

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT

Wednesday, March 29, 2017, 3 p.m.

Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Allori, Arado, Azad, Baker, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Buck, Bujarski, Carlson, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Chomentowski, Clark (for Streb), Collins, Conderman, Demir, Ferguson, Garcia, Glatz, Gorman (for May), Grund, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hashemian, Hathaway, Hou, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Khoury, Konen, Krmeneć, Liu, Long, Macdonald, Markowitz (for Rodgers), McHone-Chase, Millis, Mogren, Montana, Moraga, Naples, Nejdí, Newman, Novak, Olson (for Chung), Patro, Pavkov, Pluim, Riley, Roberts (for Dugas), Rosenbaum, Ryu, Saborío, Scherer, Shin, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stephen, Stoddard, Tan, Than, Thu, Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Briscoe, Chitwood, Chung, Dugas, Farrell, Manning, May, Penrod, Rodgers, Shibata

OTHERS PRESENT: Baker, Bryan, Doederlein, Falkoff, Hulseberg (for Nicholson), Klaper, Reynolds

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Good afternoon. I'd like to call today's meeting to order and welcome all of you here today. If anyone wants to come up and change places with me right now, you're welcome to. Just a joke, just a joke.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: All right, our first item of business is adoption of the agenda. May I have a motion to accept the agenda?

M. Haji-Sheikh: So moved.

G. Long: Mike Haji-Sheikh, and seconded, Laura Beamer. Any discussion? I have a discussion. I request to move VIII. A. immediately after the consent agenda. This is a motion to clarify the election timeline and length of service to the Faculty Senate. Yes, George.

G. Slotsve: Before we begin, we're out of clickers, and there are still a couple of people that will need a clicker. So we don't have enough clickers to vote.

G. Long: So, we've distributed all the clickers?

G. Slotsve: We've distributed every last one.

G. Long: Pat just informed me that, when we originally, when the Faculty Senate originally purchased the clickers, they purchased them based on attendance. And the plus size, we do better with attendance now than we did, but that also creates a bit of a problem right now with clickers. If need be, we can do paper ballots, we do have those available if that, if clickers aren't going to be sufficient. Or we could do voice votes, you know, so we will make sure everyone has a chance to share their thoughts, but we are out of clickers. We have no extra supply we can go get just yet.

Okay, so I was going to request that we move Item VIII.A. immediately after the consent agenda, and this is a motion to clarify the election timeline and length of service for the Faculty Senate president and vice president. Because it's a change in the bylaws, we need to have a first reading and then take a vote at next month's meeting for a second reading. Moving this item will allow us to focus our conversation and discussion following President Baker's presentation without worrying that we'll run out of time for new business. So is there any discussion on the request to, may I have a motion to accept the changed agenda.

K. Thu: So moved.

G. Long: Kendall. May I have a second?

T. Arado: Second.

G. Long: Arado. Okay, any discussion? Okay all in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? Abstention? Okay, so now we have an agenda. And then the one thing I would remind you, just as I always do, that when we have a, using our captioner here, please remember to use the microphone when you speak. State your name. And also, because the captioner can only, you know, transcribe one person at a time, we need to remember to not talk over each other, okay?

[Pause in meeting discussion as other clickers were identified, programmed to the appropriate channel, and distributed to those still needing clickers.]

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 22, 2017 FS MEETING

G. Long: Thank you for your patience on that. It looks like we're getting our clickers assigned correctly and making sure they're on the right frequency so that, if we need to take any votes, everyone will be represented. So thank you for your patience on that. While George is getting those distributed, I think we can move on to our next item on the agenda, which is approval of the minutes of the February 22 meeting. Do we have, I need a motion to accept the minutes?

D. Chakraborty: So moved.

G. Long: Dhiman. And a second?

L. Saborío: Right here.

G. Long: Linda Saborío. All right, any deletions, questions, comments, concerns with regard to the minutes. Okay, in that case, all in favor of the, of accepting the minutes, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Abstain? Okay, minutes are approved.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: In terms of president's announcements, I'm going to keep it very, very brief today, given the nature of our conversations today and content today. Certainly as I've said, I welcome all of you for coming today. Thank you for participating. I'm hoping that you had a chance to read through a number of the materials that were sent out. I think that will, hopefully, provide some good background for you. I'd also like to offer a special thank you for President Baker for his attendance and willingness to talk to us. So, with that, that's all I'm going to say for my announcements, and I want us to have time to take care of business that we all want to talk about.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. Presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award
honoring Professor [Donna Munroe](#) – Page 4

G. Long: The next item on the agenda is the presentation of the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. Talked about that last month and identified Donna Munroe as the award recipient. And Donna, as we've talked about last month, has died. In fact, she died in a UCPC meeting. In terms of giving your life to the university, you can't really do anything more than that. And beyond that, she was a tremendous colleague, very knowledgeable, and, in fact, again let me read very quickly her nomination. It is my – And this was nominated, nomination from Laura Beamer, a senator.

It is my great pleasure and sorrow to nominate Donna Munroe, Ph.D., professor, School of Nursing for the 2017-2018 Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. Donna completed her Ph.D. from the University of Southern California in 1988 with a focus on public administration health policy. Dr. Munroe brought her passion for advocacy to Northern Illinois University in 2001.

Donna and I met in 2012 when I joined the faculty of the School of Nursing. I had the great fortune of having Donna as my mentor for the academic promotion and tenure process at NIU.

Donna had an uncanny knowledge of the NIU Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. She was also an expert on the personnel policies and procedures of the College of Health and Human Sciences and the Nursing and Health Studies. Donna carried a big black binder

with these policies and procedures to every meeting she attended. Donna was unapologetic when politely, but firmly, saying, “You can’t do that because of X policy” when problematic changes were announced by leaders or administrators. When Donna spoke, people listened. She served on many committees and councils at the university, college and school level.

Sadly, Donna died suddenly on January 13, 2015 in Altgeld Hall while participating in a meeting of the University Council Personnel Committee. Donna literally gave her life advocating for the faculty of Northern Illinois University.

So with that, I would like to invite Jeanette up so I can give her the. This is the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Aware. “Act as if what you do makes a difference; it does. William James. Presented to Donna Munroe on this 29th day of March, 2017 for advocacy for the faculty.”

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

G. Long: Okay, moving on, number VII, there are no items for the consent agenda.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS [taken out of order per motion to approve agenda]

- A. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws, [Articles 2.3 and 2.4](#) – Page 43
Clarification of election timeline and terms of service for Faculty Senate officers
FIRST READING

G. Long: Then what I’d like to do, as we talked about modifying our agenda, is to move to Item VIII. A., which is a proposed amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, Articles 2.3 and 2.4. It’s on page 43 of your agenda packet. And it’s primarily a clarification of election timelines and terms of service for Faculty Senate officers. One of the purposes to do this from a rationale standpoint is the Faculty Senate president’s contract we’re encouraging to be 12 months. Clarify the timeline for electing the Faculty Senate vice president and for appointing the Faculty Senate parliamentarian, and to clarify the term of service. So you’ll notice that the election of, this is 2.3, the election of, and we used to have officers, but at this point we only have a president and a vice president? So the election of the vice president, consent of the parliamentarian appointment shall take place at the first faculty meeting of the academic year. So we’re just making a clarification there. It’s not officers, it’s the vice president and consent of the parliamentarian.

And the next change in it is the term of office for the president shall begin July 1 and shall be for one year. The term of office for the vice president and parliamentarian shall begin August 16 and be for one year. The vice president, parliamentarian may serve successive terms.

Any questions, comments. So may I have a motion to accept this first reading? McHone-Chase. Second? Hunt? Okay. Any discussion on this. Again this is a first reading. It’s a bylaw change. We’ll have to revisit it next month, but it’s always nice to get, if you have any concerns or feedback, to share them now so we can be prepared for next month, because next month will be our last meeting of this academic year.

T. Buck: Is it the annual year or is it academic year, that service for?

G. Long: The vice president and parliamentarian basically are a year, academic year appointment because they're only really needed during, you know, when we have meetings. The Faculty Senate president is a year-long commitment, because there are a lot of things that still go on, because Faculty Senate president is also executive secretary of University Council and so staff and the university continue going all year long.

T. Buck: Okay, thank you.

G. Long: Sure. Any other questions, comments, discussion on this? Okay, seeing none, let's move on then.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Conversation with President Doug Baker

[Dec. 22 Baker Report](#) – Pages 5-12

President Baker's [response](#) to Steering Committee questions – Pages 13-20

Michael Haji-Sheikh's [report](#) – Pages 21-32

President Baker's [response](#) to additional questions – Pages 33-36

[Articles/Links](#) regarding votes of no confidence – Page 37

March 29 Faculty Senate [discussion guide](#) – Page 38-42

G. Long: At this point, we would move to number VII, unfinished business. It's our conversation with President Douglas Baker. And again, I'd like to thank you for coming to talk to the senate. During our January and February meetings, we discussed materials associated with and following from the December 22 Baker Report. We used last month's meeting to develop some additional questions. And I realize you've already addressed some of these questions in prior written responses to us. There are some members, however, that would like additional clarification and elaboration. The Faculty Senate discussion guide, which is on pages 28, I mean 38 to 42, for everyone here, includes background information, questions that we developed at last month's meeting and the follow-up letter that I sent to President Baker with regard to the specific questions we want him to respond to today. So at this point, I will turn it over to President Baker, and I would ask that we let him, you know, make his presentation, because following his presentation, there is time allocated to have question and answer. So, let's let him talk and then we can ask our subsequent questions as follow-up, please.

D. Baker: Great, thanks. Thank you, Greg. So I can see all, I think I'll stand up, come out front here. So first, thanks for this opportunity to address you about these issues. I think it's important that we get some clarify around them. There's a good deal of confusion, I think, in some cases, even after all this time. And so I think it's important to talk through these issues. And thank you for your extensive work on this, to bring it forward. I think we need to clarify these issues so that we can, hopefully, get it behind us and move forward in these very challenging times.

I also want to thank you for your hard work to move the institution forward in these challenging times. I care deeply about our students and their success, and you're the reasons that they're succeeding. So, your work is very much appreciated.

I suspect we're all frustrated we're still talking about this stuff. Mostly these things happened in 2013 and '14, and we're still talking about them in 2017. So let's see what we can do to clarify these issues and move forward.

Clearly some errors were made in that first year in terms of the hiring processes, and I take responsibility for that. When they were identified, we did take steps to clarify policies and procedures and put things in place so they wouldn't happen in the future. So I'd like to provide some context on what actions were taken four years ago, why they were taken, and then subsequent actions to clarify the situations, the policies and procedures. So, I'll use the seven questions that you provided me as kind of a framework to talk through these issues, and of course, I'm open to any questions after that.

So let me start with the genesis of all this for me. In fall of 2012, I was recruited to come to the university and went through some of the initial stages and had my first on-campus in the spring of 2013. And on my day of transit to the airport to come here for the first airport interview, I got a phone call from the search firm. And they said, "I need to warn you about something. The FBI, Department of Education and Housing & Urban Development are raiding the police station at NIU. You'll probably see it on CNN." That got my attention as I drove to the airport. Subsequently, I found that the executive vice president and CFO was on leave; the police chief had been fired; the budget was hard to understand, at best; there wasn't good budgeting policy and procedure; there were looming pension challenges that are still looming; enrollments were declining; retention was down; and recruitment activities were down. So you might say, "What were you thinking about interviewing?" But I was really drawn to this place. You know, we have an important role in this state. We are in the top 50 in the country in terms of social mobility for our students, moving them from where they are in the socio-economic status up. We're in a perfect location on the edge of Chicago. We've got an amazing faculty that do that work to transform the students' lives. And I thought there was great potential for this institution. I still believe that, in spite of some of the challenges we have from Springfield and other areas.

So, I began focusing on critical things like student career success and the three pillars that I thought were important to that. And those were sustainable financial model, we're still working on that. In fact, we met with the Resource, Space and Budget Committee earlier today to talk about where we are. Ethically inspired leadership, and I want to talk a little bit about that relative to these issues. And then building a strong community on- and off-campus.

