

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, February 22, 2017, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Buck, Carlson, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Chitwood, Chomentowski, Chung, Collins, Conderman, Demir, Ferguson, Garcia, Gorman (for May), Haji-Sheikh, Hathaway, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Khoury, Konen, Liu, Long, Macdonald, Manning, Martin (for Glatz), McHone-Chase, Millis, Montana, Nejd, Newman, Novak, Patro, Pavkov, Pluim, Riley, Roberts (for Dugas), Rodgers, Rosenbaum, Ryu, Saborío, Shibata, Shin, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stephen, Stoddard, Streb, Than, Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Allori, Azad, Baker, Briscoe, Bujarski, Dugas, Farrell, Glatz, Grund, Hanley, Hashemian, Hou, Krmenec, May, Mogren, Moraga, Naples, Penrod, Scherer, Tan, Thu

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Doederlein, Gier, Hoffman, Klaper, Maddali, Reynolds, Tomaszewski

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon. Thank you for being here today. I know it's a very beautiful day, and thank you for none of you asking if we could meet outside, because no, we can't. Too late. Too late. So just want to say welcome, call to order.

Faculty Senate President **G. Long** called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: Our first item of business is adoption of our agenda. May I have a motion to accept our agenda.

J. Novak: Motion.

G. Long: John Novak. May I have a second?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Second.

G. Long: Second, Mike Haji-Sheikh. Okay, any discussion? All right, all in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay we have an agenda. I would, and I know I've said this before, want to remind you regarding on the captioner, please remember to use your microphone, state your name before sharing comments, because she can only capture one person at a time, and from a transcript standpoint, we also need to be sure we get names. Just wanted to give you a reminder of that.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 25, 2017 FS MEETING

G. Long: Moving on, next we have approval of the minutes of the January 25 Faculty Senate meeting. Do we have a motion to accept the minutes.

T. Arado: So moved.

G. Long: Therese Arado moves. I need a second.

G. Slotsve: Second.

G. Long: George Slotsve, okay. Any corrections, changes, additions to the minutes? All right, all in favor of accepting the minutes, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Abstain? Okay, we have an agenda. We have minutes.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: Okay, moving down to President's Announcements, I'm going to keep my announcements brief. I'd welcome you to the meeting. We're doing something a bit unprecedented today in terms of Faculty Senate with our focus on a discussion of President Baker and Professor Haji-Sheikh's documents. So we have, you know, really no real agenda beyond a discussion of that. We do have a couple of topics we're going to bring up, but that is our major focus today.

I would let you know on a positive note that the Board of Trustees did meet last week and approved all curricular and programmatic changes that had been suggested to them. They also approved all the sabbaticals that had gone forward. Now both of those things would be expected, but I did want to let you know that they had happened. And I want to give a special thanks to Beatrix Hoffman. She did a wonderful job representing faculty with the Board of Trustees in talking about her sabbatical, because again, the Board of Trustees, they're not necessarily that well-versed always in higher education issues and topics. And so it's very helpful for us to show them that sabbaticals really do make a difference in professional development and faculty recruitment and retention. So they seemed to respond well and, again, I would thank Beatrix for her presentation, because it came off very well.

B. Hoffman: You represented really well.

G. Long: Oh, I always talk so that's nothing special.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy [Award](#) – Page 4
Faculty Senate will vote on the recipient during the February 22 meeting.
Recipient will be honored at the March 29 Faculty Senate meeting

1. Nominee – [Donna Munroe](#) – Page 5

G. Long: All right, the next item for our consideration is the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. It's described on page 4. And this year's nominee, Donna Munroe, is described on page 5. May I have a motion to accept this nomination?

D. Macdonald: So moved.

G. Long: Doris Macdonald so moved. Second?

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

G. Long: McHone-Chase, okay. Is there any discussion? Do you want to say anything about it, Laura?

L. Beamer: I nominated Donna. She was my mentor, and I know her best from what she did inside of Nursing, because I was so junior to her. But I can tell you that she always spoke up for what she thought was right, and she would stop a meeting and say, no, you know, we have to do this because our policy says this here. And she had such a great command of what our policies were. And she was completely unafraid to stand up and say, no, we have to do something else other than what you want.

G. Long: And I've had many years of interaction with Donna as well and thought very highly of her. For those of you who don't know, she actually died on campus during a UCPC meeting. So she was, you know, very dedicated to the university and so is there any – King.

K. Chung: And to add to her credit, she's the only one who has received our college excellence in teaching, excellence in research and excellence in service awards. So she got all three of them.

G. Long: That is impressive. Any other comments, discussions about the nomination, because it will be the first time we're giving is posthumously, but I think certainly Donna's work deserves our recognition, so I think it's a good choice. All in favor of this, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay, our Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award this year goes to Donna Munroe. We'll communicate that with her family.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

G. Long: Next on our agenda is the consent agenda, and there are no items so we can move right along.

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report

G. Long: Number six, reports from standing committees. As far as reports go, nothing from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

B. Academic Affairs Committee – John Novak, Chair – report

G. Long: John Novak, Academic Affairs Committee.

J. Novak: Just a short statement that I presented the revised document about recording in the classroom, and it's being examined by general counsel. So if things go well, we should be able to look at that and examine it at our next meeting.

G. Long: Great, thank you. Thank you for your work.

C. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – Paul Stoddard, Chair – report

1. Faculty Salary Study update

G. Long: Economic Status of the Profession Committee, Paul.

P. Stoddard: The only thing to report is that I'm working on scheduling a meeting. So members of that committee, keep an eye open, and we'll try to meet with the folks who have done the study and get their results.

G. Long: And I will say that I know there is a salary study task force meeting this Friday. And so that will be, you know, a chance for people to get a little more information as well, and look at the status of things.

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

G. Long: Now I'd like to turn it over to Becqui Hunt. She's our liaison on the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, and she's going to talk about two different positions we need to identify.

1. Nomination for Executive Secretary of University Council/
President of Faculty Senate – 1-year term
NIU Constitution and Faculty Senate Bylaws [citations](#) – Page 6
[List](#) of University Council members eligible for election – Page 7
Nominations will be taken during the Feb. 22 Faculty Senate meeting.

Letters of acceptance of nomination are due in the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by **Friday, March 17**, and will be included in the March 29 FS agenda packets. **Election of final nominee will take place at the April 26 FS meeting.**

R. Hunt: Thanks, Greg. Good afternoon, everyone. It's now the time to take nominations for the position of Executive Secretary of the University Council and President of Faculty Senate for the next academic year, 2017-2018. The list of members who are eligible to be nominated is in your agenda packet and up on the screen up front. And so now I will be accepting nominations from the floor.

G. Slotsve: I'd like to nominate Linda Saborío.

R. Hunt: I need a second.

T. Arado: Second.

D. Rodgers: Second.

R. Hunt: Are there any other nominations from the floor? Okay, hearing no more. Yes.

J. Hathaway: Kendall Thu.

R. Hunt: I need a second on that, please.

P. Stoddard: Second.

R. Hunt: Okay, hearing no more nominations, I will close the nominations. All nominees are to submit a letter of acceptance noting your qualifications and desire to serve to the office of University Council and Faculty Senate by Friday, March 17. These letters will be included in the March 29 and the April 26 Faculty Senate agenda packets. Election of the final nominee will take place at the April 26 Faculty Senate meeting.

2. Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor
Position [announcement](#) and NIU Bylaws, [Article 9](#) – Pages 8-10

Letters of self-nomination are due in the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by **Tuesday, March 21**, and will be included in the March 29 FS agenda packets. **Election will take place at the April 26 FS meeting.**

The faculty and SPS personnel advisor must be a full-time, tenured faculty member, but does not need to be a member of Faculty Senate or University Council.

