

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT

Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 3 p.m.

Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Baker, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Buck, Bujarski, Carlson, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Chitwood, Chomentowski, Chung, Conderman, Demir, Farrell, Ferguson, Fredericks (for Rosenbaum), Garcia, Glatz, Gorman (for May), Grund, Haji-Sheikh, Hashemian, Hathaway, Hou, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Khoury, Liu, Long, Macdonald, Manning, McHone-Chase, Millis, Mogren, Montana, Moraga, Naples, Nejd, Newman, Novak, Patro, Pavkov, Pluim, Riley, Rodgers, Ryu, Saborío, Shin, Slotsve, Staikidis, Stephen, Stoddard, Streb, Than

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Allori, Azad, Briscoe, Collins, Dugas, Fang, Hanley, Konen, Krmenec, May, Penrod, Rosenbaum, Scherer, Shibata, Tan, Thu, Xie

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Doederlein, Falkoff

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: Welcome to the final Faculty Senate of this academic year. So, congratulations to all of us for making it this far.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: As we're going through our agenda, the first thing we need to do is adopt agenda, but prior to doing so, I'd like to request a change. Under Reports from Standing Committees, which is item XI. D., numbers 1 through 4, are items that concern voting for next year's Faculty Senate president, SPS personnel advisor, UCPC reps and so forth. I'd like to move it earlier in the meeting so that we have everyone have an opportunity to vote. So I recommend that we move this item immediately following going to executive session. May I have a motion to accept the revised agenda? George? May I have a second? Second, McHone-Chase, okay. Any discussion? All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? Okay we have an agenda. Next thing I would say just as a reminder, with our captioner, please be sure again to use the microphone when you speak and to say your name prior to making your comments. She can only capture one person at a time.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 29, 2017 FS MEETING

G. Long: All right, moving on to number III. Approval of the Minutes of the March 29, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting, we need a motion to accept the minutes. Okay, I didn't see or hear. Oh, okay, Laura Beamer. Second Arado. Any corrections, changes, deletions, anything on the minutes? Okay, all in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Opposed? Abstention? Okay, we approve the minutes.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

G. Long: All right, we're now scheduled to go into executive session, and I need a motion to do that. George? I need a second. Sean Farrell, okay. We'll go into executive session. Paul Stoddard and I will now leave the room, and I will turn the meeting over to George Slotsve who will lead us through the – oh and all non-members need to leave the room with Paul Stoddard and me.

Oh, I'm sorry, my mistake. And we did not yet vote to go into executive session. All in favor of going into executive session, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed?

- A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/
Executive Secretary of University Council – Sean Farrell
- B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor –
Cathy Doederlein

G. Slotsve: I would like to move that we leave executive session, I need a second.

Unidentified: Second.

G. Slotsve: Those in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Slotsve: Those opposed? Thank you.

XI. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES [taken out of order per motion to approve agenda]

G. Long: All right, let's resume. Hopefully, in executive session, you haven't kicked me out yet. I just have the last meeting, so we'll go from there. And this is where we also had a change in our

agenda, where we're moving item number XI. D. 1-4, the elections, and so I would at this point like to turn it over to Professor Becqui Hunt to lead us through that.

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

1. Nomination of the 2017-18 Executive Secretary of University Council, who shall also serve as President of Faculty Senate per NIU Bylaws [Article 14.5](#) – Page 14
 - a. [Linda Saborío](#) – Pages 15-16

R. Hunt: Good afternoon, everyone. Can you hear me? Our first item of business is to select our final nominee to serve as the 2017-18 executive secretary of University Council, who will also serve as president of Faculty Senate. We will accomplish this by secret ballot using our clickers. If you are a voting member of Faculty Senate, please make sure you have your clicker. We have one nominee, Linda Saborío. When the polling opens, we will vote as follows: 1 or A for yes, in favor of; 2 or B not in favor; 3 or C abstain. So let's vote at this time. Does anyone need more time?

Unidentified: Yes.