So if you would think about what lenses I was looking at coming in with a CFO on leave, a police chief fired, an FBI investigating the institution, I wasn't sure what the political dynamics were here, what the legal dynamics were, who the players were, and who was on what side. And I really felt like I needed some unbiased eyes that I could trust to help me as I started into this, to look at people and structure and policies and procedures. And the person I thought about was Ron Walters. I'd worked with him prior to that at the University of Idaho, and he'd had a long career as a consultant

with Deloitte, one of the leading consultants for Deloitte, and his own private firm, and had done similar work at the University of Idaho where I was, and did it very successfully.

So I had approached the chair of the Board of Trustees at that time asking if she thought that that would be a possibility. She said it was, and suggested I work with senior staff on how to onboard him, which I did. And their advice was to put him in this affiliate category, and bring him on board that way. So I did ask him to come onboard and work on things like strategic planning, budgeting, space planning, campus planning, organizational culture, structure, personnel issues, to get us off on the right foot at the institution, and to really help me assess where we were and where we were going. And I think he did a good job of that.

Now in terms of hiring and putting him in the affiliate category, the advice I got at that time was that was an appropriate category. Let me actually read what that policy said at the time – and I say “at that time” because it’s now been eliminated, this category. And this is a screen shot from the then HR web page. And this was under the category of Temporary Appointments at the Institution. And so this temporary appointment of affiliate was, “These appointments are professional positions of a short duration (usually less than three months) to conduct non-credit seminars, teach at an extension class, or otherwise fulfill some short-term professional responsibility.” So the advice I got from staff was this was permissive, usually less than three months and some professional responsibility. So they felt that was an appropriate category for Ron as he came onboard. It seemed appropriate at the time. In retrospect, probably not. It turned out to be a longer stint and may not have fit that category.

So I brought Ron on. He did very good work. And as we got into it, I continued to have real concerns about the budget and the budget process at the institution. I couldn’t get my arms wrapped around how much money we had, what our expenses and revenues were, and really felt that, as the president, that was an important thing to know. So I invited in a short-term consultant, a man named Keith Ickes. Keith was the executive director of planning and budget at the University of Idaho. I invited him in for a two-day consulting visit, and he looked at our finances here. He interviewed the budget and finance areas and, at the end, concluded that my initial assessment was correct, that it was not a well-structured place. He couldn’t figure out how much money we had, and it needed to be basically rebuilt from the ground up.

So at that point, I felt like I really needed to bring on a new chief financial officer, given that the past one had retired prior to me coming, just prior to me coming onboard in the summer. So I felt like we needed somebody quickly, that this was a very difficult situation, and we couldn’t wait for a year’s search process to do that. So I wanted a temporary person to come in. Now in higher education, there’s a firm called the Registry. They’re the senior temp help kind of firm. They’re kind of the sole source for senior temporary help. So your president leaves unexpectedly, your CFO leaves unexpectedly, these are the folks that you call. And they have a pool of candidates. And so I worked with senior staff as well as the board to work with the Registry to try and bring in a pool of candidates and choose. And ultimately, we brought in two people for on-campus visits. The board met with them, board members, not all board members, some board members met with them. I met with them, and ultimately, we chose Nancy Sutfenfield to be our interim chief financial officer. Nancy came to us with a very illustrative background. She’d been the chief financial officer at

North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Wake Forest, Case Western and the Smithsonian Institution, so really an illustrative history, and we thought she was the right person to come in.

Shortly after she got here, I got word from counsel that the Registry might not be considered as a sole source and their suggestion was we make her an affiliate employee again, under this same category of temporary and professional experience. And at the time, no red flags went up for us. I think people thought that was okay to do. Her contract actually went through, her initial contract went through September. And the idea with her appointment was we need to get her in, get her feet on the ground, and we need to start a search immediately in the spring term for a permanent replacement. And we wanted her through September so it could be overlapped with a new person as they came on. We had to close the books at the end of the fiscal year, July 1, or June 30, and we wanted some overlap there so that they could get the books closed and cleaned up.

We did a search in the spring. We ended up getting a weak pool at that time. And the search was failed. So at that point, I asked Nancy if she could stay on second semester to help us through as we did another search in the fall. We ended up doing that search in the fall so that faculty and staff could be back on campus and participate in it. We ended up hiring Al Phillips into that position, and Al, unfortunately, couldn't start until March 1, so we asked Nancy to continue on until March 1 for the continuity of it.

So that's how we got to Nancy's contract and Ron's contract with the affiliate status.

So the question was, what policies were in place at the time you became president, and I think mostly this refers to that affiliate personnel policy and how we used it to hire these two people. And in retrospect, they were longer than was probably appropriate for that term, and we probably should have forced the sole source questioning for maybe Nancy and Ron both, or done an RFP or some other process to onboard them. But we didn't, so I need to take responsibility for that. We've changed the policies. We've eliminated the affiliate category.

So the second part of that question is what was the challenge in interpreting those policies. Well at the time, the red flags didn't go up. It just didn't appear to be an issue. The interpretation was that those were permissive phrases, and they were misinterpreted. And it wasn't until a complaint came in in 2014 that it was really brought to our attention, the red flags came up on it. So again, since then we've eliminated the affiliate category, tightened our procurement and contracting policies. The affiliate was phased out in July of '15 or quit being used in '15, there were a couple people that were in the academic ranks that permanently left and completely phased out in January of '16.

We also restructured the HR area. We've hired a new senior associate director with extensive experienced, counseled staff about policies and procedures in these areas, and also counseled them on travel and housing benefits. There were some errors made for both Nancy and Ron in terms of their housing and transportation.

All right, let's see, next question I think. How have the policies been changed to avoid any current and future problems. I guess I've kind of addressed that. I will note that in 2013, as one of the pillars of ethically inspired leadership, I did put out in October of '13 this document called [Employee Conduct, Accountability, and Ethics in the Workplace](#). It's still on the [ethics website](#).

And in it, it has a series of guides to appropriate behaviors in the institution, employee conduct, stewardship of resources, conflict of interest, employee rights, due process, grievance complaints, as well as the [whistle blower policy](#) for the university. And those are, again, all linked on our website on the [ethics webpage](#).

I'll talk in a moment about the ethics policy that was adopted by the board this last December, or maybe I'll just say something about it now. That essentially brings forward the state ethics policy and puts it into our policies so it's easier for folks to find and then clarifies the places that you can [make a complaint](#). So the board wanted to put that in relief, and they did that this last December, December 15.

How have the policies been changed to avoid any current and future problems? Well, on the ethics policy, it was adopted. We've eliminated the affiliate category as I noted. We trained staff on the policies, and I want to thank Professor Long for his work on a policy library. If you stop and think about all of the policies we have in this institution across all of the divisions, it's a pretty complex maze, and it's hard to find that stuff. It's hard for faculty and staff to really know where to go. And we need one-stop shop that's easily searchable. And so I think Greg's work on that's going to be critically important as we go forward. So thanks for doing that and working with counsel to set that up. Big step for us.

In [procurement](#), they've taken steps to better communicate the criteria for expenses reimbursement. That was sent around campus in early 2016, and it included a number of flow charts that will help people navigate it. Over in [travel](#), Debbie Bonnell and Kathy Marshall, and they put up flow charts in November of 2015 that help folks determine if expenses incurred during a day trip are reimbursable as well as expenses incurred during an overnight stay are reimbursable. So we're trying to get those easy-to-read flow charts and appreciate their work back in 2015 on that. There are a variety of procedural changes made in the travel area and staff trained again so that they're better implemented.

In my [February 22 note](#) to you, I don't know if you have that, but answer to #11 went through a whole series of other policies that were put in place. The qualification-based selection system was noted. We've also added a number of procedures to the [Procurement Services](#) website, the allowable procurement communication, procurement guidelines for RFPs. The IPAC has also built a site that we're linking to on the procurement site. And then the [General Counsel](#) has put up a nice new set of [clarifying policies around contracting procedures](#). So those are all linked and those were in that response that I sent you all back in February.

Number 2. Provide more specificity on what clarifications were made. What made it difficult to follow those controls? In addition to all the changes I noted above, I've work for the board since the fall of 2014 on amending board policies that are affecting these issues. The board actually put together two ad hoc committees on factors they thought needed focused attention. One was governance, and that's where this went through. The other was on enrollment. And we continue to work through both of those. So some of the issues that they've addressed beginning in the fall and then ultimately passing new policies were on presidential spending authority, the role of the board liaison, travel reimbursements, and then those were done in March of 2015. Also presidential contracting and personnel decision policies were addressed with my support in May of 2015. And

contracting authority levels requiring board approval were addressed in June of '15. And then finally this last December the board updated the whistle blower policy to include multiple channels for people if they have concerns to report them to. So it's been a fairly active board and ad hoc committee working on these issues.

Now, a question, why did that communication go out at the very end of last year. The board asked me to do that. They had just passed, on December 15, the whistle blower policy. And a number of the board members were up for reappointment. They didn't know if they were going to be reappointed or not, and they wanted that out to you before they left the board. And so they were done at the end of the year and wanted to get that out. So from 2015 to I guess two weeks later when it went out and the rush of the semester, it just got pushed up against the rush of the semester. I apologize for that being late, but that's what happened. They asked me to do it, and I wanted to comply with that and get it out to you. I'm sorry it went out so late but, obviously, you read it.

Number 3. How can communication be improved and more transparent. And I'm certainly open to your suggestions on that. Let me just list a few things that we've tried to do. We've been aggressive trying to think about these things over the last four years, actually. We've done that through town hall meetings, college level meetings, meetings with student groups, cultural center meetings, speaking at various campus events, MLK Day, Unity Walk, Out of the Shadows, Take Back the Night, etc. We did our Bold Futures workshops that I thought were fairly effective in the fall and spring of '13 and '14, where we ended up focusing on retention issues. And that led to, and over 2,000 people actually participated fall and spring in those. And that led to a lot of the action plans we've got around retention that have led to these significant increases in retention, about a seven percent increase over the last three years. I hold senior leadership retreats with every summer, and often in the spring as well. I meet with shared governance groups and, of course, all the other reports I do: the Baker Report, the podcast, Program Prioritization updates, budget updates, we're trying to use social media better, regular reports to the University Council, meetings with various student and faculty groups including this one. And then each summer for the last two years, I've held focus groups with chairs and directors on campus, trying to get that level of the institution that does so much of the important work of the institution and get their feedback on how we can better communicate. And so we do about 20 of those focus groups, probably about 400 people each semester to get their feedback on what's working and not working. And that's led to a lot of the revisions in our communications. I'm certainly open to hear feedback now or later about any of those issues, and maybe you'll have comments for those.

Describe what you're doing to build a positive community relationship, and I took that to mean both on campus and off campus. So on campus, I think things like the Bold Futures workshops were an important cultural step for us. I found when we got there that the university was very differentiated and not very integrated. There was a lot going on, people working really hard, but not always pulling together and understanding what other people were doing. Every one of those sessions, I found people who had been here for decades who knew somebody name or something, but they'd never met that other person that had been there for a couple decades. And those are the cultural relationships I think we need to build through those kinds of meetings. So extensive communication around that.

I'm also trying to build a strong senior leadership team, and then the data systems underneath, whether it be budget or otherwise that we can report out and share with the university. We didn't have those good budgeting systems or data systems to share with the university and manage the institution. So, hopefully, that helps build community as we get that information out more.

I think the Program Prioritization process we went through the last two years was a community building activity. That involved almost 500 people in the institution at the end of the day. It was hard work to look at every program in the institution and think about whether we should invest in it or not. I found that to be a very positive thing, and that's helping us think about how we prioritize in these strained fiscal times today.

I also try to meet with various professorial groups, operating and staff council groups. We've been holding diversity dialogs. I'll host campus luncheons, presidential picnic each fall, various receptions in the arts at my office and at other places. I try to attend as many campus activities as I can and talk to people about where they are, what they're thinking about the institution. I'm, again, open to suggestions you have on building culture and communication on campus.