R. Hunt: Okay, for item number 2 on the agenda, this is the official announcement that self-nominations are being accepted for the position of faculty and SPS personnel advisor. Letters of

self-nomination are due in the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by Tuesday, March 21, and will be included in the March 29 Faculty Senate agenda packets. Election will take place at the April 26 Faculty Senate meeting. The faculty and SPS personnel advisor must be a full-time tenured faculty member, but does not need to be a member of Faculty Senate or University Council. More detailed information regarding requirements for the position can be found in the two attachments noted in your agenda packet. Thank you.

G. Long: Given that Paul is our current faculty and SPS personnel advisor, could you say a few words about your role in the position.

P. Stoddard: A few words, that's not going to be so easy. Basically, this is a person, ideally someone who's reasonably familiar with the ins and outs of the university, the bylaws and so forth. And this person helps faculty and SPS with personnel issues, which can be things like appealing tenure recommendations; it can be issues with your supervisor, your department chair, your personnel committee; it can be regarding issues with colleagues you might be having and so forth. The person in the role more or less defines how active they want to do. I mean, obviously, anybody who comes seeking help you should be open to. Some people in the role have served as advisors more. Others have offered to be advocates when necessary. I think that's a better path to take, personally, but I have seen people do it either way. The job commitment, the time commitment varies. There are times of the year, usually around the time merit evaluations are coming out and so forth, where you're more busy; and other times, I can go several weeks at a time without hearing from anybody. So it has its up and downs. The position is compensated. You can talk to me about that later. If you have any other questions or you want more information in general, please feel free to contact me, give me a call, write me an email, stop by my office, whatever you like, and I'll be happy to spend as much time talking about it as you need.

G. Long: Does anyone have any questions for Paul? Okay, thanks, Paul. Thanks, Becqui, for organizing that.

E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Jimmie Manning, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

1. [Annual Budget Report](#) – Pages 11-13

G. Long: All right, moving on, report from Jimmie Manning regarding the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, please.

J. Manning: In your packets, you'll see a letter that was comprised by Sarah McHone-Chase with some feedback from others. And this was the letter that was sent along. You might notice that it's a little different than past letters, but we wanted the letter to be a little more dialogic and a little more informative about how faculty are feeling about different issues, and especially to convey the idea that there is a committee there to dialog with, to talk about things. And so when these issues do come up, they can be discussed with the committee who can get that information out there.

G. Long: Any questions with regard to the report? I too would offer my thanks to Sarah. Previous reports have really been more or less of a reiteration of, gosh we need money to get salary increases, we need money for this. And it was largely information that certainly administrators in finance and

administration already knew about. And so this particular iteration of the document is far more – I like your word, dialogic, learned a new word today. But the idea that we have a chance to actually seek, or be sought out for input. That has been an ongoing issue for the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee just overall is being asked for advice rather than rubber stamping things. And so I appreciate Sarah’s intent in writing that to let them know that we really do have a lot of expertise among the faculty, and we’re more than open to sharing that expertise and knowledge to help. Great. Thank you. Any questions? All right.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals ([DACA](#)) – Beatrix Hoffman – Page 14
[Know Your Rights](#) – walk-in

G. Long: Now we move on to unfinished business. We have three items of unfinished business. First I’d like to ask Professor Beatrix Hoffman to talk with us about the deferred action for childhood arrivals, DACA.

B. Hoffman: Hi. Thanks so much for inviting me back, and I’ve also invited Anita Maddali from the law school. She’s a professor at the School of Law and also an immigration attorney. And we just wanted to give a little bit of background and an update on the very rapidly changing landscape of immigration policy right now, much of which affects many of our students really directly. So Anita’s going to speak about some of the legal changes that are happening, and I’m going to give a little bit, I’m going to go over that handout that I distributed last week [month] about things that faculty can do right now.

A. Maddali: Thank you for having me here. So President Trump has issued a number of executive orders pertaining to immigration, most of which have called for increased enforcement. In terms of DACA, which is deferred action for childhood arrivals, this was an executive action under President Obama, which did not give immigration status to certain children who had entered the country before the age of 16, but it did say that they would not be a priority for deportation and that they would be able to work with authorization, so they could work lawfully within the United States. So far, the executive orders have not touched DACA, but it’s uncertain what the president intends to do. If DACA is taken away, then that would not only mean that these individuals could become a priority for deportation, but it would also mean that they wouldn’t be able to work legally in the United States. So for students here on campus who may have DACA, they’re likely working in order to fund their education, because they’re not eligible for any federal grants. And so without permission to work, they would not be able to lawfully do so if DACA’s terminated.

Another issue, just for students generally, they themselves may not be undocumented, but they may have a parent or other family members who are. And so in light of the recent executive actions on immigration, there’s a lot of fear in communities. And I think it’s likely that many of our students will also be experiencing that fear as well, and anxiety.

B. Hoffman: So we would like to take some questions. But first I just want to go over some things that faculty can do right now in working with students. I’m a member of the history department. I did go through an ALLY training, which is something that’s available to people and departments on

campus. But I'm not an expert in this issue at all. I have really been educated by my students about what's happening and how it affects them. And so just a few things to think about. This is a retention issue for many of our students as they're under extreme stress and trying to continue and finish their education. So some ways that we can help them: If you do talk to students who identify themselves to you, please assure them that you will keep their status confidential, because that is a very big concern right now, is the release of students' immigration status might jeopardize them. If they do disclose themselves to you, there are resources available on campus. Some are listed on the handout here, and I can also talk about some additional resources later if you'd like.

Even if you don't know of any undocumented students in your classroom, you may have them. So it's worth thinking about making everybody feel welcome. I know we talk about this a lot, and people do a lot already in this area. But particularly in the use of the term, illegal immigrant, it's much more welcoming to use the term, undocumented, rather than referring to people as illegal. If you want to be more vocal as an ally, I have some door signs that you can use, and there's also some groups on campus that would be very happy to have you join. We just started a faculty organization called Faculty Advocates for Undocumented Students.

The administration is also getting involved in providing support for the undocumented. President Baker sent out a notice earlier in February that was a response to a sanctuary petition that students and faculty had circulated earlier. So NIU has not been designated a sanctuary campus as you may know. But the president did make several statements – oh there it is, thank you, Pat – about what NIU is currently doing to make undocumented students feel welcome here. And I just want to cover a couple of issues. You may already know this, not related to DACA, but there is a state law that allows undocumented students to receive in-state tuition rates at NIU and at all state universities in Illinois. And that currently is not affected by changes in immigration policy.

There is also private scholarship funding available for undocumented students by state law, and the administration has pledged to advertise those and continue to support those kinds of scholarships. This will be especially important, as Anita said, in case DACA is revoked, students are going to need financial support just in order to stay in school if they can no longer work legally.

Another really important aspect of the promises – actually this is a promise President Baker made – is to appoint a liaison for undocumented students, so a full-time advisor who would be able to assist students with the things that they might need. That hasn't happened yet, so I was wondering if maybe this body would like to talk about affirming that this would be a good idea, that we could urge the president to implement as soon as possible. And also any other ideas that you may have for things that we could request the administration to do. Maybe they could do more than what's listed here in the Baker Report.

Another possibility would be to increase opportunities for legal aid to students. Currently NIU does not have a way of providing legal support to students who might need help with immigration issues, so that's something that we might want to push for. And we'd be happy to take your questions right now.

M. Haji-Sheikh: If we appoint someone, put somebody's name in the paper, that they're going to be the advisor for the undocumented, all ICE has to do is find out who that is and just watch 'em,

okay? So we probably ought to make very sure that that – I mean it's not conspira – that's the way things are work – I mean the internet's a wonderful tool, but it's also a double-edged sword. So we should probably make that somewhat a private designation maybe within the community. I know there's lots of people trying to stay off the grid right now.

