll bring them back to them. So thank you very much.

**J. Stephen:** Greg, do we need a formal motion to send this to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities?

**G. Long:** It doesn't hurt to have a motion.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, motion to refer the topic as phrased earlier to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

**S. McHone-Chase:** Second.

**G. Long:** So we've got a motion to refer the discussion of Preferred Name Option to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Is there any discussion on this? Okay, all in favor say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**G. Long:** Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, thanks, more official now, thank you.

B. [NIU Print Project](#)  
Brett Coryell, Chief Information Officer

**G. Long:** Our second guest speaker here today is NIU's chief information officer, Brett Coryell. He's here to tell us about the NIU Print Project and centralized printing. So, turn it over to Brett.

**B. Coryell:** Hello, thank you for having me here today. You are my fourth governance committee that I've come before. I've already been to Operating Staff Council, SPS Council, and I've taken a pass through APAC as well. So I'm eager to share the information that I have with you today, but experience has taught me that this slide deck, although it's only 15 slides long, it takes me about 30 minutes to get through because questions can come up as we go along. And I've had as much as an hour of additional Q&A on this topic. And, while I wouldn't mind spending that time, I want to be very conscious of the fact that you have a full agenda today. I'm going to show some of the slides that I have. I'm happy to provide more information in any number of other forms. But what I really want to do is just hit two or three topics and then take some questions. I'm sure that there are some. So let's dive right in.

Of course, I'm here to talk about printers. We have a lot of printers on campus. We have 3,000 printers after having removed about ten percent of them so far. You can just imagine that's practically one per person, right? One per employee, not quite, but practically. And we print a lot on our campus, 24 million pages a year. That's enough to kill about 3,000 trees a year. So it's something that's noticeable when you look at the overall scope and scale of what happens. For me, just from an IT perspective at the university, but if you look at it from a cost perspective too, we spend several million dollars a year on printing. That's the best estimate that I have, and it's difficult to get an accurate estimate of printing costs because they're so widely diffused. They

appear in small bits in many different budgets, so it's hard to tell. But I think we spend over \$3 million a year on printing. That's just my current best estimate.

We print also in one of the most expensive ways that we can print, which is by and large the majority of our printers are individual printers, especially inkjets. Inkjet ink, as you probably know, can be so profitable for companies that they will give away printers for free or nearly free, because they know they'll get you on the ink. Ink costs several thousand dollars a gallon if you were to measure it that way. It's \$15-\$75 an ounce for most types of inkjet ink. So that's amazing, in a bad way. They're also amazing pieces of technology because the little drops that spray out the print head can be measured in sizes as small as pico-liters, billionths of a liter. So which wins? Really small drops or really expensive liquids. The answer is they give away printers for free because they'll make it up on the ink.

So there are other ways to print, and about two years ago, I would say, we started looking at getting a read-out on how many printers were on campus and what types of printers there were. And if you just could imagine maybe if there were a way to print cheaper than we do today, hard as it may be to calculate the cost. If you could print faster, right? If you had access to a faster printer that had higher quality. Maybe also if there were something like finishing options, stapling or collating that maybe you can't do on all of the printers that might be sitting on a desk. As long as it was secure and maybe if you throw in some other neat things like if you could print from anywhere and pick up your print job anywhere, wouldn't that be worth looking at. Well if I also throw in – there are hundreds of scanners and fax machines – so what if I could offer free scanning and free faxing, and if you didn't have to pay the network cost for connecting your printer to the network, because I've heard that that's been a barrier for some areas. If we could do all of that, would it be worth looking at. The answer, I think, is yes, we ought to at least take a look at it.

So back in 2015, there was a business case that proposed looking at just this. That business case went through an IT Steering Committee. I talked about it with a group of IT directors around campus that are called the IT Planning Council. This is essentially the heads of the five families of IT or the largest IT groups. We all looked at it, sure, let's do it. The method of rolling forward with this would be to visit each office or department, explain the benefits of printing that we think we might be able to bring to you, let you mull it over, and then decide if you wanted to opt in. Do you want to trade out any of your individual printers for these shared printers? There might be some benefits for you. And as we started to do that, I did my whole division first, of course, right to eat my own dog food as my industry likes to say. We rolled out to the president's office, the provost's office, at the time Dr. Weldy's office. We've rolled out the purchasing and, at that pace, we've ironed out a couple of the bugs; but the idea that you would go in, and you would do the audit for them and you would explain and then there's mulling over time. Sometimes they wanted to have us back for a second round, and then you plan a future installation. At that pace, it would have taken us over two years to visit all the departments on campus. But that's the course we were on, and this was just going to be a little background thing that I was doing.

But then this happened. I call it the crash. This is representative of the five percent cost cutting exercise that the university went through last summer. As I've been to the various governance committees, there's been very unequal knowledge about the five percent cost cutting activity that we went through. So I'll just say as briefly as I can that, of course, we're all familiar with the state's

budget pressures and the fact that we haven't received a full allocation. And we have enrollment challenges and retention challenges, so it's hard for us to balance the budget, right, we all know this. This isn't news.

Last summer the vice presidents and Central Finance, we all went through an exercise to look at cost cutting to see if we could do a better job of matching our revenues and expenses and not spend all of our remaining endowment. And the challenge to each vice president was this spread sheet. And I guess the numbers are a little small there so apologies in the back, but it's not to study, it's just to say each vice president had a challenge for their division. Come up with cost savings in this amount. So in mine, there's \$500-, \$400-something thousand dollars, \$467,000 I guess I am Row 29, no, yeah, there I am, \$467.4 in Column I. So I was supposed to come up with almost \$500,000 worth of recurring cost savings. And, you know, we did. I took a look at it, but when the sum of all of the cost cutting came up, we didn't make the target that we set for ourselves. And that's what led me to come back and look. Well, what can you do then? If we need to save money and we've tried to save money but we didn't come up with enough, everyone has to go back to the drawing board. And this is what I came up with. We're short on money, cost cutting didn't reach the goal, the printer reduction project is scheduled to save \$500,000 a year of costs by moving to cheaper ways of printing if we can get half of all the printing volume on campus to move from individual printers to shared printers. So, if you just think of it, 50 percent of printing is worth \$500,000 a year of savings. If we could do that more quickly, maybe that could be a way of meeting the cost cutting target. So I came back somewhat reluctantly because no CIO wants to do this project. People feel very personally about their printers, more so than most other parts of IT. And we said, if we could do this project in a couple of months instead of a couple of years, maybe that's a way to cut things instead of salary lines.

Now different governance committees have given me different advice on whether I should say that out loud. Some say, "Oh, don't bring that up, it's a sore subject." Others say, "You have to bring it up, because people need to know that we're down to the last set of choices." Because people were split. I don't know how you react to that statement. But this is how I think of it: I'd rather cut things than people. And if we can do with a little less convenience or if it's better for some, if we can do with a little more quality and speed and move to a different way of printing and still get most of our print needs met and save a half a million dollars a year every year forever, that would be good for me.