In the greater DeKalb community, it's actually been an area I've tried to reach out. When I got here, there weren't particularly strong relationships with the local community, and I felt like in a college town, you really need the town/gown relationship to be built. So over time, I've reached out to the business community. I've held a series of listening sessions at my house with, not just the kind of top business leaders in the community, but kind of a middle strata of small business owners and school principals, and folks like that are really the heart and soul of this community, to get a feel for what they know about the institution. And interestingly, I've found they don't know a lot. They know that there's that big school across the street that they'd be hard-pressed to be told, or to tell you where a particular building is or what goes on in them. And so coming out of that, one of the things we did was develop a business and community, or [community and business](#) link. I don't know if you've found it or not, but it's on the homepage, top right corner. And if you click on it, it shows a large number of the things that we're doing to partner in the community. And it's become a great resource. It's getting a lot of hits from the community as they think about, "Oh, I wonder if somebody at the university is working on that." And they'll go click and find it. So I'd encourage you to go look at it. It's a great resource.

I meet with the DeKalb city leadership on a quarterly basis, and we talk about joint activities. Looking at the police station, we do a lot with them on joint policing and safety issues in the community. So how do our two police forces work together on safety issues, for example.

[Proudly DeKalb](#) group, is anybody here a member of that? Christine? They started with America's Best Communities competition. We got to be one of the 16 best communities in the country in that competition. Unfortunately, we didn't get past that stage, but it did set up a whole bunch of dialogs between the university and the community that hadn't existed before. What can we do to help each other to attract and retain faculty, staff and students? And I see Christine standing there. She and about 70 of her fellow students recently had focus groups with Proudly DeKalb and some of the city leaders to talk about what they can do to make this a more inviting town. And it's really a symbiotic relationship that helps the business community and it helps create a more vibrant community for the students. So, thanks to the students for that, as well as Proudly DeKalb, for organizing it.

I also serve on the DeKalb County Economic Development Corporation Board that looks county-wide on how to develop the fabric of the community, particularly the economic fabric. I do a series of presentations to a number of groups, city leadership, DeKalb County Economic Development Corporation, DeKalb County Community Foundation, local chambers from DeKalb, Sycamore and Genoa. For example, I've spoken to, in the last few months, and I try to go to local sporting events as well, when DeKalb and Sycamore play. Those are always fun to get out and see broader segments of the community than just us.

So now three or four years later, this is your next question, where do you see the relationship? I think generally positive. I think with the community, it's really gone forward. We've developed much stronger ties, and I get good feedback both from the business and local government communities. Now that's in a pretty difficult environment. Over the last two years, we've had to cut our budget by approximately \$70 million. That's a big number. And when you make those kinds of cuts, it stresses the system. And I think our faculty and staff are clearly in a very stressed environment. And we need to work hard to manage what we can manage, and I look forward to working with all of you on that. But it is a very difficult environment. I think relationships with students, with community members are pretty positive side though.

What precipitated the need to tighten the whistle blower policy? Actually, it wasn't tightened, I think it was just clarified. It's the same policy that we've had in place, which follows the state guidelines that's in statute. And we just brought it forward to make it clear that it's there and then who the reporting channels are. And then the board wanted that to be brought forward in a timely fashion after their December 15 meeting. That's why that came out when it did.

Many faculty have doubts about the current administration's ability to lead given a series of missteps. Specifically, what can you do, if anything, to rebuild that confidence? Well I hope the description of how we got here and the steps that we've taken to clarify the policies and procedures are important steps in that regard. The intentions in those hires were only to improve the institution, to get people on board to help us move forward in a very critical time. And when those missteps were identified, we took corrective actions, and I think that's about all you can do. I am frustrated that three or four years later we're still talking about these issues, but I'm glad we're talking about them, hopefully, to get this clarity out and give you a sense of what happened and why. And I'm certainly open to further questions or suggestions there.

How can you assure us that we won't see this type of behavior in the future? Well I think we've taken important steps to correct all those things, and I've just described those. They were largely three-plus years ago that these activities happened. I will say, though, that this is a large, complex organization, and we still don't have a policy library, and we're still run by human beings, and people make mistakes. And I think we need to make it easy for them to do the right thing and to understand what the right policies and procedures are with appropriate training and development and clarity and ability to search policies and get stuff done. But all of us are going to make mistakes. And, if we do, that and we need to learn and implement the policies and procedures to take those corrective actions. I think we've done that with staff. I think we've done that with the board. And we'll continue to do that.

Again, I want to thank Greg for his work on the policy library. I think that's an important step forward, and I think it's important for us to look at these issues, see if there are other things to do, and then move forward in these extraordinarily challenging times that we've got.

So I look forward to working with you on those, and am happy to answer any questions you may have on any of that. Go ahead.

G. Long: And, again, microphone and name, please.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I forgot. You said in your report, your December 22 report, that it only [inaudible] the fact that December 15 the Board of Trustees was changing the rules. Isn't it actually true that Franczek Radelet, the investigative report came out about December 15. I believe that was about \$150,000 investigation by the Board of Trustees over the contracts. Am I correct?

D. Baker: No.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Okay.

D. Baker: So it was brought out because the board asked me to, and they passed that policy.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Okay, isn't the, didn't Franczek Radelet report the findings to the OEIG at that time period?

D. Baker: I have no idea.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Okay. Well the contract, the legal bills that were, that I have show that that was actually the case. That the Franczek Radelet bunch finished their investigation it cost about \$150,000 or about \$148 and was released roughly around the time period in early December. So it may be what was driving the board to actually report.

D. Baker: You know, you write conjectures about stuff and throw stuff out, and I think you connect dots that aren't always there. And that disturbs me.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well I'll pass it to you and you can answer us if that's true later.

D. Baker: Are there any other questions? Kendall.

K. Thu: So I appreciate your responding to all the questions, and I think we all are aware that the budget and political climate fuel a lot of frustration. And I think, if this were a different time and a different budget scenario and everybody was getting raises, I think some of these issues wouldn't be as intense. But what I hear, what I'm a little disappointed, is that I don't see that you are reflecting what faculty think about all this stuff.

And let me give you an example. We know that you requested, or somebody requested, that Ron Walters' travel reimbursement back and forth from Oregon or Washington be put in place. In other words, waive the policy where you don't get reimbursed for travel back and forth to your home base

and your work. So set that in the context of faculty knowing that that would be a special rule for an administrator who's getting paid a lot of money and in the context of faculty not being, can't access money for conferences. And then at the same time, we haven't had a raise since 2012. And I didn't hear anything about that in your opening presentation. That sets the stage for faculty, I'm not going to represent faculty, for me thinking, "Well there's one set of standards for the faculty, right? Another set of standards for the administration." And seeing that you understand that is very important to me, personally.

D. Baker: I appreciate you saying that, Kendall. There's obviously a real equity issue there. I probably did not fully grasp that coming in. It seemed, in consulting relationships that I've had with other folks in the past, we had people come in and that was part and parcel of it, and that was recommended, again, by staff coming in. Now maybe I should have caught that. That was a blind side, I should have caught it. I should have been more sensitive to it. It clearly is an equity issue. You all are suffering. We shared with the Resource, Space and Budget Committee today the reductions we've had in various categories. Travel's gotten hit big time, and that harms careers. And it harms your ability to share your research and scholarly activities. So that's clearly an issue, and I'm sorry it happened that way; it won't happen again. I can't unwind what happened there, but I appreciate that equity issue that you're talking about. It just doesn't feel right.

J. Stephen: On the equity issue, certainly we heard something more about it that over the last several years.

G. Long: Is it closer, or is that not on?

J. Stephen: I'm not sure.

G. Long: There we go.

J. Stephen: Sounds a little hollow. Certainly you've known more about the equity issue in the last three years than you did the first year. My faculty's asked me to communicate two concerns. One is, of course, the equity issue and the perception that, while money can't be found to even preserve our faculty, let alone enhance it or keep our salaries to cost of living, they have a perception that administration and administration costs have bloated under you. You can address that, but in your entire, oh almost half hour of talking, you haven't addressed, you didn't address anything that we worry about – your three pillars: sustainable financial abilities, ethical leadership, strong community.

What about academics? The professors, the faculty and the students are the resources. The faculty are the assets of the university, and we're getting part-timed out. We have larger departments that are running with all of their 100- and 200-level courses being taught by TAs and instructors, where you have several faculty members coordinating perhaps. We are not giving a value added experience to the university. If a student who comes out of high school, comes and talks to me, and they're not ready, you know, they haven't already got their calculus and stuff, I just flat out tell them, "Go to Kish, save some money." We're not offering them anything. In fact, some of them will get the very same instructors out of Kish as they would here or Waubensee, and we don't see that changing. I only know about the hiring situation from what I heard from a limo driver, that last

year we had very few hires. What the limo driver reported to me was that you've, that there have been 70 faculty positions opened up for next year?

D. Baker: I think it's about 50 that were approved for hiring.

J. Stephen: Okay, and how many of them were in LA & S.

D. Baker: I don't know.

J. Stephen: Well, I do, it's ten. It's the largest college in the university, and we're very under-staffed. Ten, 20 percent of those two are going to one department as a condition of a hiring a new chair. Other departments, nope. We cannot continue to attract students. We can't even get our professor to the standards where we can continue to support our graduate program. The attrition people are baling. I mean, somebody who's been here, like I have, for 30-plus years, and you think, if I quit now, okay, I don't have to pay 15 percent for taxes, insurance and retirement and all of that, and I'll start getting a three percent raise. Meanwhile, I remember arm wrestling over a one-and-a-half percent raise five years ago. We don't think you're on our side. We don't think that you support academics enough. We see priority in the new thing that you have coming out that is draining a little of the resources from Testing Services and Records & Registration, and a higher level support for personal studies programs, let's call that. Nothing wrong with that, but the programs that were marked for enhancement in the prioritization review are not being enhanced. Not all of them. Ours hasn't. We were marked in the enhanced program.

D. Baker: Okay, so could I take those, I think there's two clumps there. One is a misperception of administrative bloat. So the senior administrative payroll is down over half million dollars since I came here. I've eliminated three vice presidents, or two vice presidencies and associate vice president. So I eliminated Steve Cunningham's position. I eliminated Bill Nicklas' position. And most recently, I eliminated Eric Weldy's Student Affairs vice presidency.

J. Stephen: For clarification, does that also mean that no administrators received a raise in the last five years as no faculty member has?

D. Baker: Yes.

V. Naples: [inaudible]

D. Baker: Virginia, that's not true. Well, hold it, let me take it back. If somebody gets promoted into a position, you've gotten it. If you were an AVP and you became a VP, then you got a raise. But nobody else got raises. Oh, let me take it back. I did have a retention issue for one person where I gave them, I moved something that was in one – compensation was the same but it moved from one category to another, so it may look on the books like that. So let me, before we go into these other issues, let me address that. So they haven't gotten raises, I don't know where you get that from. I think that the tables may show. If you go look at the tables, there are different categories of payment, and it looks like there's differences, but, in fact, take-home pay is not changed across there.

J. Stephen: How is the line item for administrative budgets overall? You've said it decreased a half million dollars.

D. Baker: Over a half million dollars.

J. Stephen: What's faculty budget decreased over the last five years – tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty lines? What is the budget for that decrease?

D. Baker: I don't have that on the top of my head. I will tell you that, over the last two years, we just actually

J. Stephen: It's over a half a million for my department alone.

D. Baker: Over the last two years, out of the 3300 people in the institution

J. Stephen: I'm talking about faculty.

D. Baker: Okay, can I finish? Over the last two years, as we've tried to work through a \$70 million budget reduction for this institution, or actually over \$100 million budget reduction, \$107 million budget reduction in the last two years, we've reduced our spending by \$70 million. That leaves us a [inaudible] of \$47 million that we still need to fill with either more revenue or more cuts. So in that time, we've protected faculty and staff as much as we can. So out of those 3300 employees, we've reduced payroll by about 135-139 people, out of 3300. So when we talk about protecting the core, and protecting academics, and you take \$107 million budget cut and you only reduce faculty and staff by 139, I think that is protecting the core. It is protecting what's important to the students. We've cut in the faculty and their research as well. We've cut everything we could except people. Now you haven't gotten raises, and we've prioritized employment over raises in recent years because of these big reductions in our budgets. But that's the budget reality we're working with. I'm sorry we've not invested in as many of the enhance areas in Program Prioritization as we wanted, but we got hit by a big problem. Last year we had a 71 percent operating budget reduction. That's a big number. And this year we got, we have a 48 percent budget reduction, plus another \$18 million in MAP money that we've not received. So those numbers add up to over \$107 million that we've had to deal with. I wish that wasn't the case. I wish we could be investing. But I do think that we have been protecting the core as best we can, given those big reductions.