B. Hoffman: Well I don't know if we can do that, but just to reiterate, counseling service, and any sort of services that NIU would provide to undocumented students, would be provided on a confidential basis. So if you're referring students to any of these resources, it's really important to reassure them that it will be confidential.

M. Haji-Sheikh: That was my point.

J. Stephen: Is there a website link for the faculty advocacy group?

B. Hoffman: Not yet, but my email address is on the handout, so that's the way to contact us.

K. Millis: Do we have an idea of the number of undocumented students that are attending NIU or some guess?

B. Hoffman: We don't know because we don't have access to that information, but the Northern Star made an estimate a couple weeks ago, and the number was over 200. And that's just, those are students who would probably be in the DACA program, and it's important to remember that many students might have family members who are undocumented. So the number is going to be much, much higher than 200 of students who are directly affected.

L. Saborío: The other day I had a parent call me and only spoke Spanish, no English, and was concerned about the safety of his daughter on campus, because she had heard several racist remarks on campus and in the classroom. Do you have any support for parents other than Sandy Lopez? I feel bad sending them all to her all the time.

B. Hoffman: I was going to say Sandy Lopez, I'm so sorry. That's exactly what we're talking about, why we need more people to be trained to deal with these kinds of problems. And on the handout, there is some information about the diversity offices, and they're the ones who – they have an anonymous reporting system for those types of incidents. But, yeah, more needs to be done.

S. Klaper: Also there's on the, I think it's on the affirmative action website, there's a bias reporting form. And so that is not an enforcement tool so it's not something that's going to go through student conduct or be as official as an affirmative action complaint. But if somebody wants to just report those types of incidents, they can do it through that bias reporting form. There's a committee through the chief diversity officer who will investigate them. And then if there's an opportunity for education, so if it's like something that happened in a residence hall, then they will take the initiative to create a curriculum and education for those people. I work with families regularly. I do not speak Spanish but will find somebody to help me if that is the concern or that is a concern. And my office is confidential and so, between affirmative action, the chief diversity officer, the bias reporting form, my office, Sandy Lopez, then there's a network of us that can make sure that families get the assistance and the reassurance that they need.

J. Stephen: Are the university police on board with, let's say, this sanctuary policy.

B. Hoffman: We don't have a sanctuary policy. The administration turned it down so we're not officially a sanctuary campus. But Baker's statement reiterates the current policy, which is that NIU police are not federal immigration agents, so they will only cooperate with federal immigration agents if they receive a valid warrant or are required to do by law.

J. Stephen: Thank you.

M. Cefaratti: Could we check Huskies Get Hired just to see what information they ask for, to make sure that, when the students fill out some of the Huskies Get Hired information, that we're not accidentally collecting something that we don't intend to collect?

B. Hoffman: Anybody else? Can we just go ahead to the next page, there's just one more announcement. The diversity programs are sponsoring Know Your Rights workshops. They just started today. There was actually one at noon today. The one that's specifically geared toward undocumented students and their families is going to be on March 8. These are all going to be held at noon in the Blackhawk Annex. Thanks for listening.

G. Long: Thank you very much for your work, both of you.

B. Program Prioritization – Matt Streb, Program Prioritization Liaison/Facilitator

G. Long: Our next order of unfinished business is an update from Matt Streb on Program Prioritization.

M. Streb: Good afternoon. I'll be very brief. There are just three things I want to mention quickly. The first is you'll remember President Baker issued a Program Prioritization update report in the end of November. And in that report, he had about 90 or so implementation actions that he was asking his vice presidents to take. And he gave deadlines to do that. Several of those reports have come in now, and we will be posting the results of those actions on the Program Prioritization website, probably in the next two weeks or so. Not all of the deadlines have happened, but we'll continue to update that as that goes along.

Two other things I want to mention. One, you know, this is mostly from the administrative part of Program Prioritization, not the academic part. But one of the things that I always thought was valuable about the Program Prioritization Task Force Report on the administrative side was we recognize some, what we're calling complex conversation, that we probably had to have on campus, you know, things like advising, retention, adult learners. And I think those are really important conversations to have. But I will tell you that I was very skeptical when we sat down to have those conversations, because my concern was that we would get people into a room, and they would all retreat to their own corners, and they'd protect their silos, and we would continue to do things the same way we always did things, and nothing would really change. And I can tell you that those conversations are very ongoing right now, and I've been very, very happy and excited about the work that participants on those conversations have been doing. There's a lot of negative information

out there all the time. It feels like we always have negative news, whether it be in the press about the state or nationally or here on campus or whatever. That's really energized me and it shows me how many people really care about the institution. It had to make some very hard decisions and have some hard conversations. So as we have those conversations come to completion, I'll report back to you more on those.

And the last thing I wanted to mention – it's been a while since I've actually updated you on Program Prioritization, so much so that the last time I talked to you was before the president's report came out. And I wanted to mention very quickly the new enrollment management, marketing and communications division that was created in that report, because if I wasn't involved in that, and I was sitting here as a faculty member, I would probably sit here and say, well that sounds like a bunch of just moving chairs around, and that's not going to really do anything. And what I can tell you is that, first of all, we had a whole bunch of wasteful spending that will be eliminated because of that movement. We had three different customer management systems. So if you want to connect with students who are interested in NIU or they're applying to NIU or things like that, there were three different systems that we were using on campus. And these are expensive systems, and there's no reason to have three systems. So with that consolidation, we're down to one system. There is going to very likely be cost savings in salary that will be, that will come about because of that new division.

And then the last thing I'd say, I've said this many, many times, I've said it in here before: You know, it's very easy to blame the state for our problems, and there's no doubt that the state has not helped us. But we have not helped ourselves, and there have been things that we've been doing that have not been working. And I can tell you that enrollment management on this campus – and it shouldn't be a surprise given the enrollment that we have – has not been working. You know, our admissions people didn't know what the marketing people were doing. The marketing people didn't know what the online learning people were doing, right? It was, frankly, not very functional. And so the hope here is that by having this all in one shop and having it all in one area, we'll have a much better message and clearer message to students who are interested in NIU.

So that's my very brief update. I'm happy to answer any questions that you all have about that.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Of course, I couldn't resist.

M. Streb: No, Michael, we bonded over Hamilton.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Your comment about the enrollment management and communication, I have to say that I agree that the university's, as a whole, has done a rotten job, but my college has been doing a pretty good job.

M. Streb: Yes.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Now by hav, lately they've been trying to enforce us to integrate into the rest of the system, which tells me that that might actually cause the opposite to happen in our end, which is we come down rather than you guys, the rest of the colleges, university, coming up to this.

M. Streb: Yeah, I think that's a very fair point. I will tell you that our deans were very skeptical of the previous unit that we had. It did not work well with the deans. And that's, part of the reason that I mean in your college in particular, I mean Dean Vohra essentially said, "Look, I'm not happy with the services I'm getting from these units, and so I'm going to go create them on my own," right? And I think that, you know, some of the basic, some of the earlier conversations that the deans have had with the new divisions have been very, very positive. And so I certainly understand your concern, and engineering in general, I think – you can correct me if I'm wrong – I think engineering in general just across the country, enrollments have been going up. I'm not saying that's not because of what you guys are doing, but.

M. Haji-Sheikh: We're counter to the trend, actually.

M. Streb: Okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Actually across country, enrollments had been shifting the other direction so we have bucked the trend over the last five years. And a lot of it had to do with hard work on faculty and staff locally, okay. Now the question is, why didn't they, rather than trying to centralize, you know, why not try to encourage each college to have focused enrollment and [inaudible] to their clientele.