So I proposed that, and it was approved. And I'm very sorry that we're doing the project – I know that there's a lot of disappointment, especially in the faculty ranks. This is what I've been told, I haven't spoken to many of you personally, but you have vocal representatives at least who have carried the message to me to say you're not happy about having printers taken away. So I'm sorry we have to do the project. I'm sorry, but it's something that I do truly believe that we'll save money on.

The very first thing you need to do if you're going to talk about a printer project of this type, I mean sort of consolidation of printing, is you have to have a liberal exception policy, and we do. If anybody hasn't heard, or you haven't been made aware in your area yet, the only power to grant or deny exceptions that I've retained for myself is within my own division. And in my division, I've taken a very stern stance on printers, because I get to and that's how I want to run my area. I've

given one exception for my entire division of 190 people. And that person is our chief information security officer who has a marginally credible claim that he has security concerns that can't be addressed the way we do everyone else's. I make him re-justify that to me every three months, and I'm gonna get that printer sooner or later.

Other vice presidents can grant exceptions at their sole discretion within their division. And for the colleges, the deans have full exception-making authority. Now however that happens to play out in your college, whether you as a faculty member approach your dean directly, which I doubt, or whether your department chair works it out and they negotiate with the dean, or your business officer decides that whatever that is, that's your local decision because each of you and each of your areas, you have different special needs and requirements. We've granted, to my knowledge, over 400 exceptions so far and that's not bad. We have one college that has a lot of exceptions. I have the fewest percentage of exceptions that I know of. The typical exception rate is about 20 percent is what I'm seeing right now, 20-25 percent of any area ends up retaining printers for exceptions. So I hope that that alleviates some concerns.

I'll also say, yes, I have ways to keep printing private and secure. Yes, I do believe it's cheaper, and I'm not making that up. I've done some numbers that convinced me that it's cheaper, and I know that many of you do, or think you can, print more cheaply. And some of you are right, and I think some of you have overlooked – and I say “you” in an accusatory way, I'm sorry – but some areas that I've talked to don't count all of their costs. So I've tried to provide some tools to IT people and business managers across campus to help them consider all the same kinds of costs that I'm counting when I say how cheaply we can print on shared printers. That way it can be closer to an apples-to-apples comparison. I'll give one quick example: When people do inkjet printing, you might say, “I looked up on the manufacturer website. I can buy an ink cartridge for \$40 or \$25, something like that. It'll print 800 pages. But what you don't know is that every time you turn your printer off and on again, it goes through a self-cleaning cycle. Does anyone know how the self-cleaning cycle works? It sprays ink out of the ink cartridge through the nozzles into a sponge that's in your printer. So you don't get that amount of ink. The 800 pages is if you just start printing and you print 800 straight pages and nothing else happens. The other one is if you ever have clogged nozzles or misaligned nozzles. If you run a printer cleaning, again, it just sprays ink out until it clears it all out. Typically, 25 to 50 percent of your ink cartridge doesn't get used, it gets sprayed into your printer into that sponge. So a lot of people don't factor that in. That's part of why inkjets are an expensive way to print. I'm happy to talk about all of this stuff. There are benefits here.

I think the thing I hear most in the last two or three weeks is, “I have a special case around GAs. I have a special case around dual appointment faculty. I have a case about many people in a shared office space. They need to print to a grant and there are four different grants sharing one printer, how would we do that? And also about student employees. Using copy cards, debit cards, credit cards or courtesy cards – different parts of campus have different names for it – but there are these print copy cards that you can use. You get them from the card office. That solves almost every single case or request for exceptions that I've heard of. So for instance, if you have a student employee that works in two different offices, you could solve the problem of “I don't want them printing to my office when they're at somebody else's office. I don't want the charges for that other department's printing.” If each department had their own copy card and that's how the students were supposed to print, each department pays for the copy card. They hand the copy card to the

student employee. They use that and they hand it back in to the admin or whoever is helping with that, that's a way to solve the problem, and that's going to get us past a lot of the corner cases that I've heard so far.

I'm happy to talk more about those cases, but I think they solve a lot. Let me tell you about some things that we're not doing. We're not going to steal anybody's personal printers. I've heard several people say that they're going to bring their own printer in from home and print on that instead. The question is: Will DoIT take my personal printer away if I bring it in. No, I'm not going to steal your property. That's never been the case, I wouldn't think of it. I would also ask you to please not bring your personal printer in from home. And here I'm not giving a legal opinion, and I'm not the ethics officer. I'm just giving you my personal opinion in this, but I hope to persuade as many of you as possible. We have enough trouble at NIU today. Even if you swear – and even if you do say – that if your department is going to buy the ink cartridges and you promise you're only going to print work-related things on your printer with NIU-purchased ink, I just don't like that blurring of the lines. I know that you can make that perfectly fair and reasonable and equitable, but I would ask you: why bring that on us? I don't want to merge the state's purchased ink in your personal asset. But again, I'm not speaking from a legal or I'm not speaking from an ethics officer perspective. I just don't need that trouble, and I have asked all IT people on campus, please don't do this in your area. But again, colleges, you have lots of autonomy. So it's not a rule, but I'm begging you.

I'm not denying repairs for anybody's printer. You don't have to walk to another building in the snow and the rain to get it because we took your printer away and the nearest shared printer is two buildings away from you. No, if you're not getting a printer in your area because there's only three people and you don't do enough printing to justify a big shared printing machine, it's just an exception. Grant yourself an exception, or ask your department chair or your VP to get you an exception, and keep your local printer. That's a great use for a printer. Other uses of exceptions is I have a documented physical disability, and it's a hardship for me to walk down the hall to get that. Okay, that's fine. Liberal exception policy. Not an issue. We're not taking grant funding printers.

These were a set of questions where we kind of had questions – or a set of topics where we had questions along the way. I don't want to go through those necessarily. I think I just want to say: What's the next step? I think right now at this moment the next step is: Tell me what you think about this. Ask me some questions. Let me see if I can give you information that will make it better for you, or that will help me make a change to the project to address something I hadn't considered before.

I'm sorry, you in back, sir, and then you in front. And then I'll come over here.

**J. Stephen:** I don't know if this has been resolved yet, but before the winter break, the secretaries in my office were worried that we'd be reduced to our one big machine, which I have to admit is a really slick machine. I can email myself scans, and I can post my notes. It's a wonderful machine. But they were under the impression that that would be the only machine for a rather large department, the math department. And there were two things they were worried about: One is the production of confidential documents by the office manager, which should not go to a public place where other people go. And the second concern was: If something goes wrong with our main printer, we're too busy, we need another printer. And it may be perhaps true that Dean McCord has



made an exception and let us keep this one laser printers – we only use laser printers anyway – but I’m not sure of that. And I think for the larger departments that the idea of needing a second printer for confidential materials and for back-up is something that’s important.