We've got another round of reductions in front of us. We have three scenarios in the state right now that we're looking at as we do our budget planning and how much we need to close the gap. One is we get no more money this fiscal year. So we've got a 53 percent budget for this year that ran out in December so we're short 47 percent. We think that we may get MAP money. We think we may get some more appropriations, but we have to plan like we aren't going to get those. So we're planning to that.

Now we could get some MAP money, that's about \$18 million. We could get some more appropriations. If we got full appropriations, it would be an additional \$43 million. But we've got to plan against that, and so we are going to have to do some more revenue enhancement and budget reducing in the next few weeks or set those plans in place. So we're doing that modeling now. As

we do it, though, we are being informed by the Program Prioritization process. We're trying to protect the most important things in the institution. We're looking at need, cost, quality and centrality. What is most important? We met with the Resource, Space and Budget Committee today to talk about those, and we will seek their continued advice as we work down these potential lists of further budget reductions or investments to increase our revenues.

We're also trying to build up our enrollments. So the recruitment work that we're doing, I think, is much more effective. We've reorganized, as you know, to put admissions with – enrollment management with marketing and communication. That's paying dividends already. We're going to start to see that turn over the next year or so. So I wish it was a better fiscal situation. I wish we could invest more heavily, but we are trying to keep those in front of our minds as we make these budget reductions.

V. Naples: I certainly do not blame the present administration or any of the previous administrations for problems within the state, and I sympathize with anyone trying to deal with financial problems that have arisen as a result of those issues. I don't think there'd be anyone in this room that would say that the state is not responsible for a lot of our difficulties. However, what is most troubling to me is that I am seeing an ongoing and continuing trend of a trajectory in which administrations are going that is not favoring the valuing of their faculty and/or the students. When you come down to it, the faculty and the students make the university. There have been times when I've had a very small class, and I am still teaching. You can teach people if you have one student and one instructor. We're the heart of the university. And I have not felt as though I, personally, nor any of my colleagues, whom I value greatly, have been appreciated in this time. And I do have to take issue with a couple of things. I am very distressed over comments that you made the very first semester that you were here. I was on Resources, Space and Budget in a previous iteration. I am on it again now. And that was when Nancy Sutfenfield was here. There was a meeting that took place in the conference room next to your main office with a group of us. And there was, at that time, questions about, would there be faculty raises. And the answer was, no, there isn't any money to do that. And someone raised the issue about how is this going to affect recruitment and retention of faculty. And you made the comment that we may have to do something to enhance those opportunities or we would not either recruit or retain new faculty. You then went on to say that, once people had tenure, they were here and there really wasn't much of anything that they could do. And if we could not give them additional raises, that was just the way it was. That really made me feel disrespected, and I was very upset about that. And to this day, I think you can probably hear the emotion in my voice. I see all of my hard working colleagues, many of whom work many hours a day, seven days a week, whether they're during the semester or not, and not being appreciated. That really bothers me.

The other thing that many people will also realize is that I like to crunch numbers, and I was one of the people who was involved with putting together issues about inflation of administration and administrative budgets. Now I have a real problem because the only data that I can access are public data, so I have to go to the Working Papers and the IBHE website. And my data go from 2010 to 2015. And in 2010, which was before you were here, but it illustrates an administrative trajectory that has continued, not only at NIU, but nationally, of increasing numbers of administrators and increasingly higher salaries. In 2010, we had 26 high-level administrators. This was the President Peters administration. And of 2015, which was the last year for which I had the publicly available

data, there were 76. And the budgets had increased dramatically, practically doubled or more for the highest-level administration. And during that time, there were no, or very few, raises for any of the faculty. And that has made me feel very unhappy and seeing the difficulties that my colleagues are suffering as a result. That has to end.

D. Baker: Well, it's an interesting shaping of the data. I don't think I would ever say I don't care about faculty salaries, and so I challenge that comment. I care deeply about them, and I desperately want to get compensation to you. But we've had to prioritize, for better or worse, employment over salary increases. Now there's another way to do it. We can reduce our work force significantly and then reallocate our resources to higher salaries. We haven't done that yet, but that's the major category of what we spend our money on in this institution, are people's salaries. So that's kind of the calculus that we've got in front of us. And so maybe that's something we need to look at. We are down significantly in our enrollments at the institution. Maybe we need to re-think the shape of the institution and its size. But our preference to this point has been to protect faculty and staff employment over deeper cuts and reallocating to salaries. So I do care about those. We've got to figure out how to do it. In the immediate term, it doesn't look likely, given that we've gone through \$107 million cut two years. We've got to get the situation turned around, both in Springfield and with our own enrollments and get our tuition revenues back up. That will help us turn the corner on the budget, be a sustainable budget where we can invest in the salary increases.

And in terms of the senior administration, I've already noted that I've reduced the senior administration of the institution. I'm not sure which categories you're looking at below, or whether or not those are clerical difference because I have noted with the IBHE, they've changed definitions over time so people that used to not be reported are reported. We recently had a conversation with the board about that, because they sent out different instructions in different years about what to count. And so the numbers we presented were different because of the instructions over time, not because different people or more people had been hired.

V. Naples: According to my evaluations, I exclusively looked at the IBHE website going according to job titles. When I talked about higher-level administration, I was talking about provost's office, vice presidents of all different categories, to the president's office. I was not talking about deans or directors or department chairs. And I was going exclusively by the categories as reported in the publicly available data. I went through that by hand at the cost of hundreds of hours of my time, because I wanted to see where the moneys were and what were the responsibilities of the people who were holding those positions.

D. Baker: I'd be happy to look at that data with you.

V. Naples: I would be delighted to show it to you.

D. Baker: Great, let's do it.

V. Naples: Let's make an appointment to do it.

D. Baker: Done. What other questions?

P. Roberts: Really I'm asking this question because I would hate for all your questions to come just from the front row. Some comment from the back row might be good too. But I'm wondering, so our, some of the other public institutions in this state, Northeastern Illinois, Western Illinois, Eastern Illinois, have experienced layoffs and furloughs. We have not here, is my understanding. I wonder if you could speak to what we're doing differently at NIU to try to prevent resort to those kinds of responses to the budget crisis.

D. Baker: Thanks for the question. So when I got here and I finally got Nancy Suttentfield on board and we started figuring the books out, it looked like we were in a structural deficit situation, more expenses than revenues. And so we started reducing spending and bending the curve. And the steps we began undertaking then were then followed by these state budget reductions that we've had. So we initiated pulling back on our spending at that time. We started reducing hiring activities, etc., anticipating we needed to bring the budget into alignment. So we were out ahead of this a little bit. I think that's one of the reasons why, that we had pieces in place and had that momentum.

So those schools and Chicago State have all had to do some pretty tough stuff. You've probably seen that Northeastern furloughed everyone for spring break, so nobody got paid for that week. And then I believe they're going to go to one day a week furloughs after that. I'm not a big fan of furloughs. I don't want to do furloughs here. It's just a budget salary reduction rather than an enhancement for all of you. I think, if we're going to downsize the institution, you should just downsize the institution and look at things that aren't core and see if you can quit doing some things. That's better than harming everybody in the institution. So that will be our focus going forward. Chicago State declare financial exigency, and laid off everybody and then hired back two-thirds of the work force, laid off permanently one-third of the work force. Eastern and Western were also in financial straits and have laid off major portions of their folks and done furloughs.

So I think that they just didn't get out in front of it and manage it as well as we did. Reed?

R. Scherer: I'm going to ask you an interview question. Where do you see this institution in five years, shedding any rose-colored glasses and just using a time machine? Do you see substantive differences in the demographic of the faculty and the students in the future, and do you think that the Carnegie classification is something that may change in the future?

D. Baker: Great question, thank you, Reed. I do see us being shaped differently, looking differently, faculty, staff and students. So today at the end of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, we talked about how we are really poised to explode once we just get a little bit of water on the ground for the seeds to grow. We've gone through a program prioritization process that was long and hard. But we gained a lot of insight. We know where we need to invest. We are restructuring ourselves. We are becoming more efficient. We're doing process engineering. We're focusing on what's important curricularly. We've revamped our general education program with NIU Plus. Colleges are looking at their programs and changing pedagogies and content and linking out to the outside world so it's informed. We're poised to just explode.

In terms of the student body, this institution, like most in the state, is focused a lot on freshmen. We can do that, but we know the demography of the state is slightly declining for high school seniors. And we also know racial demography is changing, and there are going to be more students of color

who have lower participation rates historically. So we have opportunities to work with those communities to increase those participation rates and their success. Big opportunity for us. We're over 40 percent students of color now. That's an asset, and we've got the infrastructure and culture to support students. I think that's critically important. So I think we can really make some great strides there.

We have not been effective at recruiting. I'll just be honest about that. We haven't been effective at recruiting. Until recently, our admissions team didn't have all the pieces put together. Our constituency relations management system, the computer system that communicates with students, wasn't managed the way it should be. It wasn't getting the right information to prospects in a timely fashion. We weren't linked to marketing so that the brand issues, your research on polar science wasn't being sent out to students to show, you know, here's an NSF best discovery award winner, one of our faculty, come study with us. That kind of information wasn't getting out to students.

Our financial aid system was not well coordinated. We didn't leverage our financial aid system until last year when we did an audit and discovered we have 750 financial aid scholarship sources. And we've got them now in a package that allows us to leverage to get the right amount of money to the right students so they can come and stay and be successful.

So I think we're going to have a different we're going to have a different kind of freshman class coming in, and we're going to have a better yield rate, meaning from applicant to actually getting here. We weren't closing the loop. We weren't having alumni call and write students that we're doing now. We weren't calling centrally. We didn't have faculty, staff, deans, others talking with students and prospects and their families about coming. We're doing a whole bunch of these things that we've not done in the past that are going to increase our yield rate. Our freshman numbers right now look up for this coming fall – that's good – as do our transfers.

So, shifting to transfers, we're going to have more community college students coming here in the future. Over half the state's students are in community colleges, and we've not really actively recruited at those places. So in the last few years, we've been doing a lot of articulation agreements with schools, and we're also having faculty, many faculty, go to community colleges and reach out and work with their partners there.

We're finding that there were road blocks for transfers and articulations and those kinds of things. And there were no relationships. So the faculty in community college – even though they might have graduated from here – weren't telling their students to come here. We've put recruiters on for community college campuses. I think that's going to pay dividends for us going forward. And we're also looking at partnerships with community colleges, like we started with Rock Valley this year. Our folks familiar with that 2+2 program, some of you? Some of you. So as you probably know, Rockford is a big aerospace manufacturing industry, a lot of contractors, subcontractors there in the aerospace industry. They have a deficit of engineers, and so they worked with Rock Valley College and us to create a mechanical engineering degree program there. So students go two years at Rock Valley and two years with us, but on the Rock Valley campus. And industry donated \$5 million to remodel the facility there for students. Great partnership. So students get a lower-cost first two years, a high-quality second two years with us, an internship and a job interview. There were 120 students that came in to Rock Valley's freshman class this fall to go into that program, and we've

got about a dozen in the junior year that were kind of already in the pipeline. I think that's going to be a very successful program, and it shows that we may have to think about how we deliver our programs differently – not just here, but maybe we partner with some select community colleges to have programs on their campuses.

We're also looking at working with businesses, or not-for-profits. Maybe instead of going out and recruiting an individual student, we recruit an organization, and we offer courses, certificates or degree programs for them that meet their needs. It's another way to do it. The business school has opened classes downtown, and they're teaching an MBA and a Masters, as well as a Masters in financial risk management downtown in Chicago at our facility there. There may be other opportunities for others. I know Law is kind of thinking of that as well. So I think where we deliver, how we deliver, and who we're recruiting is going to change over time.