M. Streb: I think this is a very good point and, again, this is still a fairly new division. And I do think you're going to see that division utilized. This goes back to what I was saying about the deans and, as a former chair, I know I was very frustrated with: What was I expected to do from recruitment. There were times that I'd go out and recruit, and I'd get my hand slapped because I shouldn't have done something. There were times when I was expected to do something, and I wasn't aware that I was expected to do something. And so I think the real key here is better communication and, frankly, better trust between the academic side of the house and the enrollment management side of it, you know the admissions and marketing side of the house. And I'm hoping that that will come, especially as we get a new vice president for enrollment management, marketing and communications.

To be very honest with you, I should be careful somewhat how blunt I am here, but we did not really have a person on this campus that understood enrollment management. That's a huge problem, especially in this environment. And I think that this new division should change that. Yeah, Buck.

J. Stephen: I haven't seen much on the efficacy of our marketing or advertising. For a while, I was seeming some odd things, or hearing some odd things, on the radio. When I was driving into University of Chicago Hospitals, I was hearing advertising for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. And when I was visiting family in Nebraska, I was hearing advertising for NIU. And this was about three years ago. But I'm wondering whether I haven't seen anything about a study on efficacy of our marketing choices.

M. Streb: Yeah, that's a great question. I certainly am not an expert on this, and I'm sure Harlan Teller or Abby Dean, who I think have been here before, they were talking more about branding the last time they were here. They've done a fairly extensive study on that. I mean one of the things I

hear all the time is, you drive down 294, you drive down 88, and you see signs for Iowa State, Northern Iowa, and University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. And it seems like everybody but NIU.

J. Stephen: Correct.

M. Streb: I know that we are having some billboards that will be out there, although most of the research, I think, indicates that billboard advertising is not overly effective. But they just cut a new university spot that I saw that I thought was pretty impressive. There are some other things that are going on, and I'm sure that Harlan and Abby would be happy to come back and talk about what they know about the market, what they're doing to try to reach those students. And this goes back to actually.

J. Stephen: I just want to know if they're paying attention to whether they're spending their money efficiently.

M. Streb: And that's something I think, yeah, they can come in and talk to you about that. It's a great question. This does go back to the CRM that I was talking about, though, right? So we had all sorts of problems. We even had somebody's who's 38 years old who wanted to come back to school and get an NIU degree and was getting information about the residence halls, right? I mean, that's just, that person is going to get that information and say, "This institution has no idea what it's doing." And you get one chance, right? And we just blew it, right? And so those are the types of things that had to be fixed. The communication was really, really poor. We're not in a situation, when our enrollment was up, enrollment was up everywhere. People just came to us, right? We didn't have to do much, because people, you know, applications were up. People were applying. People were accepting. That market is not the case anymore, and so, you know, we need to change and we need to adapt. And I think that this change, I hope, certainly could help with that. These are all very good questions. Anything else.

T. Buck: Just one thing.

M. Streb: Sure.

T. Buck: When you talk about the first line of communication, recently speaking with students who are enrolled in NIU, every single one of them has said, it's the website. The website, the website, the website. It's the first place they go. They almost didn't come here because of the website. So a lot of the marketing and communication has to happen at that level, because pretty much every senior in high school is going to go there first when they're looking at colleges. So they have to easily be able to get the information they're looking for. The design of the website needs to be maybe overhauled, and not by an intern or someone to add it to their list of to-do, when they're already burdened with a million other things, but someone who does that for a living. That could be a hired role, to keep updating and keep it fresh, keep it really easy to read. I think that could be money well spent.

M. Streb: Yeah, Jennice O'Brien is somebody else who, that's kind of Jennice's area, and she'd be, I'm sure, happy to come in and talk to you about what has been done. I think there actually is a new template for the website. I have to admit I haven't paid that much attention to it, and I'm not sure

what the decision was, how they came up with the new template, all that type of thing. But again, I think that's something that would be very important. And one of the things, actually, that came out of Program Prioritization that I think is a good thing. The website development, I can't remember the exact name of the program, but we'll call it the web people, right, were placed in enhanced. And as a result of that, we were actually to take some people, where their talents were elsewhere, and enhance the website group, because it takes a long time. I know in political science, I think we just moved to the new template. It takes a long time to get people to actually change all the web sites. I mean Jennice can tell you about the ridiculous number of websites we have that are associated with NIU. And so to give them a little bit more, you know, some more people, some more bodies, I think, is a positive thing.

G. Long: Anyone else?

M. Streb: Sure.

H. Khoury: You mentioned about the ongoing campus conversations or the outgrowth of Program Prioritizations, and you referred to the administrative programs. With regard to the academic programs, who was involved in those conversations? Were faculty members truly involved, or was it dominated by administrators?

M. Streb: Sure. Great question. So what we're calling – and I wasn't the one that created this term – but what we're calling complex conversations all came out of the administrative task force report. Now those complex conversations oftentimes have academic components to it. We're talking about retention, we're talking about advising and all those types of things. I chaired all of those conversations, but absolutely, we had faculty, we had chairs. We had some practitioners on them as well, but usually each group had about eight to nine different people that were on those groups.

H. Khoury: Okay because, you know, some administrators have this double role. They are faculty members, yet they are administrators.

M. Streb: No these were – I don't want to say real faculty members – but they were real faculty members. These were people who are in the classroom. These are people who are doing research on a regular basis. These are people just like us.

H. Khoury: Okay, and it was for all programs.

M. Streb: Correct.

H. Khoury: Okay, thank you.

M. Streb: Anything else? The Northern Star better not quote me on "these are real faculty members," I guess. I mean, I could get in real hot water. Thank you.

G. Long: Thanks, Matt, appreciate it.

C. Discussion of [Dec. 22 Baker Report](#) – Pages 15-22

President Baker's [response](#) to Steering Committee questions – Pages 23-30
Michael Haji-Sheikh's [report](#) – Pages 31-42
President Baker's [response](#) to Haji-Sheikh report – walk-in

G. Long: All right, moving on, our next item on the agenda is a discussion of President Baker's December 22 Baker Report, his response to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee questions and Professor Michael Haji-Sheikh's documentation. Please note that President Baker did prepare a response to Professor Haji-Sheikh's document. This is a walk-in item, and it should be on your desk in front of you. Hopefully, since last month, you did have a chance to look over these materials, talk to your colleagues, talk to your department. I've had several people mention that they did have departmental discussions on this topic. And as we discussed last month, the primary purpose of today's discussion is to identify and develop additional questions for President Baker. He has already agreed to attend next month's Faculty Senate meeting on March 29 to respond to these questions and talk to us. And should the senate feel there's more that needs to be done, this could be discussed after the president leaves the room next month at the meeting or at our April 26 meeting.

Given the nature of this topic, I was concerned about how to run this discussion. So I talked with the Steering Committee for advice on how we might best facilitate this process, and it was suggested that we develop for this process a speakers list to identify any senator who wants to make a comment. And this process is designed to give everyone a chance to talk; it's not meant to stop anyone from speaking more than once. The Steering Committee did, however, feel that the speakers list approach does provides everyone a chance to voice their concerns and questions.

So to get started, what I'd like is for you to please raise your hands if you'd like to be added to the speakers list. Now I know, although I know most everyone in the room, when I point to you, please do say your name so that the captioner gets it correctly. Further, I would ask that you keep your questions brief, I mean your comments brief, and focused on the development of questions that we want to ask more of from President Baker. And Pat will type up the questions as they're offered so you can see them on the screen. John.

J. Novak: I wanted to point out that in the Steering Committee you also pointed out that, in addition to that list, people can be added if they come up with questions.