R. Hunt: Okay, congratulations!

Yes – 44 votes

No – 2 votes

Abstain – 4 votes

2. Election of Faculty and Supportive Professional Staff Personnel Advisor for a two-year term per Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 9](#) – Pages 17-18
 - a. [David Valentiner](#) – Pages 19-20
 - b. [Sarah McHone-Chase](#) – Page 21
 - c. [Christine Kiracofe](#) – Pages 22-23
 - d. [Kirk Miller](#) – Pages 24-25
 - e. [Jorge Jeria](#) – Pages 26-27
 - f. [Mark Van Wienen](#) – Pages 28-29

R. Hunt: Okay, our next item of business is to elect our faculty and SPS personnel advisor. Following a discussion with our parliamentarian, we have concluded that, in order to be elected, the candidate must receive a majority of the votes cast. And since there are multiple candidates for this position, it could take several ballots before one candidate receives the majority.

Here is the procedure we will follow: Following the first ballot, if no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast, the person with the fewest votes will be eliminated from the list and a second ballot will take place. Following the second ballot, if no candidate has received a majority vote, the person with the fewest votes will be eliminated and a third ballot will take place, and so on until one candidate receives a majority of the votes cast.

Okay, as you can see from the slide projected there on the screen, each candidate is assigned a number and letter to correspond with your clickers. So it's 1 or A for David; 2 or B for Sarah; 3 or C for Christine; 4 or D for Kirk; 5 or E for Jorge; 6 or F for Mark. Okay, go ahead and vote. Does anybody need more time? Okay the voting is closed.

1/A	David Valentiner	9 votes
2/B	Sarah McHone-Chase	14 votes
3/C	Christine Kiracofe	10 votes
4/D	Kirk Miller	5 votes
5/E	Jorge Jeria	4 votes
6/F	Mark Van Wienen	4 votes

G. Long: So based on these results, we would take the bottom two off.

R. Hunt: Okay.

G. Long: So the bottom two would be Jorge and Mark.

R. Hunt: Okay. So now we're going to ask you to vote again. Do we need any more time? Okay the voting is closed.

1/A	David Valentiner	9 votes
2/B	Sarah McHone-Chase	24 votes
3/C	Christine Kiracofe	7 votes
4/D	Kirk Miller	7 votes

G. Long: We have 50 people here so I think we just missed the majority on that one so we've got to eliminate.

R. Hunt: We're taking off two more? We're taking off two more. So go ahead and vote again. Anybody need more time? Okay voting is closed.

1/A	David Valentiner	15 votes
2/B	Sarah McHone-Chase	34 votes

G. Long: So it would appear that congratulations Sarah.

R. Hunt: Yes.

3. Election of University Council Personnel Committee representatives for Terms to begin 2017-18. Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting. Voting will be by college; CBUS, CHHS and CLAS have vacancies to fill this year. Votes will be counted following the meeting and newly-elected UCPC members will be notified – walk-in

R. Hunt: Okay our next item of business is to elect faculty members of University Council to serve on the University Council Personnel Committee, also known as UCPC. Three colleges have vacancies to fill: Business, Health and Human Sciences, and Liberal Arts and Sciences. The ballots are color-coded so, when I call the name of your college, would you please raise your hand, and my helpers will distribute your ballots. College of Business. Okay, Health and Human Sciences. Okay and finally College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

4. Committees of the University 2017-18 – Election of candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate. Ballot packets will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting. Votes will be counted following the meeting and those running will be notified of the outcome – walk-in

R. Hunt: Okay, the last item is to elect the faculty to serve on a number of committees of the university. These ballots are at your place. All those listed in the ballot were invited to provide a paragraph summarizing their qualifications and/or desire to serve. All paragraphs that were submitted are included in the ballot packet. Please complete the ballot packet only if you are a voting member of Faculty Senate and leave it at your place to be collected after the meeting. And thank you.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: It’s my understanding that I now am supposed to turn this over to George Slotsve for a moment.