We're also looking at international opportunities. I think there's great opportunity to, not only get more students from overseas, but to have them come here and enrich our campus by being more culturally diverse and globally competent. And so I very much look forward to those things.

And we're developing 2+2, 3+1, 1+1+1 relationships in a few countries. India and China are two of the big ones that we're working on right now, and some in the Middle East as well. So I think there is great opportunity, and we're going to be shaped differently.

How will the faculty be shaped differently? I think as we do these partnerships with Rock Valley, for example, and industry there, a bunch of research opportunities are opening up to partner there. So some of our research may be in partnership with local governments, social service agencies, industry. And that may create resources for us. I'll give you one other example on how we're teaching and the resources that we're garnering. This year we started a program with Ideal Industries, which is the largest manufacturer here in the county, a fairly innovative organization. They charge their employees with thinking everyday about, "If you were our competitor, how would you put us out of business." Kind of interesting way to charge your employees. And it's a pretty creative place even though it's a 100-year old organization. They have a lot of intellectual property. And they approached us last year about starting an intrapreneurship program. They said, "We've got a couple really interesting intellectual property ideas. How about if we put together some teams of students?" And they came and developed a business plan for these two projects. And so that started last May. They worked through May with our faculty and with their staff. Late this fall they presented to their internal leadership team, those two proposals. They were liked. They took them to the Board of Directors. They were liked. Now the students are working on standing up those businesses. So what a great opportunity for students to learn hands-on. And what a great opportunity for us to work with Ideal and potential garner resources from them to help us with our teaching research mission here.

So I think we're going to be shaped maybe a little bit differently. Our student body may be older. Some of it may be in other places than here. Some of it may be online. But I think we have great potential. Chicago is a huge market, and it needs us.

G. Long: And could I ask, let's do like two more questions so that we then can have enough time before people start leaving to discuss this presentation. So let's do two more questions please and then President Baker can have a final comment if he chooses. Joseph.

J. Stephen: Two of the things you just said sort of sound odd. You talk about entering into articulation agreements with the community colleges. Several of us in this room were involved with the Illinois Articulation Initiative, which ironed out a lot of that. I mean we have all of these little codes and dots and sub-dots and stuff like that that tell us exactly what things. And we're changing our courses to meet a particular deadline. I don't understand the problem that you need to go into individual articulation agreements with our community colleges.

And the other thing that bothered me is that you're talking about this initiative with international students. In particular, I'd like to point out that I heard the same thing about China seven years ago. How many of those university connections that they were talking about then actually developed into anything substantial.

D. Baker: We're up about 20 percent international students over the last three years, so I think we've made some progress there. We've got a lot of head room to go.

J. Stephen: How many of those 20 percent are from these schools that we've made agreements with in China? Or do we even have any standing agreements with these Chinese universities like [inaudible].

D. Baker: We do. In fact, we're just working with Southwest University and Nankai University in the last week on these very things, and garnered resources from the Ministry of Education to help us with those. So I think there's real progress. The Ministry of Education in China to help us with those.

Community colleges – why are we doing that stuff? Well with the Illinois Articulation Agreement, it actually doesn't do everything we need to do. So one of the things we've worked on a lot are our first articulation agreements – for those of you not familiar with those – if a student goes to a community college and doesn't graduate, it allows students to leave there and come here early. For example, let's say you're in a program where some of the sophomore level classes aren't all offered at the community college. Do you spend an extra term or two there to finish, kind of wasting your time – and then come here and have to kind of redo it? Or could you come here early, take our credits and transfer them back to the community college and get your associates degree. That's the reverse articulation piece. And so we've put that into place, and it helps both parties. It allows students to have faster time to degree. And then it gives credit back to the community college who taught the bulk of the program, but they get a check in the block that they graduated a student. It was a success not a failure. So we see those as being very positive and pro student as we go through it.

And then we've also found that, in a number of disciplinary areas, that things didn't transfer back here that probably should have. For example, art was one of the areas we heard over and over about we were at Elgin a year or more ago and met with art faculty who had graduated from here. And there was like painting I, II, and III. And we asked, do you send your students back. And they said,

no we don't, because you guys don't accept this painting III class. And they said, we used to teach it at NIU, but when we came here, you didn't bring it back. And so our students would have to go an extra semester or two at NIU, and it just isn't cost effective for them. So we've had to have those faculty-to-faculty conversations and say, was that an artificial barrier, or could we really accept that? And so we've had those conversations going on to try and streamline for students what they can articulate back and what they can do to help them increase their time – or reduce their time – to degree. So I think those are very positive steps that we're taking.

G. Long: And then one more question and then I'd like to have President Baker close.

M. Cefaratti: Kind of piggy-backing off of what Kendall Thu said a little bit earlier, I think, first of all, we're appreciative of having, or I'm appreciative of having you come in and speak to us, because when I think you first joined the university, and when we had Ron Walters come in and become a consultant, it helps to understand the context of the phone call that you received on the way here. The, from the faculty perspective, or personal faculty perspective, what we saw were things like the Huskie Pup buses and the electronic car charges and I think there was a tree-planting thing at some point. But please correct where I'm wrong, because this is completely from what I hear. So then we looked at Ron Walters reporting, in terms of the number of hours and things like that. And the main thing, I guess for me personally, was the idea of the Huskie Pup buses and how they weren't climate, I guess appropriate. And then it just put the thought in the head of: Did he understand our university? And so there was a bit of a perception going outside of the university, now understandably so when you're talking about what you were walking into. But were there deliverables from that consulting contract that we've put in place that have had positive impacts?

D. Baker: Yeah, great question, thanks. So we did a design charrette in January, January or February of '14. And we hadn't done a university master plan, campus plan. And that actually takes a couple years to really audit all your space and figure out what you're doing. But I wanted just some brainstorming to go on. What could we do on campus to move things forward. The campus was hard to navigate. It didn't look as good as it probably should have. And so we wanted to take those things on. And so we did that planning. We got feedback from students and community members. We had the design charrette pieces up for that feedback. And about ten things fell out of that. One of them was better transit across campus. And so we widened bike paths, put the road through. We tried to beautify it, the posters on the library are an example. We did some clean-up of the plantings that had been overgrown and just didn't look good on campus. One of the suggestions was to plant a whole bunch of trees down the boulevards. That didn't happen. But it was an interesting idea. Could you have a nice tree-lined boulevard that would really define campus and make it kind of a park-like inviting opportunity. In fact, there was even talk about having donors, you know, if your kid graduated and you wanted to buy a tree and put their name on the box, etc. It didn't happen. It was an interesting idea to try and beautify campus.

So I think Ron helped us with that. I think Ron helped me and the senior leadership team a lot with strategic planning, with group dynamics. He helped with our budget planning. He helped with community relations. So he did a lot for us, and I appreciate him kind of accelerating that. The downside is that he's a major piece of the inequities that Kendall rightly noted, and has created angst about that appropriately. And I didn't anticipate that. I'm sorry about what's happened there. I

wish it hadn't happened. But coming in the way I noted, I felt like I needed somebody I could trust with a clear set of eyes as I navigated this conflicted space that we were in.

G. Long: And may I ask, do you have a final statement.

D. Baker: Just thank you for having me. These issues from '13 and '14 weren't handled well. I take responsibility for that, but I think we've taken appropriate steps to clean those up. And if we find other things wrong in the future, we will fix those. And that's part of ethically-inspired leadership is that, if you find something wrong, you fix it. And we will continue to do that. But we will try and cut it off at the pass beforehand with better policies, better access to them, better training, better communications. So, thank you for allowing me this time and for, hopefully, clarifying some of these issues a little bit. Appreciate it.

Discussion with Faculty Senate regarding potential resolutions or motions in response –
Faculty Senate members are requested to submit proposed resolutions or motions to Greg Long at glong@niu.edu by noon Tuesday, March 28.

G. Long: Thank you very much. Appreciate your presence. Thank you. So as we move forward, what I'd ask is that you turn your attention to the discussion guide that was created. It's on pages 38 to 42 of. Again it provides some background information. Those pages also include the original questions and ideas that we came up with in our last meeting. And the Steering Committee and I worked together and revised questions and put them in an order that, hopefully, made some sense. As we looked at them, there were three basic sets of questions. One pertains specifically to President Baker. The other had to do more with just general information items. And the third set of questions was, you know, related to senate discussion questions that we might want to have. And so the Steering Committee had suggested that we first quickly review the general information items so that we're all starting with the same context, and then go from there.

I would also acknowledge to everyone in the room that there has been an email exchange. Probably many of you saw this earlier this week with regard to my request to get motions or resolutions submitted ahead of time. I apologize if there was any miscommunication with that. From a Roberts Rules of Order standpoint, you know, it's in the book to submit resolutions written ahead of time. We did the same thing with the art annex. We did the same thing with the DRC resolution. And so the point was to try and suggest that, you know, people write something and submit it ahead of time. And all of you have in front of you the three resolutions that were, in fact, submitted. But again, my intent was in no way, shape or form to preclude any sort of motion from being brought from the floor at this point or to censor any discussion. So if there was any perception that that was my intent, because that was absolutely. My goal is to run this in a manner that has integrity and that is defensible, so that's why I asked for things to come forward upfront. So just to kind of lay that out.

And so if we do it this way, and we do have the questions up there, right? Yes. I will quickly go through the first eight questions. If anyone wants to add something to any of my answers, please don't hesitate. The first question is how long will President Baker be in the position? His contract runs through June of next year. So he had a five-year contract from July of 2013 through the end of June 2018. So that's how long his contract is.

Second question: When will the outcome of the Office of Executive Inspector General Investigations be known? We have no clue on that. You know, and I could encourage any of you to go check the website, you know, fact check me on these things, because there is no list of pending investigations. They list what is, what has been recently ruled on. But beyond that, we do not know how many there are or when anything's going to come back out of that.

Fourth question: What does the vote of no confidence mean? Now I know I may have inundated you with a lot of reading. I certainly that some or most of you did the reading to help get some perspective on this. You know, in quick summary, a vote of no confidence is the strongest statement a faculty senate can make to the board relative to their dissatisfaction and lack of trust in the president, all right? There are other less severe types of things: reprimands, censures, letters, so on and so forth. But a vote of no confidence is the most significant thing, statement that a senate can make. Now the other part of that, and there has been some clear miscommunication from people talking to me, is that a vote of no confidence. You know, if we have a vote of no confidence and we support it, it's truly still symbolic. This is an advisory piece of information to the Board of Trustees. It does not force their hand. It does not make anything happen immediately. So just so you know, the vote of no confidence, because I've had several people say, "Oh, well if we do a vote of no confidence, then that means they dismiss the president." And that is not accurate. It is, again, it's simply a recommendation, opinion. It's advice that is provided to the board. And the other thing, as part of my role as Faculty Senate president, I've put in a lot of effort in talking to board members, both last year and this year, to get some sense of, you know, what their concerns are and so forth. And so there's nothing that we have talked about in this room or in any of the documents that have been shared with you that the Board of Trustees doesn't already have access to. So they're very, very up to speed on what's happening.

All right, would a vote of no confidence now have an impact given the time remaining in his contract?

K. Thu: If I might, Greg.

G. Long: Please.

K. Thu: I just want to add a little bit of information to your description.

G. Long: Yes, please.

K. Thu: What a vote of no confidence means. I think many of you got the copy of the email from the representative at AAUP that I contacted. Because not having any experience in any of this stuff, I wanted to talk to someone who had some expertise with this kind of thing at other institutions. And so he sent that email to me. Then we had a phone call and discussed it further. In his experience, a vote of no confidence, as well as some other flavor of a vote of no confidence, such as censure or reprimand, is essentially saying the same thing: that you want to get rid of the president. That's the underlying communication.

And then he also went on to say that, as Greg is alluding, we don't have any binding authority to get rid of the president. It's up to the BOT. And that, in many cases, what resulted was a hardening of

the relationships between faculty, the president and the BOT. So I just wanted to make sure that that was out there.