G. Long: Oh absolutely. Thank you for the clarification. The point of this is just to get us started in an organized fashion, but it does not stop anyone who, for example, did not raise their hand initially from raising it again. This just gets us a way of getting started, because, like in any environment, you've got to have some people who are going to be more willing to talk than others. And given the sensitivity of this particular topic, the Steering Committees wanted to be sure that everybody who did want to speak did have a chance to do so. So that's why we're being a little more formal and a little more process oriented than we might normally do so. But certainly anyone who has things to add after we go through the initial list, who wants to speak again, there's nothing to stop that, all right? So is that process clear with people? Any questions on the process? Yes.

H. Khoury: I have a question. Is the conversation going to be recorded?

G. Long: We have a transcript so yes.

H. Khoury: Thank you for the clarification.

G. Long: All right, so let's do this, though. Let's start our speakers list. Pat would you put up the, do you have the slide?

P. Erickson: They are going to raise their hands and slowly say their names, and I'm going to highlight their names on this sheet of paper for you.

G. Long: Oh, you've got it on that, okay. All right, so, who would most definitely like to speak so we can put your name down. Raise your hand up? Okay. Although, may I ask that you follow our procedure, so, Mike, name and.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Mike Haji-Sheikh.

G. Long: Mitch.

M. Irwin: Mitch Irwin.

G. Long: Mitch Irwin, okay. Anyone else?

M. Rosenbaum: Mark Rosenbaum.

T. Buck: Todd Buck.

G. Long: Todd Buck.

J. Novak: John Novak.

J. Manning: Jimmie Manning.

L. Saborío: Hello. Linda Saborío.

G. Long: Anyone else? Thus far on my list, I've got: Michael Haji-Sheikh, Mitch Irwin, Mark Rosenbaum, Todd Buck, John Novak, Jimmie Manning and Linda Saborío. Anyone else want to have their name on that initial list? Okay so again, we'll go ahead and get started. I'll just go in the order in which people raised their hand and so first turn it over to Professor Haji-Sheikh.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I think one of the major questions we should ask is – and you should be asking yourself this more than him – is this is a trend or a pattern of behavior that we can accept. And we can go on and ask him if, why should we accept these disjointed answers in the way they've been given, because if you go through the handout, each one of the answers is unconnected somehow to the whole picture, yet if you draw a direct line of decision-making to each one of those spots, Ron Walters, Ron Walters gets Wally Pfeiffer. Wally Pfeiffer and Jim Heid, they're all connected to a decision-making stream. And we need to know how can we believe that, in the future, that we won't see this?

G. Long: Thank you. Next on the list is Mitch Irwin.

M. Irwin: This might be a slight detour, but I think it's a question we should ask ourselves. And for me, it affects the way I want to go forward. There are at least two OEIG investigations open, is that the right number.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Could be three.

M. Irwin: Could be three.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Or four.

M. Irwin: I wish we knew. And separately from that a court case, is that right? I mean, I would like to know if we're going to know about the OEIG investigations in a reasonable time frame. I think we should be cautious about making conclusions when those bodies have more facts than we do. And if we knew that that decision was going to come down in a month or so, I would like to read it and digest it carefully before we get too far out in front of ourselves. The same for the court case. But I'm curious to know how public is that? How do we know how many OEIG investigations are there? And can we as a body find out how long we're expected to wait to know this really important outcome.

G. Long: And I can give you a little bit of a response to that, because I did ask Greg Brady, the acting general counsel about release of information related to the OEIG reports. And basically, until the OEIG decides to release information, we are, you know, the records act is such that we're not going to be given any information. And from a timing standpoint, it's anyone's guess, because I've been in this role since July of, you know, '15, '16, whatever, and – it seems like forever – and I have been told since I got in this role: We're waiting for the OEIG report to come out. So there is no immediate date for when we can expect the information. Plus, according to Greg Brady, if the OEIG does not find anything, they're not obligated to say, "Oh, by the way, we didn't find anything." So there may, in fact, not be a report that comes out. It really does depend on how they choose to operate. And that is from general counsel. I do not have a background in this. I'm simply relaying information.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Can I correct something minor? I just need to correct one thing you said.

G. Long: Okay, very quickly.

M. Haji-Sheikh: The OEIG, even if they find something, if they are not the ones doing the finding, they will not report.

G. Long: Okay, thanks. So our hope of waiting on the OEIG is something that may or may not be of value to us in the long run. Okay? Next on the list, Mark.

M. Rosenbaum: So these comments don't necessarily represent my views, but I talked to my department, and the department felt that, regardless of whether he's guilty or not of some of these

wrongdoings or malfeasance, that President Baker is in his second-to-the-last year, if that's correct. And is it a little late, that essentially a vote of no confidence now probably will not have that great of an impact. And again, that's not necessarily my perspective, but that is the department's perspective, is that we probably waited a little too long as a faculty.

G. Long: And just from a background information, did look at some information from AAUP, American Association of University Professors, on the topic of no confidence votes. And they did provide a response that said that, while they're not uncommon, they don't, there is certainly no guarantee that they result in the termination of a president, and oftentimes may, in fact, harden the relationships between faculty and president. So it's one of the things to think about. That was one of the issues that prompted this discussion is: Do we want to have a vote of no confidence? But that is a, it's a serious thing to undertake, and there's no guarantee that, by doing it, it resolves the problem. So, next on the list is Todd Buck.

T. Buck: Thank you. Some of the questions that I was going to raise have been brought up by some of my colleagues here already, such as: What measures will be put in place to make sure it doesn't happen again. Even if President Baker does retire, we want to make sure that our next president has a pretty clear understanding of what's expected. And I'm kind of curious, how much of NIU's resources are expended in legal defense of President Baker's actions? And does a vote of no confidence result in any repercussion whatsoever, such as lessening retirement benefits. If it's too late, or is it really too late? I could go through what my faculty members said specifically with their gut reaction, but I don't think that helps raise the questions of what we're going to additionally ask President Baker to address.

G. Long: Okay, thank you. John Novak.

J. Novak: My main question was already asked, but I have an alternative one. The allegations seem to say that the president is quick-draw on the checkbook; and whether or not these hirings are legal or not, why are we looking beyond the talent at our university to help us? Why are we looking at the great education state of Idaho to help us? It seems really onerous in a situation where there's just so little money going around for everyone else that it's really of all ethical things, this monetary thing right now just hits home to, I think, a lot of us. And additionally, number 8 on this item, it says that his contract was for \$1750 plus expenses. Well I believe that's a per diem, not his total. From what I've read, that was the basic per diem for all these people that were hired, and someone can correct me if I'm wrong about that.

G. Long: And I do not have that information so we would have to ask. Okay next on the list is Jimmie Manning.

J. Manning: I brought this up with my department as well, and we had a discussion. And so this is kind of the themes that developed out of that. First of all, I'll echo what other people have said. There were questions about what investigations were ongoing, will we ever get reports, and so on and so forth. And so is this something that would resolve itself? But despite all of that, the faculty in generally felt that looking at Baker's actions, whether all of those are actual actions or not, which I know is also a question that people had, that he has taken, that it does show a repeated pattern of disrespect and ignoring policy or going about things maybe not in a way that ethics would suggest

they should be gone about. But the biggest concern of my faculty was the public relations aspect of this, particularly how this would point eyes toward the university or point ears toward the university. And so there were two kinds of questions that were being asked that I think we're hearing answers for here. First of all, is this something that the board might want to hear. So is there a way to direct our communication to the board and say, "Look, here's how the faculty feel" in a way that wouldn't necessarily be saying that we are putting up a vote of no confidence for the president, but reflecting what the Faculty Senate feels to the board so that, if they were going to make a decision of that nature, they'd have that information and know exactly where we stand.