**B. Coryell:** This may set the trend for the answers that I give you today. I agree with some of what you said, and I want to challenge some of what you said. So a second printer, a back-up printer, I’ve told many, many groups that having an emergency back-up printer is a great idea for several reasons. One is, what if we have a big network problem and nothing is flowing over the network. Doesn’t someone need to keep – you can imagine there’s a grant deadline of some sort, and maybe you have to print something, although I don’t know, maybe we do all electronic submission now. Whatever the reason is, there’s a deadline, you’ve got to get something done that has to be printed, you can’t get to the network, what do you do? There’s an emergency back-up printer for business continuity purposes. I’m all in favor of that. If your department doesn’t have one, you should ask for one. And I would support going to your dean and saying, “No, big departments, there’s no problem with having one of those, let’s get together on it.”

I wouldn’t say you need a second printer for confidentiality purposes. Some people today, you print it and it appears within arm’s length on the printer in your office, and that’s a good way to assure confidentiality. But there are also cases where, let’s say that printer isn’t working, it’s out of toner, it’s jammed, whatever that is, you don’t have the latest print drivers, I hear it all the time. Then the most common thing I hear is that people will email it to somebody else and then they’ll print the document and you’ll get it from that person. But then you have to remember to ask them to delete that document. And then – I don’t know if anybody thinks about this but now it’s deleted, that just means it’s sitting in the deleted folder. So you have to ask them to delete it from the deleted mail as well to really get rid of it.

Or some people talk about they’re in a shared printer environment today but not a globally shared. So you have a departmental printer you can print to, so you print it and then you spring down the hall to make sure you get to that shared printer before somebody else. There is no print-and-sprint with the anywhere printing. The way it works is you print that, and it doesn’t go to a printer, it goes to the data center where it sits on a machine until you walk up to any one of the 400 anywhere printers on campus and you swipe a card. And only when you’re standing in front of that machine and you swipe your card, will it start printing your device. So it’s secure from a network, transmission and encryption point of view, that’s not an issue. It’s stored securely in the data center if you don’t come pick it up for a while, that’s not an issue. And you don’t have really the chance to have documents just laying around on a printer where, for whatever reason, you haven’t been able to get to. It’s secure from that point of view as well.

So I think I’m satisfied with that as an answer and I want you to be too.

**J. Stephen:** Well, I’m not but we can use the back-up. We still have worries about like if we have 20 graduate student contracts we have to print out.

**B. Coryell:** You bet. Another option that people will have – and this isn’t going to work in every area – if you want to know where the printers are in your building, your local IT person has a list of what all those are. But I’d be happy to send the list to Greg or Pat, and we’ll get that distributed to

this committee as well. You can go to any other printer. So if someone's printing a big job, they won't get off of the printer, if your printer is broken for some reason but the network is fine, there are 399 other printers on campus including – maybe – one right down the hall. So you show up at this printer, it's busy, you just walk another 20 steps down the hall, you swipe at that printer instead. There are 400 back-ups on campus.

**J. Stephen:** Will you revisit this if a department or a section actually can demonstrate that they need, say two of these big high-volume machines

**B. Coryell:** Yes, and the way to do that is to work through your local IT point of contact. Since you're in math in CLAS, Aleks Kosoric is your guy. Now if we do put additional printers in, we're going to save all of those until the end of the deployment. So look towards the end of the semester for that. I can't change the scheduling and the logistics chain that I've got going right now to put a second printer in.

**J. Stephen:** Oh no, we're fine now.

**B. Coryell:** If you're fine now, you're good.

**J. Stephen:** Because we've got five of them.

**B. Coryell:** Protracted answer, so I apologize.

**G. Long:** And for our purposes, to keep the meeting moving, let's have like one more question because I think things can – we can certainly send questions to Brett, or you can funnel them through me, and we can get answers and bring them back to you. I just want to make sure we've got other topics to address today too.

**B. Coryell:** You pick then.

**G. Long:** Paul and Hamid. Oh, I'm sorry, did I miss? Cathy, I'm sorry.

**C. Carlson:** I have a couple of questions. First of all, you talk about security. Our printers jam all the time. So if I've printed, I'm chair of the Personnel Committee, I printed somebody's document that says they're not going to get tenure, it jams, do I walk away?

**B. Coryell:** Hopefully, you clear the jam and the job continues.

**C. Carlson:** Well, sometimes you can't.

**B. Coryell:** If you can't, that's a rarity, but I can't deny that it happens. If the job jams and you can't clear it, you can cancel the job. Now there's still a page in there that's half-printed and, again, that's something that we just don't, there is no answer for it, it's a physical problem, it's not an IT problem.

**C. Carlson:** Okay, and I have two more things. One is a general statement. I just think that this is disrespectful of my time. You say a printer is 20 steps. It's 200, 400 feet away. It's down the hall past 16 offices and behind a locked door for every single item I want to print. That's the way it is.

But advising, I have to advise students all the time. We have to print them and have them sign them. So do I take them out of my office because my purse is in there, my computer is in there, my tests are in there. Have them sit out in the hall, lock the door, walk my 200 yards down to the printer, come back, and let them in my office, I mean it's just awkward.

**B. Coryell:** By far the most common exception that I've seen is for advising. So if you are an advisor and that's not a valid exception in your college, I would just say it's time to revisit that with your dean.

**C. Carlson:** Everybody in the nursing department is an advisor. That's part of our job description, and we have to.

**G. Long:** As faculty, that's an expectation for us. I think it's a hard thing because that's – I share Cathy's concerns too.

**B. Coryell:** Different colleges have treated that in different ways, and some colleges have been more liberal with advising exceptions, some have been more restrictive with advising exceptions for printing. I don't know what to tell you on that. It's a local decision.

**C. Carlson:** Okay, so the dean.

**G. Long:** And then we had Paul and Hamid, questions, and then we'll move on.

**P. Stoddard:** Why are you here now instead of last semester before the decision was made? Why weren't faculty consulted about this?

**B. Coryell:** That's a fair question. This, and most IT projects, don't go through the formal four different shared governance methods in order to get approval for going. There's a separate path for IT governance projects that has academic representation. So this went first the IT directors, which isn't really a governing body. It went to the IT Steering Committee, and they have seen and voted on it.

**P. Stoddard:** Who's on that from the faculty?

**B. Coryell:** The membership that includes some – so the faculty member is Andreas Glatz, who is here with us today. Sue Mini is on that, and Dean McCord is on that, all sharing an academic perspective.

**G. Long:** I think, just as a perspective, I mean you and I have talked about this before that I do share Paul's concern in that I recognize that you had a short amount of time to deal with this, but as things go on further, enjoining us at the beginning of the conversation would have been a much better way of coming up with a strategy so you'd have better buy-in from us.