G. Long: Thank you. Thank you. Okay, would a vote of no confidence now have an impact given the time remaining in his contract? He has one year left. I certainly can't answer that on behalf of the board. From a logistics and financial standpoint, it would seem unlikely, but I can't answer for them. But again, they know the issues that we're debating in here.

Does the vote of no confidence impact retirement benefits? It would only impact retirement benefits if they dismissed him. So it would not have any impact on retirement benefits other than that.

Number 7 is one I have to say that, when we talked about, we weren't really clear. The cost of litigation. I don't have an answer to that, because there's a variety of things going on, and we weren't clear on what was being asked there. So I apologize about not having a direct answer for that one.

And then finally, what is the process for renewing the president's contract? The specifics of that are included in one of your resolutions. There's a letter from the Board of Trustees chair, John Butler, with regard to the process. But essentially, the board has to decide if they want to renew, to offer President Baker the option to renew his contract. His contract ends June 30. Prior to June 30, they need to do an evaluation. And that's what, again, that's described in the letter that I shared with you from John. So they do an evaluation, and they're giving us the opportunity to participate in this. So that's, from my standpoint, is very cool, but that's a separate talk with regard to as we get to the resolutions. But they do, they do an evaluation of him to decide whether they're even going to offer him the opportunity to renew. And then he also, upon hearing their feedback, has a decision to make, whether he wants to, you know, renew or not, you know, cause. So that's essentially the process that exists.

Are there any questions on those general information things, because those were ones that people had asked last month, and wanted to be sure that we all had the same background information. Are we okay on that? Yes, please, Andy.

A. Krmenec: It's my understanding that the APPM stipulates what that process is for the president's evaluation should be. And it shouldn't be an invitation from the Board of Trustees for faculty to participate. If I recall correctly, the APPM says there is faculty, student, etc. involvement in that review process.

G. Long: Well actually, if you pick up one of the, on that table we've got handouts. And in one of the handouts, you'll see that there are actually five different procedures and policies that are in our governance documents relative to how upper administration and the president is evaluated. So the APPM – and in fact, the APPM is one I missed – so now there's six, because. No, seriously, we've got the Board of Trustees regs, Board of Trustees bylaws. You've got two statements within our constitution and bylaws, and you've got the president's contract. So I know when Baker was here, when President Baker was here, and he was talking about the policy library, this is one of the things that helps demonstrates. It's like, how can you have five or six different policies for evaluating the president of the university, and none of those policies specify what our role as faculty are, what

input is received from students. You know, so there's none of that is part of the policy. So we have many, many policies that relate to the topic, but very, very little specificity as related to those. So, yeah, I know the APPM may say that, well in fact, our bylaws – I forget which one off the top – we were just looking at it – says the University Council has the responsibility of evaluating the president every six years. Well he only has a five-year contract. And subsequent to, well Baker has a five-year contract. As things move forward, presidents in Illinois will only have four-year contracts. So it's kind of a moot point at some level too if we're going to evaluate him every six years. So that's kind of where we stand on that. There are, in fact, multiple policies which is, to me, creates a significant challenge. Other general information issues or questions. Linda.

L. Saborío: Do you know if President Baker would be interested in sharing the outcomes of the OEIG investigations on him?

G. Long: You know, I have no idea, and the thing is, they've not been, the outcomes have not been released yet, to the best of my knowledge. And so, you know, asking him if he'd be willing to release them. "Well, of course, I would be." I mean, I don't know.

L. Saborío: I don't know.

G. Long: You know. So I've, but that is a challenge for us. And I will tell you that, when I started this position in July of 2015, the OEIG report was one of the first things that the board members talked to me about too that, oh it's, you know, it'll come out and, you know, and it's now nearly two years later and we still don't know when anything will be dismissed, disseminated in that regard. Other questions.

All right, then if we move down to our next set, the third set of questions relate to. First off, what are our options? Okay, if you did your reading or looked through the resolutions, you'll see that, at this point, we do have three resolutions that were put forward. In terms of, is this a trend or pattern of behavior we can accept, that can be part of this discussion as we move forward.

If President Baker leaves, how can we make sure that the next president knows what's expected? Well again, I would go to the, you get some policies and procedures put in place on how we are actively involved. Now you move forward in a positive kind of proactive direction. Otherwise, I don't know that there is any way that we would know.

How does this situation impact the public relations of the university? You all probably have as good a sense of that, on that, as I do. I've had any number of people talk to me. I've had students mention it as a concern among students. I've had community members ask me about it. And I've had others among you talk to me about this. But I, you know, how it affects community relations, I, you know, can't really quantify, nor speak more directly on.

Would a vote of no confidence send a strong message to the BOT? Discussion point, my perspective is that it's very unlikely to send a strong message, because they've already been, they already know every bit of information that we already have, and more. And in my role, I have kept communication with John Butler who is chair of the Board of Trustees, and others so they know our concerns. I've tried to be as transparent in this process as possible, because, you know, this is

precedent-setting. This is new territory for us. So while we, you know, we may have a vote of no confidence or one of the resolutions is a vote of confidence, it's, I cannot say that the Board of Trustees will have a particularly strong response one way or the other. I doubt seriously, given the time left in his contract that it would be something that would motivate them to dismiss him. All right?

How is NIU's reputation impacted? Same issues here. And then do we communicate concerns to the BOT? Again the way it's typically done is through the president's office. You have a university, we have a university advisory council that consists of three faculty members and operating staff president and SPS Council president. And we meet prior to the quarterly Board of Trustees meetings. From my standpoint, much like when we put in the guidance letter on resource, space and budget, we'd like to be used in a more advisory capacity than simply, you know, being informed and offering some thoughts in that regard. And if you read some of the material that came from AAUP, even in those materials, they talked about, you know, at some institutions they actually have a representative from the faculty who has a real position on the board. Now that doesn't happen with us just yet, but again, from a resolution standpoint, we have an opportunity to start a collaboration with the board that we've never had an opportunity to do so before.

So I would open it to further discussion. Or if you want to move directly into a discussion of the individual motions, I'm open at this point. Do you have any further points or shall we go to each of the three motions?

J. Stephen: I'd like you to place it as a note for next year's UC to revisit the evaluation process for the president and the term limit for that. Six years is too long.

G. Long: Oh sure, sure. So that's, and that's a bylaw amendment for next year to look at the change in our evaluation. Well, tell you what, let's do this. Since I'm not seeing anyone raise, let's go through each the motions, all right? So, and I do not have the original handout. Oh, I'm sorry. And I would ask if, you know, there are some seats up here if anyone's standing and wants to sit down, please go ahead.

M. Falkoff: So I just want to understand what these are. My understanding of the request for resolution language was, and the reason it's in Roberts Rules, is that when you have something lengthy, you don't have to be drafting on the fly and so forth. And my understanding is that these would have been submitted in case they wanted to be introduced as motions. So are these actual motions? Or do they need to be discussed without being moved? That's just my question.

G. Long: To my understanding, and Ferald, I would ask you to correct me if I'm wrong. My understanding, based on our discussion, is that these were submitted as motions or resolutions to be discussed.

P. Stoddard: None of them are seconded yet.

G. Long: No, no, no, no. I mean we need to go over each of them. So we have three to review, but, and the way that we would do that is we would look at each one, you know, I would state it, get someone to initiate it, get a second, discuss it and then decide what we want to do with that. That's

at least how it's been, the process has been described to me as I've to read through things and talk to people.

P. Stoddard: Greg, my department has expressed some concern over even holding a vote of confidence or no confidence. If we were to introduce the motion, that would sort of mean we need to vote or somehow table it to avoid the vote. So I'm not sure that it's necessarily appropriate to go through each one. I mean if somebody wants to make a motion, they should make it. But I guess I'm trying to figure out how to avoid doing something that maybe we don't want to do, all things considered, I don't know.

G. Long: Okay. Well, I mean, okay.

M. Falkoff: If I may, given the nature of the correspondence that went back and forth, I imagine that people might have been under the impression that, if they had intended, if they wanted to make a motion, they better reserve it by throwing it into writing and sending it to you; and they might not – I'm speculating – might not necessarily want to follow through on that motion here. And I agree that, true something would need a second, although that tends to be automatic (although people should think twice before seconding some of these motions). Again, I just urge caution.

G. Long: Agreed. Agreed. Well tell you what, well Kendall and

K. Thu: Yeah, I was concerned about the same thing, that if somebody makes the motion and seconds it, that it automatically is going to lead to a vote. That is not the case. As Ferald is nodding his head in agreement, right? There are ways of not doing it.

G. Long: You can either, you can postpone, which would then send it to the next meeting, or could be tabled, which essentially kills it. Those are two other options. All right? I'd like to go over the motions in the order in which they were received in our office.

1. [Proposed Resolution](#) to collaborate with Board of Trustees to develop an inclusive evaluation process

G. Long: And so the first one that we received should be on the top of your packet. It was submitted by Professor Linda Saborío.

Kendall Thu: No.

Unidentified: That one.

M. Haji-Sheikh: This one.

Unidentified: We're going by the order

G. Long: Oh, as far as, well the date was changed on this too since we just talked about it today and put it out. But from a receipt of getting this, you sent it to me a week and a half ago. So that was the only reason, I mean, immediately not a week ago.

All right, so as the faculty, here's the proposed resolution: Whereas the Faculty Senate would like to provide meaningful and comprehensive recommendations to the Board of Trustees in regard to the evaluation of President Baker; Whereas Faculty Senate seeks to collaborate with the Board of Trustees in an inclusive manner that compromises, that comprises, that comprises input from various NIU constituents including faculty, staff, students, instructors, alumni and community members; Be it therefore resolved that Faculty Senate move to collaborate with the Board of Trustees per their request in the development of a formalized process involving faculty, staff, students, instructors, alumni and community members for the evaluation of the president.

So may I have a motion to accept. George? And Paul as a second.

Okay, open this up for discussion. Would like to, from a discussion standpoint, certainly call your attention to the second page of this resolution. Given the nature of this talk of the concept of a vote of no confidence, I have certainly been in contact with the Board of Trustees to figure out what different options are. They know that we're potentially taking a vote of confidence or no confidence today. But they also recognize that there may be a mechanism to be a little more proactive that has been suggested, because right now when we're dealing with President Baker, it's a situational issue, and I don't, I'm not here to influence you one way or the other in terms of, you know, yes it's a situational issue we need to address, but bigger picture is how do you do this moving forward. I mean one of our questions is how do we insure that future presidents don't get into this kind of a problem. And so for the first time ever, the Board of Trustees is willing to work with the Faculty Senate and the other councils to seek input. And to give you some sense of how unique this is, they've existed since 1995, and their current approach to evaluating President Baker is the very first time that the board has done a 360 evaluation of the NIU president. So neither La Tourette, nor Peters were ever evaluated in a bigger sense other than interactions primarily with the Board of Trustees, all right? Virginia.

V. Naples: I just have the question. I would like it if you could clarify a definition of a 360 evaluation. I'm assuming it means 100 percent around the circle, including all issues. But I would appreciate a better definition of that.

G. Long: Yeah, and that is ultimately their terminology. What he's saying there, if you look on third paragraph that says, "third, I informed you that Trustees Coleman and Barsema have been working closing with Acting General Counsel Greg Brady and Procurement to devise a 360 assessment that surveys trustees, direct reports and individuals with the capacity and authority to represent a larger group of stakeholders, permits candid assessment by respondents, offers a confidential platform, provides for a combination of in-person interviews and electronic survey application and offers the prospect for both a meaningful and cost-effective engagement.

So at this point, again, they're working to set something up. They have a desire to work with us, and both in the short-term, because if you read this, they've got to do an immediate evaluation. If you look on the second page on this, it says, ask about a time line, the board's objective is to complete the 360 assessment in advance of the board's regular meeting on June the 15th. So they're going to do an initial assessment of President Baker between, you know, basically between now and probably mid-May. We are invited to participate in that. If you read this through, you'll see that I've

asked Trustee Butler about our ability to provide questions, that we have a lot of expertise that we can offer, that, you know, by necessity they're going to use an outside agency, but that we would work in collaboration with them. So short-term solution is to work with the board to deal with the immediate evaluation. But that this sets the stage, and their goal is to then work with us and University Council and other councils to figure out a strategy for moving forward that does specify how we get input from faculty, staff, students and alumni. And what's the process for doing that. And how do we get rid of five or six different policy prescriptions for doing an evaluation and narrow them down to one. And so they're interested in having this be much more efficient and getting our input as well. So that's kind of where this comes from and how it's been proposed.