G. Slotsve: As most of us think know, this is Greg’s last meeting as president of the Faculty Senate, as well as he will be retiring this year at the end of June. That will be 26 years of service, I believe, at NIU, the last two as president of the Faculty Senate. So I would just like to thank Greg for his leadership and being willing to serve as president of the Faculty Senate. It’s often difficult to find anyone who is even willing to step up to the position, and I can kind of understand why.

I just want to note a couple, three of his, what I think are probably his biggest accomplishments. One is I think is the real time captioning. I personally have found it very helpful. I hope everyone here has. It’s also, on a personal level, helped me. I’ve been able to let my wife know that it is, indeed, a hearing problem, rather than selective hearing, that I have. So it’s helped. Secondly, I would like to thank Greg for assembling the Faculty Salary Task Force. Hopefully, we will be hearing from them this coming fall. But thank you for running that initiative. And probably the longest-lasting effort that you’ve made was being the driving force behind the NIU Policy Library. And I think that could really have lasting effects. For that, I would really like to thank you very much, Greg.

On behalf of Faculty Senate, I would like to present you with a gift and thank you.

G. Long: Thank you very much. Sorry, I need to look for just a moment. It’s not a record. Oh, very nice. So I’m not late. It says “Northern Illinois University, in grateful appreciation, Faculty Senate President 2015-2017.” Thank you all.

And so that leads me in to President's Announcement. And I say this with all seriousness. I thank you for the honor and the privilege of being Faculty Senate president. It's been a tremendous learning experience. I appreciate the senate's advocacy that we've demonstrated this year in terms of resolutions in support of the Art Annex, support for the Disability Resource Center, as well as our discussion and interaction with President Baker and the Board of Trustees. I encourage continued diligence and willingness to address difficult issues as a senate.

And I would also like to thank, again, all of you as members for giving up your time and energies for the senate, as well as my colleagues up front here. Particular thank you to Pat Erickson. Pat is really the, what makes Faculty Senate and University Council run. She is a tremendous asset, not only to our office, but to the university, so want to give a thank you to Pat.

I'd also like to give a special thanks to Ferald Bryan. You know, one of the parts of being a faculty member is you're not really necessarily required to know Roberts Rule of Order. And now in this position, I feel much more adept with it, but much of that can be attributed to the help I've gotten from Ferald. He has been a consistent ally and colleague and willing to answer questions, look up things on topics. So, again, Ferald is a real value for all of us, and I would just say thank you very much.

She's not here right now, but I would want to mention Sarah Klaper as well, as our ombudsperson. She is a true asset for the university and, I think, has been very helpful. I confer with her on a regular basis for perspectives and opinions, so thank you to Sarah.

And I'm glad George mentioned the captioner, Cathy Rajcan. Cathy, I think, has done a remarkably good job of getting as many of our names correct as possible, because when you're doing this, it's phonetic. So sometimes there are mistakes, but otherwise it's been a tremendous value. So I'd like to thank Cathy for her work as well.

And I apologize because I feel confident that I'm going to miss one or two people in this process, but there are a number of individuals who have been very involved this year that I do want to say thank you to, especially the committee chairs within Faculty Senate.

On Rules, Governance and Elections, it's a shared position with University Council and Faculty Senate. And it's Therese Arado and Becqui Hunt. Both of them have given a lot of effort this year, and we've made significant improvements, so thank you to them for their work.

Certainly thanks to George Slotsve for his ongoing dedication as vice president of the Faculty Senate. He's filled that role for multiple years, as far as I understand, but he's been a definite asset to us, so thank you, George.

Would also like to thank Paul Stoddard for his work chairing the Economic Status of the Profession Committee. But perhaps most importantly, being the faculty representative to the IBHE. That requires a fair amount of work and effort, and he's always bringing back reports to us. So thank you, Paul, for your efforts there.

Katy Jaekel, would like to thank her, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. We'll hear from her later. They've just done some work on preferred name option, and also talked earlier in the semester about religious holiday observations, and so thank you for your work on that.