**B. Coryell:** I agree and, even if this project wasn't going to go through the four shared governance committees to get a yes or no because there's a different path for approving most IT projects, I would have liked to have come to you in September. But September was the time when we made that acceleration decision and, honestly, I was embedded in the logistics of how are we going to turn this into a two-month project in probably February or March, and I wasn't thinking enough about communications. And it would have helped me a lot, and I think it would have helped all of you a lot if you would have heard, even as an FYI or what are your concerns so I can do it in planning, if I could have done that in September instead of starting that process in November, which is when I did start with shared governance.

**G. Long:** Okay. And then final question, Hamid?

**H. Bateni:** In addition to what Paul said, I know I received actually a lot of feedback. Faculty were concerned about not knowing about this. We received an email one day saying that within the next two weeks or so the printer is going to be taken out of your office and done. So people were worried about that.

But a second thing I would like to, I want to ask a question. I think NIU could have saved even more money with a different approach. If the aim is to go to a shared printer, your office could simply say, "From now on, we are not going to support office printers anymore." Because my understanding is you collect all these old printers and you threw them out. They still have cartridges and they still have the potential to print hundreds of pages. Basically you are wasting all of those. But if you would say, "We are not going to support this anymore," faculty first of all, I guarantee you would have saved, NIU would have saved on paper because faculty would be more conscious to print out because they knew once the printer is out of ink, they have to walk to the shared printer. And second, you would have saved all the ink in those old printers for a long time, and that would give you time also to install those shared printers. So that approach, I think, would have saved a lot more money than the approach saying, "Well, all the printers." And then you can't even imagine how much of time IT people are spending to figure out where are these old printers. We didn't have any record of it. They have to walk through the offices. I could see them days by days walking through the offices to figure that out. And even more than that, how much time faculty spent to write a justification that I need a printer in my office. And I don't know how much our deans are going to spend to turn those justifications down or accept it. So these are all times that are going to be spent, I think, that didn't really need to be spent.

**B. Coryell:** Thanks. Thank you for those comments. It's true, and I acknowledge the fact that part of the cost calculations for the savings did not include the cost of time spent writing justifications for keeping exception printers. Didn't even think about that when I first authored the business case back in 2015. Very true. Nor did I account for the cost of trying to find all the existing printers that we have. I think that's a blind spot. Maybe I just assumed that we had better asset tracking than that. But we don't and so there has been a lot of time trying to even just be able to say how many printers are on campus. It's a fairly basic question that IT units all over campus, those in your areas and those that report to me, we should all have better track on that and we didn't.

There is a fair place to say that the cost of the abandoned ink cartridges and the remaining useful life of a printer before it just breaks down and cannot be repaired profitably anymore, there's a fair place to say that those are real dollars that we're throwing away. There's also an equally valid or strong argument – and you just have to decide for yourself whether it's fair or not – there's another one to say that the money for that purchase has already left NIU, and some printers have an operating cost that's so high, you're more, it's more to your advantage to get on cheaper printing today than to try to run those anymore. People have been on both sides of that argument. And in addition to the governance, we've talked about this in cabinet multiple times. We've talked about it in an operations cabinet multiple times. There's an Executive Budget Committee that's looked at this on probably three different occasions and, at some point, you just have to make a choice and say, there are about four or five different layers of looking at it, and some of them are dollars and cents based. Some of them are strategic based. Some of them are culturally based. Should we all go through this change at once and just get it over with, or should we waste seven years until every printer on campus ages out and make that migration. Eventually, we made a choice and said, "This is where we're going." When the transition happens, then certainly the operating cost is lower, the value of the things we're throwing away, that's a fair point. And ultimately, in the decision-making process, it was outweighed by other factors that were not monetary. But I appreciate what you're saying, and I acknowledge the truth of it.

**G. Long:** And what I would suggest for us again as the senate is to write down any questions, concerns. I mean there's no reason that we can't continue our conversation with Brett. I don't want to use any more time today on this. Thank you very much for coming and sharing the rationale for this. We may not all agree with the decision, but at least there's a rationale to it. And I think we will follow up as well, just in terms of any questions and even just the monitoring of it, because we can talk about it right now. My biggest concern is the productivity issue of how much of my time is wasted and so forth. But over time, we'll have better data on that and I would just suggest as a group that we continue our vigilance on this.

**B. Coryell:** Thank you very much.

**G. Long:** Thank you.

- C. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award – [call for nominations](#) – Page 6  
Written letters of nomination should be submitted to Faculty Senate President  
Greg Long no later than noon Wednesday, Feb. 15, 2017.

**G. Long:** All right next thing is the Faculty Senate consideration is the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. It's described on page 6 of your agenda packet. This award recognizes an NIU faculty member for special service to the faculty, and that's really basically all it says. There's no additional detail on that. And as noted on page 6, please send nomination letters to me with additional information no later than noon on Wednesday, Feb. 15. Okay, so just an information. Any question on that?

**J. Stephen:** Have we found out where that plaque in the Holmes Student Center is yet?

**G. Long:** Does anyone know where the plaque is. It's right outside the cabinet room, oh the Capitol Room.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, so it's back where it used to be, because they took it down for a while.

**P. Erickson:** It's a new location.

**J. Stephen:** Oh yeah, that's right, the Capitol Room.

**G. Long:** Okay, thanks.

## **VII. CONSENT AGENDA**

## **VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- A. Program Prioritization – Chris McCord, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
Faculty Senate feedback on password protection of action reports

**G. Long:** We no items for the consent agenda. Under unfinished business, as usual, we have a Program Prioritization. Matt Streb is not here today, he's unavailable. Chris McCord's been asked to come and fill in, give a little update. One thing before we get started and hear from Chris, though, I did want to share a question from Provost Freeman. When the reports were initially released last spring, the Faculty Senate asked that access to those reports be password protected, which was, in fact, how they were done – I mean the task force reports, not the actual reports, excuse me – when the task force reports were released last spring, they were password protected. Provost Freeman did the same thing when most recently the action reports were released, that they're password protected. She raised the question to me: Do we still feel a need to have those documents be password protected. So I'm just asking you that as a question. If you have a strong feeling, one way or the other, I mean my tendency is to remove the password protection, but that's my decision to make. I want your feedback, please. Does anyone have a thought about it? Kendall Thu.

**K. Thu:** My response is I think it's time to take the password protection off. I think the original reason for putting the password protection on had to do with allowing the – if I remember correctly – allowing the campus to discuss the results and not get it into the public eye and having. I'm not sure I agree with that, but that was the rationale at the time, and that's no longer the case.

**G. Long:** Okay. Are there any alternative feelings to that?

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Do we have to do a motion to go ahead and say that?

**G. Long:** We don't have to, but we certainly can. I mean it wasn't a movement. So, Kendall, do you want to make the motion?