K. Thu: I agree with the conceptual approach here, and it's consistent with what was recommended by the AAUP rep. I think the resolution can be strengthened a little bit by referencing the kinds of concerns that many of us have voiced here. We haven't gotten to a point where we actually had a discussion of what we've heard from Baker. And so I would like to see some sort of articulation of what are our remaining concerns that we want the evaluation process to attend to, particularly from the board's perspective. I would like to see it have some attempt at teeth in it so that we know what we want.

G. Long: Right, so for us to help provide some structure for the types of questions to be asked. Is that a way of saying it? Helen.

H. Khoury: Greg, are these three motions mutually exclusive? So it's like.

G. Long: No, they're not.

H. Khoury: There's a lot of commonalities. So what if, you know, decisions are made whereby one is negative, the other is positive? What is your plan? How are you going to deal with that? Do we need to have one integrated motion or keep them as is? And then we know they are not mutually exclusive.

G. Long: Right. You could do it. I mean, quite honestly, you could do it either way. The thought in doing this is each motion exists as a separate thing. So we want to combine them as a group, and we can talk about that, but

H. Khoury: Paper-wise they are separate.

G. Long: They are separate.

H. Khoury: But not content-wise.

G. Long: Right.

H. Khoury: There's a lot of commonality in here and lots of implications, common implications that are included in both. And I don't know the legal implications that may come through, through these. So it's like the other thing, what is our current role here as faculty who have been here for

three, two hours now, right, in making, I mean in looking at these resolutions, you know, and making decisions, right?

G. Long: Right.

H. Khoury: But they are not mutually exclusive, so

G. Long: No, you could endorse two of the resolutions. I mean, it could be that we endorse two resolutions. It's not that, if we endorse one, you can't endorse a second. It's just, because each stands individually. I mean at least in terms of how they

H. Khoury: [inaudible] getting my view across correctly. Content-wise, they are not mutually exclusive. They are not independent.

G. Long: All right.

H. Khoury: And they are related

G. Long: Help me understand, because

H. Khoury: Right? They are related content-wise somehow.

G. Long: Although

H. Khoury: More clear or so, do you suggest, would you, I mean, to make one out of all of them? Or do we want to keep each one separate?

G. Long: Well, I would at the very least, let's at least talk about each one separately before we try to put them together. I don't know. Are we

H. Khoury: I mean I'm not recommending. Sorry, I'm not recommending that we put them together either. I'm not doing that, but maybe one could be better off than the other. Maybe one needs more detail than the other.

G. Long: To be honest with you, if you look at the three resolutions, you've got the one to say collaborate with the Board of Trustees. You've got one here that says there should be a motion to contact the OEIG and ask them to either come to campus to explain their process or ask them for a report when they conclude their investigation. I mean, we can certainly support that, but that will have no influence because the OEIG will not be coming to. You know, we could make the request, but they're not going to come and talk to us, and they're not going to release information ahead of time. So, while we could support that, that's a, you know, golly that's great, it's not going to result in any action, so.

H. Khoury: That's right, but as you mentioned earlier, these are symbolic, you know. These are motions

P. Stoddard: Point of order

H. Khoury: Excuse me.

P. Stoddard: This is a point of order. We have a motion on the floor, and I think we should be discussing that.

G. Long: Okay, so, Buck.

J. Stephen: I have a great deal of problems with John Butler's reply. I don't see that coming up with policies during the end of April to be provided to the board in May to have a turnaround for the 360 assessment with great effort to the particular assessment service to define in a confident that stakeholders will be, we're gone.

G. Long: No, here's the deal. They're going to do this regardless. They have to do this for Baker's contract. What we're suggesting, what they're willing to do is say, "We will let you be involved. We'll engage you in this first portion. Granted it's a short time frame, but then let's build a process moving forward from this."

J. Stephen: Oh, I understand that.

G. Long: And they're going to do it regardless of us. They have done these reviews of La Tourette and of Peters without ever involving us.

J. Stephen: No, that's not my point. I don't see that his response to the 360 assessment's realistic. I don't see a time line long enough to actually get any input back from the faculty. If let's see

G. Long: Well as far as input from the faculty, at this point, I know that they're not going to seek input from absolutely every single faculty and staff and student. They're going to look, they're going to go to representatives of those groups.

J. Stephen: Is the UC going to send a group of representatives, such as when we sit in on hiring a new president or provost?

G. Long: That would be part of it, yes. But, again, these things have not been worked out. I'm pushing to have them be as inclusive as possible. I was, in fact, when I was talking to Butler, I suggested that they use the entire University Council, SPS Council, Operating Staff Council and Faculty Senate as the respondent base. The response back to that is, there's not enough money to do that, because a lot of this also includes focus groups, interviews and so forth. And so, yeah, we could send out an electronic survey to everyone, but from their standpoint, they'd rather get more qualitative and in depth information from a smaller number of people. But, like I say, the details of this have not even remotely been worked out. What we're saying here is, this is an opportunity. And again, it's an opportunity that has not heretofore ever been presented to the Faculty Senate.

J. Stephen: I just don't think it's much of an opportunity.

G. Long: No, but any door that's at least partially opened, gives us a chance to get in, because right now, if we don't respond to them, I mean, think about it conceptually. From their standpoint, if we take a vote of no confidence – and again, we may certainly do that and vote up confidence, all right – they may very easily say, “Well, we've heard from the faculty, we don't really need to, what more do we need to hear from them?” And that's potentially problematic, you know? And the other part of all this – and I'm sorry but I've got to put on my University Council hat – is that what we're doing right now excludes staff, students in this process. And I think that, that also causes some bit of concern, and the board would interpret any votes we have within that context as well. Now we have the right to do this, and that's not to say that, but recognizing that other groups have options as well. Kendall.

K. Thu: I think a lot of us have a concern that we're being given this process-speak from Butler and that, if we engage in it, it will somehow end up vacuous, that it really isn't going to be effective, that it will just end up in a, you know, a smoldering pile of recommendation rubble. So that's why I think we need to make very clear in our language what our expectations are of the faculty role in working with the BOT.

G. Long: Well and we can make recommendations, but from the hierarchy of how things work, we can't tell them to do anything.

K. Thu: I understand, but that doesn't mean we can't make recommendations.

G. Long: No, I agree, and I think we should. I don't think you should ever make a complaint without providing some possible solutions, but yes, certainly yeah.

P. Stoddard: I'd like to propose a friendly amendment to the resolution on the table to include – and I've got the language here. It's a little involved, but, to include another whereas: Whereas, the faculty of Northern Illinois University is deeply concerned about the future direction of the university. And then another Therefore clause: Therefore, be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate moves to include questions of ethics, the relative roles of academic and administration, and the future direction of the university be included in the Board of Trustees' consideration of President Baker's renewal.

G. Long: Okay, and so that's a friendly amendment. Do we have a second for that?

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

G. Long: Okay. All right. And we need a vote on that.

Unidentified: It's a friendly amendment.

P. Stoddard: Well, if it's a friendly amendment, then the original motion maker and seconder have to approve it.

Unidentified: Yeah.

G. Long: Ferald, what, how do I do this? Do I? I'm sorry.

P. Stoddard: Or you could have a vote.

F. Bryant: Friendly amendment implies unanimous consent. If there are those who don't consent to the friendly amendment, it's not friendly.

G. Long: All right, well.

F. Bryant: That's what it means.

G. Slotsve: I made the motion, Greg, so I'll accept that as a friendly amendment.

G. Long: Okay.

K. Thu: We don't need to vote again.

G. Long: We do not need to vote, okay. Any further discussion on this particular motion, you know, given the additional language that Paul has added. Yes, Janet.

J. Hathaway: Just a quick comment. I just, I think this would be a very responsible way for this body to move forward. I think especially just to maintain our credi8bility, that we should certainly want to be involved with this, given the discussions that have been going on the last several weeks.

G. Long: Other comments or questions before? All right, we should probably call this for a vote then. But before we do that, let's test our clickers. Sorry. Those of you who have new clickers, the ones that George handed out the end that are, you know, look like old calculators. Okay, we want to, let's, Pat, tell me when. Okay, if you have a new clicker, vote 1 or A right now. We just want to make sure you're tuned into the frequency that we're accepting.

J. Stephen: Smiley face means we're connecting, right?

G. Long: Oh yeah. We did not give out 14 of those. So some of you are just practicing, I'm afraid. Excuse me, yeah, Pat. If you have a clicker like that, click 1 so we know that it works. Yeah, we're going to start again, because we didn't give out 14 clickers, so several of you clicked just for the hell of it, which is okay, but it didn't help us. Okay, seven looks better. All right, Janet.

J. Olson: I'm sorry, Greg. Before we vote, could you read the amendment again, just so that I'm clear on what I'm voting on.

G. Long: Sure, can you? Did you? Paul.

P. Stoddard: The amendment includes an addition whereas, which states: Whereas the faculty of Northern Illinois University is deeply concerned about the future direction of the university. And another therefore clause which reads: Therefore be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate moves to include questions of ethics, the relative role of academics and administration, and the future

direction of the university be included in the Board of Trustees' consideration of President Baker's contract renewal.

G. Long: Okay.

J. Stephen: Would that be the third paragraph now?

J. Olson: Is that going at the very end?

P. Stoddard: I don't know.

G. Long: That goes right before the "be it resolved."

P. Stoddard: Okay, third paragraph.

G. Long: Yeah, it becomes the third paragraph, yes. Mark Riley.

M. Riley: I just want to point out, I think the amendment substantially changes the tone of the resolution and makes it, a reader could infer an awful lot from that amendment that they wouldn't, I think, infer from just saying, "Hey, we want to be involved." And I have a problem with the amendment for that reason. I think it's a statement that is not going to play well publically. And I don't think it's necessarily what we were looking, what this motion was looking to accomplish. I didn't write the motion, but that's my take. Okay?

G. Long: Other comments? Mitch.

M. Irwin: I think it's okay to add a little context. Sorry, I respectfully disagree, Mark. I would add one friendly, friendly amendment, friendly amendment to the friendly amendment. I wonder about the words, "contract renewal." Shouldn't we just back up a little bit and say "assessment process" or "assessment of President Baker" recognizing the fact that we are advisory, not

G. Long: Although, within Butler's letter, he did talk about our more active involvement in contract renewal talks because they do, the board has to do a yearly sit-down with the president to review goals and objectives, how he's done. But those yearly reviews do not, and have not typically, involved feedback from faculty or other groups. It's been with, you know between the board and the president. So this has to do much more with the end-of-contract, you know, how are things, how do you look at things.

P. Stoddard: I appreciate that comment, but since we don't get a chance to evaluate the president before his contract is renewed, this is our chance to do that. I would be open to saying "consideration of presidential contract renewals" to make it a more general statement, rather than specifically single out this president.

G. Long: Yeah, we need to have this move forward as a positive statement from us, because there will be other presidents. That's not trying to – Mark.

M. Riley: I like that change. I think it's helpful.

G. Long: Yeah, because that, from, we don't need to antagonize the board in any way, shape or form, because they're already reaching out to us. I mean, they're going above and beyond what they are obligated to do in terms of working with us. And so the more positive and solution-focused we can be in our interactions, the more likely we're going to be successful. So I would, I like the idea of us being as collaborative and cooperative and anxious to work with them as possible, because the more we work in a way that shows them that we've got something to offer, the more likely they are going to continue to use us. I mean even if you want to talk about going to the future, I mean, the selection process of a president, there's multiple ways in which that is described as well. As we've talked about in some of those articles you read, there are different ways of composing a board that may involve a faculty member, and so, from my way of looking at this, and I mean and, honestly I don't have a dog in the race, I retire in three months, okay? So I'm giving you my honest, like looking at this from the future, move forward, plan for the future, have this be something that is a forward-looking opportunity rather than simply responding to the moment. You know, or respond to the moment, but we also look at this as an opportunity to move forward. And let's say, and the point that Kendall made, I think it was Kendall, well, what if this is still just a bunch of hoey, you know, that it's not really the board's not really going to be all that interested. Well that does not preclude this group from next fall saying, you know, basically, the heck with you, we'll have a vote of no confidence then. I mean, so, so it doesn't, it doesn't stop us from doing things in the future. It just gives us an opportunity to right now be engaged immediately in a process, and then be engaged in a longer-term process as it moves forward.