I'd also like to recognize John Novak. John has probably had one of the most frustrating committee chairs of the season from the standpoint of working on the classroom recording policy. And John and his committee have done a very good job, came up with lots of good ideas. And then it has gone to Office of General Counsel where, at this point, Greg Brady is looking at it with the idea that there may need to be some structural changes to how we initially organized it. So essentially, time ran out. It had nothing to do with John or his committee, that they had done a good job. We just have to continue pushing forward on that to make sure that policy gets re-written in a way that meets all legal mandates for next fall. So just wanted to say thank you to John and his perseverance with his committee.

And then we also like to acknowledge Sarah McHone-Chase and Jimmie Manning. They have been the co-chairs of the Rules, excuse me, of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee. And, from our standpoint, that's perhaps one of the most important committees on campus. Sarah has been the lead on that and took the main guidance in writing the advisory letter, the budget guidance letter that goes forth where we argued fairly strongly to get a little more input, have more opportunity to participate, and actually be advisory rather than simply endorsement-oriented. So thank you to both Jimmie and Sarah for your work as well.

And then nearing the end here, I'd like to, I saw Cathy Doederlein in the room. I don't see Holly Nicholson. They're my colleagues in terms of Operating Staff Council president and SPS Council president. And the one thing I have learned, I'll mention even a little bit more later when I talk, staff are really incredibly valuable, and I think many times we may overlook them in our concerns for our own roles and positions. But Cathy and Holly do a tremendous job, both as role models for their constituencies and in terms of giving back to the university. So like to thank both Cathy Doederlein and Holly Nicholson for their help as well.

And last, but not least, I'd like to say thank you to anyone in this room who is retiring or leaving NIU. I don't have names for everyone on that list, but for any of you who are retiring or leaving NIU after this year, if you'd raise your hand, we can say thank you to you as well. Okay, well, yeah, Paul and I would both like to. Okay. If I've missed anyone, I apologize because I do know so many people have given so much of their time to having us be successful. So thank you all sincerely.

A. Faculty Salary Study [update](#)

G. Long: I'd like to provide some updates now beyond just saying thank you. The Faculty Salary Study that we alluded to earlier, I'd like to thank Virginia Wilcox and Kristen Myers. You should have at your desk an outline, I mean, excuse me, a brief report from Virginia Wilcox and Kristen, to give you an update about what's going on with that, where they're at. As with most every project that we undertake, things take a bit longer than we had anticipated. Do feel confident they will finish this and it will be ready for discussion in the fall. At that point too, maybe an opportunity to include with that discussion, any sorts of concerns or questions we have about administrative salaries and, you know, concerns that President Baker may have mentioned. And so bringing those

up in the fall will be, I think, a very helpful thing to do. But there's been a lot of work done on this. And for anyone in this room who has participated in this process, I want to thank you for your effort on this as well. So Faculty Salary Study is coming up.

G. Long: In terms of lobbying, want to mention this. Rich Grund and several members of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, got together and put together a memo that we're going to be sending out to everyone, basically all of the employees of the university, both faculty and staff with regard to lobbying guidelines and talking points, and a quick reference guide to how you identify which legislator or legislators you might want to get in touch with. And so that's, that will be coming out, I suspect you will get that either by the end of this week or first of next. So want to thank the group for putting that information together.

In terms of our budget and Resource, Space and Budget Committee, would mention that the president has invited members of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee as well as the Academic Planning Council to a meeting tomorrow afternoon where each of the divisions across the university are going to be presenting information relative to their planning and budget efforts, and so on and so forth. The Resource, Space and Budget Committee is also able, based on some decisions we made the year before last, to meet in the summer as necessary to participate in discussions. So we have that happening, and we'll see where that goes. I expect, quite honestly, that tomorrow's meeting that the president's having with the divisional chairs may provide information that people will want to hear at the next University Council meeting the following week. So I have nothing to report on that so I'm not trying to mislead you. I don't have any details, and I'm going to the meeting, along with a number of other people, but that will be something that will be shared, I'm sure, in more detail at University Council next week.