**K. Thu:** Well I'm just saying it would send a message to

**G. Long:** Right, right. So it's clear, I mean, versus me just saying, hey, the senate was okay.

**K. Thu:** So I'll make a motion to dispense with the password protection.

**G. Long:** George seconds it. Any further discussion on this? All in favor say aye?

**Members:** Aye.

**G. Long:** Opposed? Okay, very good. Chris, turn it over to you for a few minutes.

**C. McCord:** Okay, thank you. So quite a bit has happened since the November senate meeting, so I'd like to give you a brief update and give you the opportunity to ask questions. The president's progress report on Program Prioritization was released the end of November. That focused primarily on the administrative task force and the results coming out of that. Provost Freeman at the same time released the academic affairs division's action plan, which largely represented the response to the academic task force recommendations. As you know, Matt Streb and I have been assisting in moving forward the recommendations coming out of the administrative task force since that's primarily what I'm going to comment on.

A few numbers first. Matt and I totaled up the recommendations, the calls for next steps reports, and we totaled up 80 action steps or reports that were called for in the president's report. Many of those are simply requests for more information. There were 20 identified specified calls for reduction or reallocation of resources. There were 10 places where at least a preliminary investigation of the possibility of outsourcing was identified. There were about 30 programs that were recommended to the Executive Budget Committee for prioritization against possible enhancement.

So in very broad terms, the president's report had four kinds of statements that it made about the – recommendations made by the task force and then the action steps called for by the vice presidents as a result. The president's report basically identified one of four things: Either the task force had recommended a reduction and the president said, yes, I agree with that recommendation. Vice President, give me the plan for how you're going to make this reduction happen. As I said, there were about 30 of those specified in the report. There were a few places – and I'm sorry I don't have a count on this one – there were a few places where reduction or elimination recommendations were not accepted by the president. They were recommendations. Recommendations may meet with agreement or not. The canonical example you probably heard more than once was there is a recommendation to merge the law school admissions with graduate school admissions. And the sense, upon further evaluation, was that wasn't actually a healthy thing for either of those programs. It was an understandable recommendation, but ultimately, not an acceptable recommendation.

There were action steps that seemed to essentially be revenue, or resource neutral. And the president had the option of either saying, "In principle, this is a good thing, go do it," or "No, even though it's revenue/resource neutral, I don't think this is a good idea, don't go do it." So it made recommendations of that type.

And then there were the recommendations that had resource requirements. Those were then directed to the Executive Budget Committee for prioritization. So I know this was a Program Prioritization process that's been running for some time, but this is now moving, the program narratives were not,

really budget documents. The action steps that came out of them are the things that carry budgetary consequences. It's those action steps that are now going to the Executive Budget Committee for prioritization. So a lot of the material has now moved forward and is sort of in one of those four dispositions.

The other things that are still moving forward are: Those recommendations were fairly granular. Those were recommendations about specific action steps for specific programs. There were a lot of places where we said, what's really needed is to step back and take a holistic look across multiple units at a larger issue. Those we dubbed "complex conversations." So those complex conversations are all moving along at various paces. Some reports have been submitted, and in some cases, essentially they've been fully acted upon. One of the recommendations was to create a consolidated institutional effectiveness office. That's been acted on. That's essentially a done thing. IT customer support – a group has been making an intensive study of that. That report's been submitted and is now moving towards implementation. Advising and tutoring and academic support – Reports have been submitted to the president, the president's reviewing them, making determinations about what action to then follow up based on those recommendations from the complex conversation. Reports are coming soon on complex conversations about retention, about external programming, about online and off-campus programs. And then a little further down the road, in some cases deliberately lagged for external reasons, there's longer-term conversations about how to structure conference and events services, how to handle school connections, how to deal with community relations.

As somebody who's been here and been here for ten years and been in higher education for 30 years, this is real stuff. The task force recommendations are catalyzing real movement, and I think the breadth and depth of the actions that are coming out of the task force recommendations is one of the most substantial I've seen in my time in higher education. So, I can say the administrative task force's recommendations are producing real follow-on action. And Matt and I are very much involved in making sure that all that stays on task. So, happy to answer any specific questions you have.

**G. Long:** Any question for Dean McCord. Chris, I mean, excuse me, Kendall.

**K. Thu:** So Chris, one of my very smart, astute colleagues pointed out to me that we now have a universe that the university has structured in which we know where all the administrative programs are. They're in this one category and we have all the academic programs in another category. And for each of those programs, we have costs. It would be not a – fairly straightforward – task if we could add up all the budgets for the administrative side. And I'm not suggesting that you do this, but maybe you can assign a committee. And then all the budgets on the academic side, to see how much money we're spending on both, and then perhaps track that going forward. We know what the national trend is in terms of number of administrators that are being added to universities, and this one is no exception. I would think that that would be a way for all of us to have a universe of administrative versus academic expenditures. And then we could further subdivide the administrative side into different kinds of programs. This might be a suggestion for some sort of committee. But if you want to comment on that, Chris.

**C. McCord:** It is my belief, not based on first-person involvement in such activities, it's my belief that that already does take place, and that those numbers are already benchmarked, tracked and



reported to IPEDS. And so I think that's where a lot of the benchmarking against national averages for peer institutions comes from. I don't disagree with your fundamental suggestion. I think that it may not be a new opportunity, but I think the value of what you're proposing is clear – that, yes, by all means we want to know what our administrative overhead is and benchmark our administrative overhead against peer institutions. I fully agree.

**G. Long:** Anything else? Thank you very much, Chris.

**C. McCord:** Thank you all.

## **IX. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Discussion of [Dec. 22 Baker Report](#) – Pages 7-14  
President Baker's [response](#) to Steering Committee questions  
Michael Haji-Sheikh's [report](#)

**G. Long:** Okay, moving along, under new business. We have one item under new business. It stems from questions and concerns raised about the December 22 Baker Report, which is included on page 9 of your packet, and it's titled Correcting Course – New policies enhance transparency. As background, several individuals contacted me after the December 22 Baker Report came out to request a special meeting. I conferred with a number of people. The earliest we could have had a special meeting is September [January] the 18<sup>th</sup>. We're meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup>, and in terms of getting things out to people, the decision was reached to have this be presented today. And this was done in consultation with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. So I did not make these decisions of my own without getting some feedback. So I've shared these concerns with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, as well as the University Council Steering Committee. So both steering committees had the December 22 Baker Report on their agenda. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee agreed that the first step in a response to this would be to pose some questions to President Baker and have him respond to them. That is document that you've got here. The reason things weren't sent out to you – you also have a second document I'll mention in a second – the reason this was not sent out to you ahead of time was that the Faculty Senate [Steering Committee] met last week on Wednesday. Per our protocol, we need to review things prior to them going out, and so this didn't hit our office until today. The other document that you've got was also received after the Faculty Senate Steering Committee meeting. So we're bringing these in to you today as walk-in items. We want you, you know, I want you to look at them. I want you to read them. I recognize that the dissemination of them, you know, at a meeting, particularly the complexity of these and depth of these, are hard to deal with in a very short time. But I did want to bring both sets of reports to you, if you would.