T. Pavkov: Greg, is it possible to have that amendment added to what's on the screen so that we actually can see what we're potentially voting for.

J. Stephen: Have you got a re-worded third paragraph, Paul?

G. Long: Pat do you have that? Thanks for your patience. And for those of you who were complaining about the request to submit resolutions early, just heads-up.

J. Stephen: Join paragraphs three and four.

P. Stoddard: No, you always keep the whereases and the therefore's separate.

J. Stephen: Oh no, sorry I missed that. Okay, friendly amendment to substitute the old paragraph three with the new paragraph three and four.

G. Long: Okay. Janet Hathaway, are you going to? Is it about this?

J. Olson: I think I just want to point out, I think it's important to highlight Mark's point that, when we're wording this, I think we need to be very careful about tone, and I think semantics are important in terms of the way this is going to be viewed by folks outside of this body, outside of the university. And I think that we need to consider that. So I do have some concerns about the whereas part, "The faculty is deeply concerned about the future direction of the university" in terms of the tone in that particular sentence.

J. Stephen: How about “deeply invested in”?

G. Long: Invested, yeah.

J. Olson: I mean I think it’s important and what I like about this resolution is that it does allow us to move forward in a positive manner [inaudible]

G. Long: [inaudible]

P. Roberts: Greg, may I make a comment on that because I

G. Long: Name again, I’m sorry.

P. Roberts: I’m sorry, Patrick Roberts, College of Education. And I agree completely. I very much like the substance of the friendly amendment, but I think the phrasing there too reflects a – because if the faculty were deeply invested in helping to determine the future of this university, absolutely. And I don’t think the Board of Trustees, or anybody else, would take issue with

G. Long: No, because we are

P. Roberts: that claim. Correct.

G. Long: Right.

P. Roberts: And I think that’s a more active affirmational phrasing

G. Long: Yes.

P. Roberts: that I think honors the spirit of the memo a little better. So I too would like to suggest that, rather than saying “deeply concerned,” we say “we’re deeply invested in helping to determine the future of the university, yes.

G. Long: Certainly. Paul, as a friendly amendment.

P. Stoddard: That’s fine.

G. Long: Okay, and so we’re

P. Stoddard: Invested in.

K. Thu: And put a smiley face right next to it.

M. Haji-Sheikh: We keep going, we’re just going to

G. Long: All right. Oh, I’m sorry, Janet, I apologize.

P. Roberts: May I really quickly, my suggestion would be “is deeply invested in helping to determine the future.” Clearly, we’re invested in the future, but I think we’re also invested in helping to determine it.

G. Long: Right. In determining, right.

P. Roberts: In helping to determine the future direction of the university.

G. Long: Paul?

P. Stoddard: Sure.

G. Long: Excellent. Janet.

J. Hathaway: I don’t quite understand the phrase, the relative role of academics and administration and am a little concerned if I don’t understand it, then how it would be received. So some clarification there.

P. Stoddard: Okay, well that was in response to Buck’s and others’ line of questions for the president, which I think is something we all share anyway. I’m certainly welcome to phrasing that makes that clearer.

J. Hathaway: I guess I’m not sure what it means to begin with, though.

J. Stephen: How about just to questions of ethics, the roles of academic administration, and the future direction.

G. Long: Yeah, Just get rid of “relative.”

J. Hathaway: Does academics mean programs? Faculty? Like, what does academics mean?

P. Stoddard: Yes. Basically, if you look at the university, it’s traditionally been divided into, well, back in the older administration, it was divided, when I was sitting up there, it was divided into finance and facilities and academics. And the finance and facilities budget was doing this, and the academic budget was not. And so that’s kind of how I had this in my head is it’s a no-win, well it’s a, I forget the terminology.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Zero sum gain.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, thank you. Zero sum gain. So if one side gains, the other side loses. And I think most of us in this room feel that the academic side should be the one gaining if anybody’s gaining.

M. Haji-Sheikh: And the Board of Trustees definitely recognizes the differences, because they have committees specially set for academics and then the facilities and finance, so.

G. Long: Yeah, they recognize the differences.

K. Thu: Call the question.

J. Stephen: No we have to approve the friendly amendment, first.

P. Stoddard: I'm good with it.

J. Stephen: Secunder?

G. Slotsve: I approve it. I accepted it.

J. Stephen: In this final form? Okay.

S. McHone-Chase: Yeah. Roles.

G. Long: Okay, so this is the complete amendment, right? Whereas, Faculty Senate would like to provide meaningful and comprehensive recommendations to the Board of Trustees in regard to the evaluation of President Baker. Whereas Faculty Senate seeks to collaborate with the Board of Trustees in an inclusive manner that comprises input from various NIU constituents, including faculty, staff, students, instructors, alumni, and community members. Whereas the faculty of NIU is deeply invested in helping to determine the future direction of the university. Be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate moves to include questions of ethics, the roles of academics and administration, and the future direction of the university be included in the BOT's consideration of presidential contract renewals. Be it therefore resolved that the faculty – oh – be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate – Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate move to collaborate with the Board of Trustees per their request in the development of a formalized process involving faculty, staff, students, instructors, alumni, and community members for the evaluation of the president.

P. Stoddard: And I hate to do this, but just to keep it looking right, it should, well, the abbreviations will, obviously be spelled out, but it should also be after each paragraph, it should be President Baker, and whereas; community members, and whereas.

G. Long: Okay.

P. Stoddard: And no period after university in the next one. And then similarly, yeah, thank you.

G. Long: Does that

J. Stephen: Change FS and BOT to Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees.

M. Cefaratti: If we would like this to be something that moves forward, should we just say president in the first paragraph? Did you? I'm sorry I didn't hear. Oh great, me too.

G. Long: I'm sorry, I missed.

M. Cefaratti: Remove “President Baker” and just leave “president” in the first.

G. Long: Yeah, yeah, yeah, absolutely.

P. Stoddard: All right, so are we moving to remove President Baker, is that what I just heard?

G. Long: Very subtle, Paul, very subtle, not close enough. Okay, so at this point, are we ready to call the question? There?

T. Arado: The use of “include” and “included” does not make sense in the sentence. So I think the first “include,” it should just say “moves.” “Moves questions” so “to include” in the first sentence should be removed so that it makes sense.

Unidentified: Or just say “to include questions” and take out the “included.”

T. Arado: Exactly, either way.

G. Long: Are we okay again?

P. Stoddard: I third and fourth that.

L. Saborío: Fourth paragraph, remove “be included” in the second line.

J. Stephen: And for consistency, I suggest just changing FS and BOT to the full

G. Long: Oh yeah, no, we will. And those will be spelled out. Yup. Anything else on this one before we call the question. So are we ready to call the question on this? All right so would ask you to use your clickers. If you support this resolution, oh wait a minute, please. Okay if you support the resolution, vote 1. If you don’t support the resolution, vote 2. And if you abstain, that’s 3. Okay, so if you would take a moment and vote yes, no, or abstain, that would be great. Pat, can I? Okay, has everyone voted?

Unidentified: No.

G. Long: No? Okay. Make up your mind quickly then. It’s okay. All right, so are we set? Okay, can we see the results, please, Pat. Oh, I’m sorry. So we’re trying to get as many votes as possible. Technology is a great thing when it works. Okay, we’ve all voted, let’s see what the results are.

1 – yes – 51 votes

2 – no – 1 vote

3 – abstain – 1 vote

G. Long: Okay, that seems pretty good from a resolution standpoint. We’ve got a very strong position to share. I thank you for that resolution.

2. [Proposed resolution](#) to demonstrate confidence in President Baker

G. Long: Let's look at the next one then. The next resolution was submitted by Professor Haji-Sheikh. Try to make a motion?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yeah, I move to, what is it, continue?

J. Stephen: Continue it.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Continue it to the next meeting and wait and see how the board responds

G. Long: Okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: to our motion. Because if they come back to us saying, well guys we, you know it's nice that you wanted to do this, but hey

G. Long: Right.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Okay?

G. Long: Oh no, I agree, we need to hold them to their word on this. I mean this is a promise, it's an opportunity, but it's not a guarantee.

M. Haji-Sheikh: This up here is the reason why they don't want, they [inaudible] people they really don't want us voting on this, so they're giving us an opportunity. If they don't follow through with their opportunity, then we need to make sure that we have this option for the last, basically the last meeting of the year.

G. Long: Right, and I've already conveyed that sentiment to Trustee Butler from the standpoint that this can't be, this can't be a hollow promise. We have to be able to work together, because, if not, then it is meaningless and we do have a right to then, you know, to our votes and to share them more publically, absolutely.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yeah.

J. Stephen: Feral, this doesn't require

G. Long: So you are, are you saying to postpone this, you'd like to postpone?

M. Haji-Sheikh: I would like to postpone this confidence vote until next meeting. I would like to move it.

G. Long: Okay, we need a second.

P. Stoddard: Second.

G. Long: Okay, any discussion? Yes. Yes. Any discussion on that? All in favor of postponing that motion, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay, so we'll

3. [Proposed resolution](#) to request information from the Office of Executive Inspector General

G. Long: And then the third motion, with regard to the OEIG report. Keith.

K. Millis: So this came from a discussion with my faculty, and it is sort of in response to, you know, the vote of no confidence. And we thought that would be, really should be based on the outcome of the OEIG investigation, but our understanding is that we may never see it,

G. Long: Right.

K. Millis: and so given that the vote of no confidence was postponed, I'd like to probably, well I mean, probably the best thing would be just to extract

G. Long: To withdraw the motion?

K. Millis: Yeah.

G. Long: Yeah, since we have no control over this, and as a piece of advice to anyone, they're not going to care, because, you know, no offense, but the board has no control over OEIG, and so letting them know we want to talk to them. They'll know that OEIG's not going to come and talk to us.

K. Millis: Yes, in regard to at least maybe learning more about the process.

G. Long: All right. All right. So in summary, it's, go ahead, Kendall.

K. Thu: No, I was just going to say that nothing we've done here prevents us from taking further action once we get the

G. Long: Oh gosh, no.

K. Thu: [inaudible]

G. Long: No, that's very important point for everyone to know. This is our immediate response and this provides an opportunity to show good will on our part and collaboration on our part toward the Board of Trustees. But, as several of you have mentioned, it doesn't necessarily, if they don't follow through on their part, we have other options.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- B. University Professionals of Illinois “Teach Out,” April 27 – Paul Stoddard

IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

X. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs Committee – John Novak, Chair – no report
- C. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – Paul Stoddard, Chair – no report
- D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Rebecca Hunt, Liaison/Spokesperson – report
 - 1. Letter of acceptance of nomination for President of Faculty Senate/
Executive Secretary of University Council;
Faculty Senate will vote at the April 26 meeting.
 - a. [Linda Saborío](#) – Pages 44-45
 - 2. Letters of self-nomination for Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor.
Faculty Senate will vote at the April 26 meeting.
 - a. [David Valentiner](#) – Pages 46-47
 - b. [Sarah McHone-Chase](#) – Page 48
 - c. [Christine Kiracofe](#) – Pages 49-50
 - d. [Hamid Bateni](#) – Page 51
 - e. [Kirk Miller](#) – Pages 52-53
 - f. [Jorge Jeria](#) – Pages 54-55
 - g. [Mark Van Wienen](#) – Pages 56-57
- E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Jimmie Manning, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- 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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

J. Stephen: I move to adjourn, Greg.

G. Long: Move to adjourn? We all good?

Unidentified: We need our clickers for that motion? I'm just kidding.

G. Long: All in favor?

Members: Aye.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.