And then the other question that came up was, how long Baker would be in that position and whether or not this was just, you know, something that would kind of go away. The other thing that came up – less in our discussion and more afterward – a lot of people after they started thinking about it, said that the way that faculty were told was very condescending and not very transparent. And so some of them said, "I read the Baker Report and I thought, did I miss something?" And, no, we didn't miss anything, at least not, you know, something that was put out there to the public. And so maybe looking at specific issues like that and finding a way to communicate those would be good, because in that case, you know, talking about these new vague policies that are put into place, no one really knew the context for that. And so just getting some more information there would be good. But at the same time, letting the powers that be, whoever they are, know there are other ways to communicate it was something that my department in particular was concerned about.

G. Long: Thank you. Linda.

L. Saborío: Most of my questions have been asked, but I also, I likewise shared the information with my colleagues and less than a handful replied that a vote of no confidence would perhaps send a strong message to the BOT, that we are not satisfied with the current administration, especially the president. But then there were other conversations that happened in the hallway of Watson Hall regarding the reputation of NIU, similar to what Jimmie was just saying. And then really, folks are saying that they need additional documentation from both sides to determine whether we should move forward with this or not. More specific details they were looking for. And we have several tenure-track faculty that really have no idea what's going on, kind of came in in the middle of the story and so they don't have a comment and said, "I don't have an opinion, even though I'm a very opinionated person." And I don't think they're really sure what a vote of no confidence means. So maybe even some more information about that would be nice. Thanks.

G. Long: Okay. Paul got my attention, so Paul is next on the list.

P. Stoddard: I just wanted to respond, I guess, to what Mark had said. Even if this is towards the end of Baker's first term, he's up for renewal at that point. Whether or not he would like, I mean we don't know what his intentions are. But I would think a vote of no confidence could weigh heavily on the BOT when they have to decide on renewal, especially since there are so many new members of the board. If they came in and said, "Well, this is a guy who doesn't have the support of the faculty," that might make a big difference. So I would not let the timing dissuade us if that's the way we decide we want to go.

G. Long: All right, so at this point I've taken care of everyone who has raised their hand to be on the list, so I would just open it up to people in general. No, this is now, I'm opening it to everyone, so we're good.

J. Stephen: I had several questions about votes of no confidence, but it wasn't anything that was, a lot of conversations even in a large department. The main feedback I got was the dissatisfaction of the faculty with the change in attitude that was prevalent under John La Tourette and John Peters, and they feel it's much more of a prescriptive top-down governance from the president, and they're very unhappy with that. But as far as the vote of no confidence, only about three or four people out of, you know, like 25, talked about that.

G. Long: Okay.

J. Stephen: But they were unhappy with the top-down strength that's coming.

G. Long: Sure, I can appreciate those things. Other comments or certainly other people who have talked to colleagues in their departments who may care to share what some of their colleagues have said or thought about this issue. Todd Buck.

T. Buck: I'll just say the one thing that keeps sticking in my craw that was spoken a lot about by my colleagues is that, even if the allegations are proven benign, it's the optics of what upper administration is doing with spending money on [inaudible] through improper channels. And any perceived waste at the upper administration level, it's a slap in the face to the faculty who are continually being asked to do more with less. And I think that's what's really sticking in the draw of a lot of my colleagues is that feeling of – What the heck? – we're asked to do the job of two, three, we're not getting new hires, more committee responsibilities, yet money is being thrown around unchecked at the administration level. And I think that's got to – the optics of that are really bad.

G. Long: Yeah, agreed. Other comments. Cathy and then Mike.

C. Carlson: A couple of people brought up about their reputation of NIU. And this could have a negative impact on NIU, but it may not. Because it may show the strength and concern of faculty and our values and ethical values of faculty.

M. Haji-Sheikh: There is also been an update to the Finance and Facilities are going through all of the expenditures of Baker on food. This was told to someone directly at the Board of Trustees meeting. All the checks that were cut to 'em are going to be reviewed in the background. Sometimes things that should have been out of the Foundation were paid out of 41 accounts, stuff like that. So I have seen them, personally, the receipts and the accounts they came out of. And I say they got a lot of work to do.

G. Long: Are there other questions that we want to pose to President Baker. I mean comments as well, but certainly questions.

L. Saborío: Can President Baker decide to release information even if the OEIG...no, he can't? Okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: [inaudible] lease is up

G. Long: [inaudible] oh I was thinking Baker, yeah. I would suspect that for many reasons, he will not break protocol with what's typical in that.

L. Saborío: Okay.

M. Irwin: Just quickly, I think we should follow up on Jimmie's suggestion, it's something I've thought about, and I think we talked about before. I think we're feeling a sense that none of us want to walk all the way out on the plank in terms of that vote we were talking about, but there should be nothing stopping us from communicating to the Board of Trustees a list of concerns. And we can even couch it in the terms of "We don't know all the facts, but we know enough to be concerned." And if the Board of Trustees has full confidence in our president, it won't sway things. But if they are already swaying themselves, we owe it to ourselves to make those feelings known formally. And I think we should explore in this body whether that's something we want to do in lieu of the other thing.

G. Long: And I think I may have mentioned it before. If you talk about a vote of no confidence, there are a variety of alternatives to that that we could communicate from the senate with regard to concerns on transparency, communication and advice-seeking. I mean, so there are messages that we could send that would be less aggressive, for example, than a vote of no confidence, but could still send a message to the president as well as the Board of Trustees.

M. Irwin: And would those be directed to the president, addressed to the president, rather than the board, or both?

G. Long: That's up to the body.

M. Irwin: Okay.

G. Long: I mean I think there's great value in anything that we're sharing the Board of Trustees has the right to know as well. So I'm in no way, shape or form trying to hide anything or be anything less than transparent in this whole process, because I'm the role of trying to walk, you know, where having to give President Baker the right and responsibility to defend himself, as well as I think as Faculty Senate we have the responsibility to watch out for how the university operates and, you know, sorry to say this for any staff, but we are the heart of the university, I think, and we need to, you know, we need to keep sure it's beating.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well, let's phrase it differently. Why have a vote of no confidence? Why don't we have a vote of confidence. If you're that confident he should continue on, everybody should be able to vote yes. It's not a negative vote, it's a positive vote. If everybody here thinks, yes, this is a confidence vote, that we want to be confident. I mean if you're really truly confident going forward we will have us vote a positive vote going. Youi have the full confidence of the faculty. Because I hear that people going, "Oh I don't want to do a no confidence vote because it's so negative," but in reality, guess what, your guy is in his penultimate year, he could get renewed. There's nothing that

will keep him from being renewed. The Board of Trustees is the only decider on this, okay. We could be continuing hearing dribbles that there are other investigations for the next two, three, four years. It's \$225,000 was allocated for his legal defense, \$225,000. I know \$185,000 were actually given out. So far, it cost, the Grady legal costs over \$500,000. I think the Jackson case is going to exceed that coming up. So I don't know who's going to win that one, that's a civil federal court. And I'm not trying to say one's right, I'm just saying, at this point in time, it's a bottomless pit of cash.

O. Guer: I'm an alumni of NIU, and I live in DeKalb County, and I came to this meeting from the point of investment. And what I'd like to bring to the faculty here is that so much circulating about DeKalb County, people are, don't strongly against enlisting in rental properties in DeKalb County. As I hear and personally talk to people start selling and refuse to buy anymore, buy somewhere else. And I hope that you all realize that faculty and higher educated people that your jobs is on the line because people are, as I showed outside of DeKalb County in the community that nobody knows that if your university will pass like five more years and what's going to happen with the university with all this conduct. And as a, you know, a resident, I'm very concerned about that. And all this summer was brought to the [inaudible] attention was very respectable. But nobody understands that it seems that nobody talks that if the improper conduct is going on, that you will not have a job, might not, so this is not good as NIU is a major employer here and that's what I'd like to bring to attention of this audience. Thank you.