So if you're curious about the specific questions on pages 7 and 8, you can see the email request that I sent forward to President Baker saying that both the Faculty Senate and University Council steering committees had questions. These questions were also shared with the Operating Staff and SPS council staff to get their input. So what you have in front of you is President Baker's response to the questions. You have a second document from Professor Mike Haji-Sheikh, this one, The Case, where he lays out concerns with regard to perceived financial mismanagement over time. So at this point, we'll open it for discussion. Kendall.

**K. Thu:** So I was one of the faculty members that contacted Greg after the December 22 Baker Report was released. And I struggled with how to respond to it because I was immediately pissed off because of the nature, the content, of the report and, of course, the timing. And set within the backdrop of Baker wanting to have more transparency, then we have a report in response to problems that are taking place on a Friday before Christmas when everybody's gone. Now he responds to that in his report. So I'm the author of the first six questions. Those are the ones that I formulated. Greg did a little editing, I know, but essentially they're the same thing.

And I thought the first step for me was I wanted – and I discussed this with some of my colleagues – is I wanted him to respond to specific questions that I elicited from the three newspaper articles that had come out about what's going on. And bear in mind this was, in my mind, in my experience, was a press release of a Baker Report that was part of a cumulative series of events that have occurred over the last several years in the Baker administration. This one really torked my jib. And so I need some time – and there's a lot of overlap I can see between what Baker responded to in his memorandum to the Faculty Senate and some of the things that Michael Haji-Sheikh is raising. And so I'm going to have to have some time to do an A/B comparison and sort through these before I can sort out in my own mind what I would like to see next. But I would like to see the responses from my colleagues.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** I'd like to add something to that. Hi everybody. I want to point out that Dr. Long has the annotated hotlink version of the pdfs and some supporting documentation on one issue only, okay? So he was joking about 145 pages. Well, that's 145 pages of information on only one of the issues. What I have given you, to tell you how serious I take it, I was under what's called whistleblower protection, okay? Because I came across so me documents in which I found that there were difficult issues for me to take as a faculty member and there's a fundamental rule of the state is that if you see something that you believe is essentially wrong, you're required by state law to turn it in to the OEIG. So the moment you guys have this, I'm basically not covered anymore, okay? But what I want you to understand is that it's a lot of little things, not just one big thing, okay? But the one thing that's on the very back is the whistleblower, it was about the road change, I think I mentioned it a couple times. What I found out was that the, Dr. Baker has a friend name Ron Walters and another friend named Jim Heid. Jim Heid did the Bold Visions plan. Once you do a plan like that by state law, it doesn't matter where the funds came from, you're required to not be able to take any subcontracts. I found out there was at least three subcontracts he had worked on that was based on the Bold Visions plans. I have talked to the attorney on campus over that. I also found that the changes in the roads were decided a year ahead of the emergency that was called. So it was never an emergency to ask for half a million dollars. They just decided to put it off for a year. And then, you know, the bus, now they have a 30-foot variance.

The other thing that's in that last part is that you'll find that Dr. Phillips had signed the contract that was dated effective November 11, 2014. Well if you look close on the contract, actually the form was actually dated 8/15/2015 or something like that, I can't remember the exact date on that, it's highlighted. The other funny thing about that contract was he didn't work here when it was effective, so he didn't date, it was never dated under ????. So it appears to the casual observer that the contract was given normally. But it turns out and appears that after they granted the contract, the money was all spent, the year later they actually filled out the contract. In the end, that's what it turned out being. And that was one of those that for Mr. Heid, or Jim Heid, who works for a

company called Urban Green. He ended up being a subcontractor a company called Knight E/A. So I just wanted you to understand it's fairly complex. I tried to make sure that it was easy to ready. There are supporting documentation that Dr. Long has. If you want it, you can contact him, or you can contact me.

**G. Long:** Actually, as part of the meeting minutes and so forth, they will be part of the record. And so the electronic links will be available. We just didn't, you know.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Oh you're not going to print 145 pages. I never expected that.

**G. Long:** Given the volume of things, we couldn't print it out, but the links that are associated with the meeting will be

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Speaking of the cost of printing.

**G. Long:** Right, exactly, yeah. Yeah, do it on your own personal printers please. No. Exactly. Exactly.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Thank you everybody.

G. Long: Other comments, questions. John.

**J. Novak:** I just have a question about the nature of the sensitivity of these two documents. Are these documents that I should be disseminating to my colleagues or not? I just don't know.

**G. Long:** There's nothing to prohibit you from disseminating these because, I mean, these are going to be posted on the Faculty Senate/University Council website. We're giving the same, exact information to University Council, so there is no sense of keeping this. I mean, it's not going to be able to be kept private even if you wanted to, so.

**J. Novak:** Okay, thank you.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** And all the information was FOIA'ed.

**G. Long:** Yeah that, thank you for saying that, because that is one thing I checked when Mike sent me this document, and there were additional attachments to it. Again this is part of my learning experience but, yeah, anything that has been obtained through a FOIA action is publishable. So the materials that you see that are linked to this document have all been FOIA'ed and they're all okay to be published. Cathy.

**C. Carlson:** What is the process after this? What's going forward?

**G. Long:** Well, I think there are a variety of things that we could do. Certainly, from my perspective right now, I would be not at all of the opinion that by having these two documents in hand that I could make any sort of decision today based on time to review and time to think about this. To me, I would prefer that we think about having a thorough discussion of this and having

people having read both documents. If you have additional questions, you know, please put them together, but that we do this in a very scholarly and thoughtful fashion, because in the big picture, I know there, you know, people feel that there's a rush to this, but we can't rush to judgment on this. Part of the initial request that I had on this, to be perfectly honest with you, were to have it be considered a vote of no confidence, right? And were we to do such an action – again I'm the facilitator here, I'm not trying to play one side or the other, but I would play the side that if we go that route, it needs to be done so in a way that's entirely defensible, that we followed our rules and protocols. So that's my take on where we go.

Baker has said that he would be willing to – President Baker – has said that he would be willing to come and talk with us personally. So, I mean, we could have that as an action. But I did want to give you a little bit of history and then, George.

**G. Slotsve:** I also just wanted to add, Greg, that I'd like some time to take this back to my department and have discussions with members of my department, as well, to get their feedback before any votes. That would be the other thing that I would ask people to do is to have a broad discussion with who you represent, what group you represent.

**G. Long:** Right, because the idea of a broad discussion, I mean that's why we just didn't limit this to Faculty Senate, because this isn't just a Faculty Senate issue, this is a university issue, which is why this has also been shared with the University Council. So that's, you know I am doing my best to work through the system to let as many people know the concerns that are being raised and that both perspectives that are being shared on this. Kendall.

**K. Thu:** Greg, I agree wholeheartedly with what you said and also with what George has said. I think it might be useful to say as a process going forward, let's take this back to our departments and solicit the feedback of our colleagues. And perhaps have this as an agenda item for the next Faculty Senate so that we have a date and an ongoing process where we can maintain the continuity.