And then the final thing I would like to say, this has to do with the status of the resolution we passed last month. In terms of working with the Board of Trustees on presidential evaluation, we followed up, and I'll give you, the Board of Trustees hired a consulting firm. You may have seen the Baker Report on this, he talked about it a bit. Hired the firm of Greenwood/Asher & Associates to conduct what they refer to as a 360-degree review of the president. The Board of Trustees decided to use an outside agency to control for privacy and confidentiality. They also are an approved vendor from the Illinois Public Commission, and they gave us a fairly significant cut on their price, given the budget situation that we're facing in Illinois.

From my standpoint, multiple interviews are being held within the Faculty Senate. We weren't able to provide opportunities for every single senator to have an individual or group interview, but we did invite 17 of the faculty senators to participate in either an individual or group meeting to provide feedback on this. Leadership and representatives from the Operating Staff Council, SPS Council and Student Association were also involved, both in individual and small-group interviews.

And the results from these interviews will be presented to the board sometime in May or June. And the evaluation that comes from this will be posted on the university's website. That's a recently enacted state law that that evaluation will be posted for people to see. So, based on what we talked about last semester, the Board of Trustees has done quite a bit of outreach, and we've had quite a bit of opportunity to provide input. Again, and that was our goal when we talked last month. We have

not yet gone any further to codify things in terms of specific policy. That's to be worked on, but we have plenty of document and support from them that shows us that that's certainly their, their goal. They want greater information from us. There's, I get that a lot from them. So that's it in terms of my president's announcements.

G. Long: Move on to Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, and we have none. Oh sure, please.

J. Stephen: My faculty was somewhat disappointed that they weren't asked their opinion, and they asked me, "Shouldn't we get a survey or something or anything?"

G. Long: Right, well and that was the question if you didn't hear it was, some of Dr. Stephen's faculty were concerned that they weren't directly contacted. And we did bring that up to the consulting group upfront, because I, you know, I had wanted every, you know, my request was to have everyone on each of the councils, at the very least, be surveyed. And, you know, again, you think of a 360 thing, and perhaps everyone, you know, out there, from a cost standpoint and time standpoint, the view was they needed to be more selective and get this done sooner vs. later. Now again, moving forward, that could be part of how we talk about, you know, getting greater participation and subsequent evaluations. But right now, yeah, that was, you know.

J. Stephen: [inaudible]

G. Long: Right, they, we are the representatives for our programs at this point and it does, again, represent the first time we've ever been asked, as faculty, to participate in an evaluation like this. So yes, we weren't able to get everyone, and I apologize about that. I, that had been my initial goal, or at least to have the entire senate be queried, but that was not within the budget of what was, you know, going to happen this time in the time line. Okay?

Yeah. And if anyone wants to sit, those seats are not taken up here. I mean, you're more welcome to come up or stand. Okay? Okay, moving along, unless there are any other questions about my announcements?

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

G. Long: Okay, there are no new items for Faculty Senate consideration.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approve [list of candidates](#) running unopposed to serve on committees of the university – Pages 4-5

G. Long: May I have a motion to approve the consent agenda. It's simply a list of candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the university. So may I have a motion to accept the consent agenda.

J. Novak: So moved.

G. Long: Novak. Second?

J. Stephen: Second.

G. Long: Second, Stephen. All right, all in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay. Moving along.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed amendment to FS Bylaws, [Articles 2.3 and 2.4](#) – Page 6
Clarification of election timeline and terms of service for Faculty Senate officers
SECOND READING/ACTION ITEM

G. Long: Moving to number VIII, Unfinished Business. Our first item of unfinished business is a proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Articles 2.3 and 2.4. I would call your attention to the rationale presented on page 6 of your document agenda. And this amendment, as written here, is simply to clarify that the Faculty Senate president's contract is 12 months, that we have a clarified time line for electing the senate vice president and for appointing the Faculty Senate parliamentarian, and finally for clarifying the term of the Faculty Senate vice president and parliamentarian. So may I have a motion to accept?

M. Haji-Sheikh: So moved.

G. Long: Haji-Sheikh. Second?

L. Saborío: Second.

G. Long: Saborío. Any discussion on this. Okay, given that this is a bylaw change, we have to use our bylaws threshold. Pat, do we have that up there. I've got it written down. Sorry. It's up there now, okay. All right, so to become effective, it's got to be approved by two-thirds of those who are members and two-thirds who are present. So we have a total of, number of faculty senators is 72, 70? We have 72 faculty senators, and so we need 48 people to endorse this. If we don't reach 48, then this doesn't pass. Right and so [inaudible].