G. Long: Thank you. Other comments, questions? If I'm, can't go far with this. If you look at those questions, do you have any concerns with the questions as written? Do you want to add anything to them? I know, I don't really want us to do serious re-writing at this point, but from the standpoint of do those questions address the things that you want us to bring to, have President Baker come in next time and talk to us about?

J. Stephen: I think to paraphrase Ms. Gier, we should be worried about what the perception of scandal does to our status within the community.

G. Long: Agreed. Anyone else?

M. Riley: I got very few comments from faculty in my department. I did get a comment about the vague nature of the answers to the questions. And I think that's a valid comment. To be more specific with respect to the hiring of Ron Walter, I see a lot of references to, or at least implications, that NIU's policies and procedures really weren't understandable, there was some lack of clarity. And what I'd sort of like to see is a before and after picture of what policies were in place at the time, and would a reasonable person have, how would a reasonable person have interpreted those policies? So I'd like to see, I guess a comparison, a before and after picture. And I'd like to know what clarifications, I'd like more specificity on what clarifications were made to the policies and the controls and what made it difficult to follow those controls in the first place?

G. Long: Okay, thank you.

M. Riley: So clarification.

G. Long: Clarification, got it. Very good. Others?

D. Boughton: I think the previous question was the same question that I have, and that is: Is there any accountability that the president has when he decides to spend money on inviting people to come and work here? Is there any vetting that takes place? Is there any fiscal procedures observed when this is done? If there isn't, should there be? Thanks.

G. Long: Okay, you bet. That's certainly a question to be asked. Anyone else? I know it's an awkward pause, I just want to give you enough time to be sure.

T. Than: If the president is planning to come anyway, is it possible at all for him to come and then answer our questions live, not come with prepared answers, because if he has, oh I don't know, I think it will help facilitate to see whether or not he, I don't know, his credibility, everything, right, the way that he has been answering our questions. So if we could change the format a little bit, that probably could help.

G. Long: I certainly think there's absolute opportunity to give him the opportunity to answer some questions on the fly. I think from a procedural standpoint, I would be uncomfortable if we're talking about questions, but we're not sharing them with him ahead of time. So I mean, we have talked as a body, and I've shared this with him as well that we're going to talk about this. You know, we've invited him to come back to talk to us. And so I would be hesitant to create these questions without sharing them, but that doesn't mean that, when he gets here, we can't go off on other tangents as well. But at least let him know that, as a body, these are the things that are significant, that are not yet answered. Would you be okay with that? So it's a kind of compromise that, given questions, but there certainly would be a bit of an open question and answer session.

T. Than: And we talk about it during our last meeting. Is there going to be a section on education about what are the options we have if, you know, vote of no confidence is not the way that, I don't know, that the body is not going to adopt, I don't know. So are we going to have a section or information on these other options?

G. Long: Well how would you all like to do that? Because I'm happy to facilitate and share some information we found. On the other hand, if you want to do your own looking at things, I don't want to pre-judge or otherwise bias any information that is shared with you. How would you like to proceed on that, because I'm happy to share, you know, if you look at the American Association of University Professors, the AAUP, they're a strong body and they have several documents on governance and relationships between faculty and presidents, and faculties and board of trustees that I've looked at. They may be helpful to get some additional thoughts about how this works. I just don't know. I can send you ten links to things, but I don't know which ones you'd find most helpful or how you want to pursue this.

We could certainly have the Steering Committee, Faculty Senate Steering Committee, talk about this in a little more detail in our upcoming meeting from a planning standpoint. Anything else?

M. Cefaratti: I would welcome wordsmithing on this, but it's in response to Ms. Olga's question or comment. Could we ask the president – I remember when he first got here, we did Bold Futures

Workshops and it was about building community with our local area. I think we donated the money for a firetruck with [inaudible] and things like that. We were working really hard to build a positive relationship with our community, and I would like to know where he thinks that relationship stands three or four years later, how he's seen it progress or what some of the impact on our community has been from his perspective.

G. Long: Okay, thank you.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Ethically inspired leadership.

G. Long: That's not really a question.

Unidentified: It's a goal.

J. Manning: I think it would [inaudible] something that my faculty has indirectly asked, and that is: What is the ethic or the kind of credo he follows when releasing information and thinking about communicating with the faculty?

G. Long: Well I think this has been a positive exchange of information, and I appreciate the ideas that you've shared. We will certainly write them up and share them with President Baker. We'll schedule him. Again, I canceled out guest speakers for today. I canceled out guest speakers for our next meeting so that we would have sufficient time to deal with this. And so we will share these questions with him, and, like I say, he's already got this on his agenda, because I assumed we would probably want him to come and talk to us. George.

G. Slotsve: Do we need a motion to postpone discussion then, Greg? I don't know what the procedure is.

G. Long: Well at this point, as a discussion, we're good to go. And we have had, you know, we've generated the questions, we've invited the president, I'm confident that he'll come. So I don't know that we need to do anything. We don't need to postpone it because there's not been a specific motion beyond just having this discussion, and we're inviting him to come and answer questions.

M. Cefaratti: What are we looking to hear? Or maybe it goes back to your question of understanding our alternatives. I'm not sure if it's our alternatives or what are we looking to hear that would be specifically different from what we've heard in the past in terms of detail?

G. Long: Does anyone want to respond to Meghann on that, because I don't want to, I can't speak for the body on this one. Yes.

T. Than: Would it be more helpful for us to talk to the BOT directly instead of the president? I don't know. To follow Mitch's questions, if we cannot gauge what the BOT is thinking, they might need a signal from us, or we are awaiting a signal from them? I don't know. These two bodies, I think, could hear more from each other I think.

G. Long: There are certainly rules and procedures that, if we were to go directly to the BOT, we'd need to follow that. Again from my standpoint, though, before we think about moving in that direction, it seems that we need to gather more information. We need to hear from President Baker, because, you know, when we move it up to the BOT level, that's a significant move. And from my standpoint, I want us to look like we've been thoughtful and smart and respectful in this process, because to rush through this process, I mean, as several of you noted, he's got a couple, what one or two years left on his contract. I mean there is not a major, you know, if we wait another month, this is going to kill us – that's not going to be the case. But we do need to approach this with, you know, some speed, because we are looking at the end of the academic year. So I'm not suggesting that we put things off, but I am suggesting that we act in a way that is fully defensible in the eyes of the public and, you know, do so with forethought. So are we generally okay on this plan? We've got questions developed, invite him next time, I'll give him those questions, and then we can certainly allow time afterward for some open questions from people. Depending on how long that takes, we may or may not dismiss him from the room and discuss what we're going to do in response. Or it may be that we come back and have that discussion in April. But from a process standpoint, are you satisfied with that? Are we okay? Okay, good. Because, really I'm very committed as having us see this through. Regardless of outcome, we need to have a discussion on this. We need to have both sides have the opportunity to present their perspectives, and then we are in a position to listen and make some decisions. So let's take it seriously and go forward.

J. Stephen: Regardless of whether we come up with some sort of vote, I think that maybe next month we should be prepared to at least think about a statement of concern.

G. Long: Sure.

M. Irwin: Just quickly, you mentioned two options. I think I would be more in favor of the discussion unrolling next month after President Baker was in the room rather than putting it forth until April. April is our last Faculty Senate meeting? And I don't want to lose it over the summer if you know what I mean. Do people agree with that?

G. Long: Absolutely. I mean, again, much like this month, next month is going to be pretty slim with tasks other than this discussion and President Baker's presence. So, you know, I would just ask that, if you want to go that route, please plan to, you know, in theory, we're scheduled until 5 p.m. Now I know we've tried to get out of here at 4:30, you're like, really? No. And we do try to get out of here at 4:30. I would ask though, again, given, this is a very, very serious thing that we're talking about here. This is, this is, you know, this is unprecedented in NIU's history as far as this level of concern. There's only been one other time that the president has been brought before the Faculty Senate to answer questions, and that was before any of our time here, President Clyde Wingfield.