**G. Long:** Right. Well as an item of new business, one thing we can do with this that would follow Robert's Rules of Order would be to make a motion to postpone, because we don't really have an action for today. But we could postpone until next meeting with the goal of that meeting being to have significant time devoted to a discussion of this topic. Mitch.

**M. Irwin:** Thanks, Greg. I think I agree with everything that's been said so far. But I think I would just add one thing. Do we need time to take this home and read it, yes. Do we need time to share it with our colleagues, yes. I think the third piece that I would like to see is some expertise on what the Faculty Senate can do. Is it just a case of a vote saying we're unhappy? Or is there precedent here? What are the possible paths forward? I know that we need to think about who President Baker's boss is, and I guess that's the Board of Trustees, but I don't know that the Faculty Senate has an official line of communication with them. Can we ask for some clarity on, depending on how we feel after we assess the information, what possible pathways there are? I don't know if that's you that has that information or somebody else.

**G. Long:** Well, I mean as with anything else, we can always make a motion, we can always make a resolution, we can convey things forward. And even, I mean, we've done our homework and I give

a tip of the hat to Pat, because went back and looked through the archives of past Faculty Senate meetings. We have no, there's no precedent for calling a special meeting of the senate. There's nothing in our bylaws that support that, and also historically, we've had no similar kinds of votes of no confidence of the president. We also looked and found a couple of articles on, you know, outcomes of votes of no confidence, because I'm trying to get some background on that. And even that varies greatly on the institution and how it's approached. And even when you do that, it goes up to the Board of Trustees, because that's ultimately their decision. So the Board of Trustees is the group that ultimately, if as a senate we decide that we need to convince someone, that's probably the group. Mike.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** You did have Clyde Wingfield is ??? no confidence. There was a no confidence

**G. Long:** No, no there was not. No we absolutely. I've got. Pat has pulled those Faculty Senate records.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Okay, so we never did have. Because the old-timers say they had it.

**G. Long:** No. There was a – and Ferald might have talked about this as well – there was a very contentious Faculty Senate where President Wingfield came here and people gave him massive amounts of grief, and he did subsequently step down soon thereafter, but there was no formal vote taken by the senate. I can promise you that, we've looked into that.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** I have one other thing to remind everybody. The defense of this issue has cost the university \$185,000 out of state budget. It's clearly, when I looked it up, the money came out of state budget. \$165,000 for the OEIG investigation, \$20,000 for the contract investigation. There's a budget maximum of \$225,000 so it could go up to \$225,000. The other thing that I want to point out that is – this is – you know, we're talking about how we can go forward with this. I think we should continue discussing it myself. I've never said that this should go straight to a no confidence vote. I've always said that this has got to come up in discussion. But this is, this is, I did get a FOIA request, I FOIA requested this reports, the reports we're talking about, and got denied. And the denial gave me about five – I can pass that on to Greg too. But there's about five different reasons, and there was a confusion because when they first gave me the FOIA, they said, federal investigation report. And I said what, is this federal investigation or not? And so there's some fuzziness on that too. So they need to clarify what they mean because they've given four different organizations this information. And there are six reports, not just two. That came out in FOIA.

**G. Long:** Thank you.

**E. Shin:** I would like to ask a question. The Baker Report says that in the – they have adopted an upgrade to the whistleblower policy, and I would be wondering what upgrade has been made. The whistleblower policy, what upgrade has been made.

**G. Long:** Sure, we can ask that. George.

**G. Slotsve:** Greg, I just wanted to make a motion to postpone some of the discussion and then maybe we can be able to email questions that arise that we can try to address. But can I make a motion to postpone so we have that formally on the books.

**G. Long:** You can make that, but we need to specify a date. We can't do that as a just postpone. So we would postpone until our next meeting.

**G. Slotsve:** Postpone until our next meeting is what I was meaning.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** I'll second that.

**G. Long:** Do we have further discussion on this? Virginia and then Cathy.

**V. Naples:** I may be the president of the United Faculty Alliance, the tenured and tenure-track faculty union, which has just been put together, and we do not yet have a contract, but I am, at this point, speaking exclusively for myself as a faculty member, I do not know how many of you have been here for a very long period of time, but I am in my 33<sup>rd</sup> year, so I am at least one of the longer-term residents of this university. And one of the things that I would like to say in all of that time, this kind of problem is unprecedented. I have never seen anything that has astonished me as this has and has disappointed me as greatly as this has, especially in a climate where the budget is already severely impacted. So I would also like to urge everyone to share this information, to think about it, to process it, to talk to your colleagues, to ask questions, and to decide how you would like to go forward, and be active in bringing that information to the Faculty Senate or to anyone else.

In terms of what the faculty does, we are governed by the Board of Trustees. We do not actually work for our administration, both we and the present administration, as all the previous and future administrations, work as well for the Board of Trustees. This kind of activity on our part will send a very important message to the Board of Trustees that the faculty care about what is happening for the direction of their university, that we are aware of what is going on, and that we want to know that the university is moving forward in a responsible and ethical manner that will forward the mission for all of us and all of our benefits, faculty, staff, students and everyone else.

**G. Long:** Thank you. Cathy.

**C. Carlson:** I have just a simple question. Are we going to be supplied electronic copies of these?

**G. Long:** Yes. Well I mean it will be in the, you'll have links to them, so we're not going to send pdfs, but we'll send links to the articles and all.

**C. Carlson:** Not the entire article, not these two documents as they are?

**G. Long:** Oh yeah, we can send those to you as pdfs.

**C. King:** I just have a question. When I read Baker's address to the Faculty Senate, he said that, you know, all he did have consulted the Board of Trustees. Is that true?

**G. Long:** And I'm not in a position to make any statements one way or the other. I don't have any data on that. But again, that's part of the, so let's write that down as a question. The one ask that I would make of all of you is please think of questions, please send them my way. The Steering Committee meets the week before the next Faculty Senate meeting. It would be very, very helpful to have your questions to me. I'm giving you a three-week window here, because I don't think it's fair to bring someone in and have no, you know, just shoot from the hip and ask a question. That doesn't mean we can't have some flexibility, but my encouragement would be that we invite President Baker for the next meeting, or would you rather wait and have a discussion first?

**K. Thu:** I would prefer to have a discussion amongst our own first unless anybody strenuously disagrees with that. I think we need to digest these documents, discuss it with our faculty members, and then come back and have a discussion amongst ourselves.

**G. Long:** I'm very comfortable with that approach. Is that something that, as a body, we're good with? All right so George had made a motion to postpone further discussion until the next meeting. Did we have a second on that?

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** I seconded it already.

**G. Long:** Oh, Mike seconded, okay. Any further discussion on that idea? All in favor, say aye?

**Members:** Aye.

**G. Long:** Opposed? Okay, so we've got that. I apologize on time today. We're just is a really, really full schedule. I'm trying to move us along. So we're okay with that.