J. Stephen: We don't need 48 for it to pass, we need...

G. Long: We need a majority, yeah, we need, I'm sorry, you're quite correct. Yeah, we need 48 to be here. And when we were doing those votes earlier, the numbers seemed to range anywhere from 45 to 49, and so, just to be on the safe side, let's do a clicker vote so we know how many are actually here so we can be precise about this. So what I would ask is, kind of, if you're here, press 1. If you're not, no sorry. If you're here, press 1 please. Let's see how many of us we've got to be sure. All right, for those of you who didn't vote earlier, all right. Yes, 53.

J. Stephen: So we need 35 to pass.

G. Long: Two-thirds of 53. Thank you. So we need 35 to pass. And so, we've had the motion, we've had a second. Any further discussion on this? All right, let's take a vote. All in favor of the proposed amendment, press 1 for yes, 2 for no and 3 for abstain. Okay? So, all right, how about that, we're good to go. So that amendment has been passed.

Yes – 50 votes

No – 1 vote

Abstain – 1 vote

B. [Proposed resolution](#) to demonstrate confidence in President Baker,
Postponed from March 29, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting – Page 7

G. Long: All right, our second item of unfinished business is Professor Haji-Sheikh's proposed resolution that was postponed from last month's meeting. Professor Haji-Sheikh, how would you like to proceed with this?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Hello. I've been asked by several people that we should go ahead and either vote or table, okay? And I think, from the standpoint, people need to understand, it's a vote of confidence, it's not, if it doesn't pass, it just says that we don't have any confidence in him going forward. It isn't a vote officially of no confidence. It's very parliamentary. It's very much like European parliaments do. They do not come out, flat out and say, "We hate you." We say whether or not we like you, okay? Now, as Dr. Stephen said, your faculty have, many of your faculty members want to have a say, and this is probably the only way they're going to have a say, because, as you said, there's no money to do a survey. There's no money to do just about anything right now, okay? And, as we are facing \$35 million worth of cuts without any financial or fiscal data being given to us to say, you know, is there any justification for this at this point, I think it's fair to go ahead and have a vote. But I'm going to let for others to propose to move forward, rather than me pushing, feel like I'm pushing it down everybody.

G. Long: So at this point, you've made a comment where you're saying you're not making a motion, but you're opening it?

M. Haji-Sheikh: I'm opening it for others.

G. Long: Okay.

L. Saborío: I would like to move to table the resolution. We did just complete an evaluation where faculty, staff and students, albeit selected certain constituents were provided the opportunity to give meaningful feedback in regard to the president. And the Board of Trustees has the information. They have the feedback. They have the data. And they are, I think they have what they are looking for in order to make a decision regarding renewal or non-renewal of the president. I'm not quite sure what a vote of confidence means. Does it mean that we're confident he's going to show up to work tomorrow, yes. Does it mean that we're confident that he will have all budget issues resolved

by the end of the year, no, probably not. And that's just one of my concerns with the vote of confidence resolution. So there you have it.

G. Long: So we now have, we need to deal with one thing at a time.

T. Bishop: I second.

J. Stephen: I second that for various reasons.

G. Long: Okay, so we've got a second to that. It's not debatable so if you are in favor of tabling the motion, or tabling the, it's not really a motion, so it's tabling, cause it's tabling a concept, that's not, tabling the resolution, all right. If you are in favor of tabling the resolution regarding the vote of confidence, that would be 1 or A. If you're opposed to that, that would be 2.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Shouldn't there be a discussion part of this at this point.

G. Long: According to Roberts Rule of Order, when someone calls for tabling it, there is no subsequent discussion.

F. Bryan: It's not debatable.

G. Long: The resolution's right there. So the resolution is simply that the Faculty Senate resolve to demonstrate their confidence in Dr. Douglas D. Baker to lead Northern Illinois University as president for the foreseeable future.