Unidentified: [inaudible]

G. Long: Oh really? I won't make any old-age jokes then?

J. Stephen: [inaudible]. I keep a picture of myself [inaudible]

G. Long: That's right, okay. Keith.

K. Millis: So we'll be sending him these questions. He'll come in and answer them. Will we be able to ask new questions at that time?

G. Long: Yes.

K. Millis: I just wanted to make sure that's clear to him.

G. Long: Yeah, no, I will certainly let him know that we will ask him additional questions. And my hope is, I mean, I've been very impressed with the nature and quality of questions and discussion that we've had today. There's not been any snarkiness. There's not been any, you know any ugliness that sometimes happens. And my hope is that, if we, when he comes here, that we also, even though we might be emotionally wrought about this, that we still treat him in a respectful fashion, regardless of you may feel about his actions, would be my only hope as we move forward. Okay, well, very quickly, let's, I'm going to assume we're done with this discussion?

IX. NEW BUSINESS

G. Long: All right, moving on, we have no new business for the meeting.

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – [report](#)

G. Long: In terms of reports from advisory committees, Paul you had a little update, you had an update on the IBHE?

P. Stoddard: So the FAC to the IBHE met last Friday down in Springfield, University of Illinois at Springfield. We had a lengthy discussion with textbook publishers about the digital delivery of course materials. I don't know if I actually did forward that – I'm going to forward my notes on that to Pat, who will post on the appropriate page. So if you want to see that discussion, there was some good stuff in there. After the publishers had left, we had some reservations about their presentations, but. They were there again, even though they said they weren't there to sell us their products, we sort of got the impression they were there to sell us their products. There are some very interesting things that they can do in terms of feedback and so forth, so it's worth taking a look at that discussion.

In other business, we are preparing, or we're working with a couple of folks in the Illinois Senate to prepare a bill regarding faculty representation on the IBHE. As you might recall, this has been an ongoing issue, especially for the FAC where the governor has decided who he wants to appoint to take the faculty seat there. We're taking the attitude that we should have at least equal representation to the students. The students have two members on the IBHE, and the Student Associations get to choose those two members. We think that something along those lines would be more equitable. So I'm not sure what the final bill is going to look like. I guess there are some politics involved with that, go figure.

In other news, some discussion of Attorney General Madigan's proposal to not fund state employees until there's a budget came up. Apparently, this does not affect university employees. It's a different appropriation situation and so we're told not to worry about that for our own purposes. There is, however, a proposal that could as much as double our share of insurance premiums to CMS. And over the long term, this could actually be rather significant, so that's something we want to keep an eye out on. For those at the lower end of the pay scale, those insurance premiums make up something close to 18 or 20 percent of salary, so yeah, that's significant.

And then we also got a presentation about out-migration of students, students from Illinois going to colleges in neighboring states, primarily. This is an issue, I guess, that's been in the making since before the budget impasse. That doesn't make it any better. In fact, it makes it worse. But this is of serious concern. I think the presentation we saw this morning said there were actually 18,000 students from Illinois who will be attending schools elsewhere this semester. So it is a significant issue when enrollments are really the only way we have of trying to make up the budgetary shortfalls.

G. Long: Thank you.

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: I already mentioned to you a bit of an update on the Board of Trustees.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

G. Long: And so we would go to questions and comments from the floor. I'm not seeing Virginia.

Unidentified: She's not here.

G. Long: Okay, does anyone else have any questions or comments from the floor?

J. Stephen: On the UFA, I know that right now she's working on developing the bargaining committee unit.

G. Long: Okay, thank you.

J. Stephen: The president of the UFA's on campus today, so she's walking around recruiting people.

G. Long: Okay, thank you.

J. Stephen: And I got caught.

G. Long: Okay.

V. Collins: I just have a quick question. So the walk-in, this President Baker's response to additional questions, can we have an electronic copy so we can share it with our faculty?

G. Long: Oh yeah, absolutely.

V. Collins: Thanks.

G. Long: Yeah. Anything else? King?

K. Chung: I am really new here and then I hear that all of you have shared the documents with your departments. And I'm wondering how you guys are doing it, because when we were talking with the dean, she was sort of suggesting that we should delay this process of getting faculty feedback. And then what have you guys been doing that we are not doing yet?

J. Stephen: I'd ignore it and just email them.

M. Haji-Sheikh: You had a dean that suggested that we delay this?

K. Chung: To email later.

G. Long: Speaking as Faculty Senate president, I would encourage all of you to share the information, regardless of what your deans say. It's actually my dean as well. I didn't know that information, but the information, it's public. It's, you know, all you have to do is go to the Faculty Senate website and look up our agenda, and that information is already there. So to not have a discussion on it seems kind of foolish, given that the information is already there. So the information is already out. I would argue that we have a responsibility as faculty to do that. I mean, it's part of what tenure is about. I'm sorry, I'm not trying to pick on you, but it just, you know, as tenured faculty, this is what academic freedom means. It's not my ability to say, "Oh, I don't want to do something." But this is where academic freedom comes in, and we do have a right to share information with our colleagues, and I think that's, to me that's the point here.

K. Chung: Okay, I guess she did emphasize that we, you know, she would help us to do it, you know, if we choose to. You know, she did emphasize that. But then the undertone, because Hamid and I were in a call with her, and that we felt that she was suggesting that we should delay disclosing to the faculty. So I'm not sure what I'm supposed to do, so I guess.

G. Long: Yeah, I think many people have shared it with their faculty. So I mean the precedent has already been set that many individuals have, who are not on senate or University Council, have already seen this information, had it shared with them, their opinions have been sought. So we're not breaking any new ground by sharing this information in Health and Human Sciences.

J. Manning: I would just say also – I'm a communication professor, and this is actually my area of expertise – it wouldn't be considered a best practice to require the faculty to do it over email. It's certainly not illegal. It's certainly a choice people can make. But it's making your faculty vulnerable to two things: One, if the president would ever say, "I wonder who's saying what about me," you

have a digital artifact that can be passed along. But even more importantly and more likely, if we did start to have a vote towards a vote of no confidence or whatnot, a reporter could almost certainly get that under the Freedom of Information Act and publish things that faculty members, who might not want to talk to a news media agency, they could publish that with the faculty members' name. A lot of people go, "No, that's illegal." It's not.

M. Haji-Sheikh: They can get after your – if it's public business – they can go after your regular email.

J. Manning: That's what I'm saying. I would say it's just not a good idea to facilitate this over email. Again, I'm not saying it's illegal, because a lot of people go, "You can do whatever you want." You certainly can. It's just not very good practice.

J. Stephen: I distributed it to my department over email, but not one person responded by email. But many people came by to my office to speak.

G. Long: Good, that's not a surprise.

J. Stephen: I invited them to come by and talk to me if they wanted to.

G. Long: Very good.

C. Carlson: I'm in your same college, and we distributed it through our secretary, you know. We just said, "Here's the documents." It goes out with the minutes, we have monthly meetings, it goes out with the minutes from our monthly meetings. So there wasn't an opportunity to leave a track record of comments back to us. But we distributed it three weeks ago?

L. Beamer: As soon as we were asked to. But we didn't ask the dean for permission, we just sent it, because the Faculty Senate president asked us to do it, and we sent that email message to our chair. And we said the Faculty Senate president asked us to please send this out to our faculty, and so we just did it.

G. Long: Anything else?

A. United Faculty Alliance update – Virginia Naples, President

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
- Q. [Annual Report](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

G. Long: All right, can we have a motion to adjourn?

Unidentified: Move to adjourn.

Unidentified: Second.

G. Long: Thank you all very much.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.