## **X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

### **A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report**

**G. Long:** As we move forward, reports from advisory boards, Paul, did you have anything you wanted to say?

**P. Stoddard:** Well I do have a report from FAC. In deference to the time, I'm going to skip most of the introductory stuff and boring stuff. But at the end of the meeting, Tom Cross, who is the chair of the board, the new chair of the board, came by and sat with us for an hour or so and answered questions. Cross was appointed by Gov. Rauner about nine months ago and, as such, I was very concerned that he'd be a yes-man to the governor who has yet to show that he is much of a friend for higher education. Cross, I think, went some ways to allaying a lot of those fears. He does seem to value higher education in Illinois. He's very concerned about the MAP grants. He noted that in 2001 we had 100 percent coverage for MAP. We need close to \$5 billion to do that now, and he thinks the current budget, such that it is, only calls for \$2.75 billion. He's looking for full funding of MAP as one of his priorities.

He was asked about changes to higher education by somebody from Northern, as it turns out, and one of the parts of the question had to do with potential mergers of institutions that are having

trouble. He said he knows of no talk about that in the administration. So Chicago State, for example, there was talk of merging it with UIC. But he has not heard anything specific about that.

The more important part of that question, in my opinion, had to do with changing the emphasis of higher education from liberal arts to more of a vocational training. He said he has heard no discussion from the administration about an abrupt change in that direction.

**G. Long:** It's only partially comforting.

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, exactly. But he personally seemed to value – he said we need to train students for careers, but not at the expense of a liberal arts education. Those are his words. He was also asked by someone, how do we best communicate with legislatures. He said, keep it simple stupid. Basically, his suggestion is that we find five or ten of the things – in our case, Northern – does best and always hit legislators over the head with that. We're training these kids to do this; we're doing that; we're doing this; we're doing the following. And just hit them with it over and over again and convince them.

His final point – and I'll leave out some of the middle ones there – you know, his most important agenda items for the IBHE are to get a budget passed, whatever influence he might have in doing that. And to remind, or to sell, everybody in the legislature and in the public on the assets that our higher education institutions offer to the state of Illinois. And so, I mean, it was somewhat comforting. I did ask him afterwards, you know, I mentioned that I was afraid of his yes-man role. He said, I told him when I took the job I'm not anybody's lap dog. So, hopefully, he means that.

**G. Long:** Okay, thank you. Any questions for Paul?

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report  
Cathy Doederlein, Greg Long, Holly Nicholson,  
Rebecca Shortridge, Kendall Thu, Leanne VandeCreek

**G. Long:** Very quickly moving on, University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. I know it's listed as no report because I generally encourage you to read the board meeting minutes yourself rather than having me summarize it for you. But I would note that President Baker did make an announcement in the Baker Report, I think it came out yesterday, with regard to changes in the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees is composed of eight people, and three of them that have had some long-standing history with the board, Marc Strauss, Robert Marshall and Cheryl Murer, are not coming back as Board of Trustees members. Coming back are: Wheeler Coleman, John Butler, Bob Boey, and Matt Holmes. Matt is the student representative. And the three new trustees that were appointed – one is Dennis Barsema, long-time ally and advocate for NIU, major contributor to the foundation, Barsema Hall, that's Dennis Barsema. The second appointment is Eric – and I may mispronounce the last name – Wasowicz. He too graduated from NIU, has a successful business in technology and teaches, and has come back and taught a course in College of Business in entrepreneurship. And then the third appointment is a woman, Veronica Herrero. She's the chief program officer at One Millions Degrees. It's a Chicago-based organization dedicated to providing comprehensive support to low-income, highly-motivated community college students.



And then one final member, Tim Struthers, had been filling in in a vacancy position for the last two years. He has been reappointed, and Tim is the president of First National Bank here in DeKalb.

So we have a significant change in the Board of Trustees. As the Faculty Senate President, one of the things that I did last year and I will do again now is I feel, from a governance standpoint, we've alluded to it, but the Board of Trustees is the big dog. I mean they control everything. I mean they are President Baker's boss, their rules supersede anything our constitution and bylaws might say. They are the ones that are important and so I feel like there is some value in this role of getting to know them and say hello and so share concerns. And so I will, on behalf of the senate and University Council, reach out to all the new Board of Trustees members to see if I can't have individual meetings with them to say hello. I already checked in with Dennis Barsema, we happened to meet in the hall. So, just want to let you know I'm going to be doing that on our behalf and sharing information. So that's it for that.

## **XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

A. United Faculty Alliance update – Virginia Naples, President

**G. Long:** Comments and questions from the floor, Virginia Naples, did you have anything you wanted to share in terms of United Faculty Alliance?

**V. Naples:** No I don't, but do stay tuned. There will be new information coming on to the Faculty Alliance Website. We are having training meetings, and we are actively seeking people to be department and area representatives. We're looking for people to be interested in serving on other committees including the bargaining committee and communications, as well as a variety of other things. So we also have a training session that will be in this room on Saturday starting at 10:00 in the morning. So people who would like to get to be more active in the union are welcome to come and learn about how we are going through this process and some of the information about how we're moving forward. We're moving forward toward the bargaining effort that we intend to make as soon as we can get the appropriate committee members in place and get our research completed.

**G. Long:** Thank you.

B. [Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals](#) – Beatrix Hoffman

**G. Long:** And our last item on the agenda, Beatrix Hoffman.

B. Hoffman: Sorry about that. I'm Beatrix Hoffman from the History Department. I'm here on behalf of Dream Action. Thank you, Pat, for making a copy of this handout. This is such an important issue that I guess I'd like to ask for time on the agenda next time. I'm sure there's a protocol for that, but maybe I could talk about that later. In the meantime, there's just a brief sheet that can assist those of you who are working with undocumented students, which is probably most of us, students who are afraid for their futures or their family's futures. Trump did make an announcement today that did not affect DACA yet, but we don't know what's coming in the future. There are things we can do right now to support our students. Also President Baker is going to come out with a statement about NIU's support for the undocumented, probably next week. Thanks.

**G. Long:** Thanks. Any questions? Well as far as I can tell.

**V. Naples:** Greg, I just forgot one thing. I also wanted to mention that there are going to be bargaining platform meetings that the union is holding to ask for input from our members, and anybody from the bargaining group who would like to become a member that we're going to be holding in the next couple of weeks.

**G. Long:** Okay, thank you.

**V. Naples:** There will be information about where those will occur and the times as well.

**G. Long:** And I would just like to say, as we close the meeting, thank you to all of you who stayed the extra time. I know this is one of our longer meetings today. And also thank you for the level of discussion today. I'm really quite pleased with how this went. Thank you.

## **XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- C. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

## **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**G. Slotsve:** Motion to adjourn.

**G. Long:** Motion to adjourn. Yes. Second. Done.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.