Unidentified: But we're just moving to table.

G. Long: Yes, so we're just voting on. So we're not voting on the resolution, we're voting on the idea of tabling. So it's not specifically the resolution, it's tabling further discussion on this.

M. Haji-Sheikh: So this means then we won't have any further discussion for this year.

J. Stephen: Not if it's tabled. If they don't table it, if they don't vote to table it, then we have discussion. And then maybe it still doesn't get passed, or it does.

G. Long: Right, so at this point, we're simply voting on to table or not table. If you're going to table it, then you'd vote 1. Not table it, vote 2. And, Ferald, this is a simple majority, yes?

F. Bryan: Yes.

G. Long: So 1 is we table, 2 is that we do not. Go ahead and vote if you would. I was going to say, yeah, who finally decided to vote? All right. Okay, so at this point, it would appear that votes are in favor of tabling the resolution.

Yes – 37 votes
No – 17 votes
Abstain – 0 votes

J. Stephen: Greg?

G. Long: Yes.

J. Stephen: The BOT's very aware that this is floating around.

G. Long: Could you speak a little louder so we get it.

J. Stephen: The BOT's very aware that this is resolution is floating around.

G. Long: Oh yes, I, in terms of the BOT, I have had multiple discussions with John Butler. I've also talked to each of the new Board of Trustees members just to talk to them about shared governance and answer any questions they have. They've been copied on every bit of information that we've received. They have access to even more of that. So there's nothing that we're sharing with them that

J. Stephen: I don't want to put the new BOT into an embarrassing situation, but I certainly want them to get the message.

G. Long: Yeah, no, they, there's, from my standpoint, absolutely they, they have heard the message loud and clear that the faculty, I mean that we've spent all semester on this. We've devoted four meetings to this, you know, this semester, just to talk about the topic. So, no, they read through our transcripts. I mean it's surprising how much attention they tend to pay to our meetings. So, yeah, no, they are very aware of what we've been doing and what we've been talking about, and the dissatisfaction with regard to certain aspects of how things were handled in the past. No, they're definitely aware of that. And that will certainly be part of their decision-making, I'm sure, as they come to resolution as to what they want to do with the president, as well as the data that they're getting from the 360 perspective review. I mean all of these are data that they're going to use because, as we mentioned last week, it is ultimately their call as far as what happens with the president should he decide that he wants to be renewed.

Comments?

M. Haji-Sheikh: I wanted to let everybody and just you should also understand that the law required them to review him. They didn't just do it because of the goodness in their heart. It's in that law that they had to be reviewed and that that review is on the, would be required to be hosted. So a lot of this is forced by the law, and, you know, if there's some dissention and they didn't have that in that public posting, then that would also be something that they would have to face, because they've been forced to have additional governance training also by the Governor's Office. To embarrass or not embarrass is kind of not a question, okay?

J. Stephen: Yeah, well it still [inaudible]

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yeah.

J. Stephen: I got to run, I've got a 4 o'clock.

G. Long: Other questions or comments on this? It does not preclude, if other things come up, for this topic to be raised again in the future. This is not, this is not something where we're saying this will never happen, but, for the time being, we're, it's off the agenda. Okay. Does anyone have anything else, because I'm going to move on otherwise.

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

G. Long: All right, next we have Matt Streb talking about Program Prioritization, please.

M. Streb: Thanks, Greg. I really don't have much today other than to say that the last Program Prioritization update of the year, the report from the president, the report will be released the week of May 8. So we'll have a kind of a final look at all of the action plans and the implementation plans that he put out in his November report, will report on that May 8, the week of May 8.

G. Long: Okay, thank you. Any questions for Matt? All right.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

G. Long: Moving to number IX, New Business, we have no new business for today's meeting.

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

G. Long: On number X, Reports From Advisory Committees, Paul Stoddard, Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE.

P. Stoddard: Thank you, everybody. We've got, we met last April 14 at Western in Macomb, Illinois. My first time out there, it's quite a drive out in the middle of nowhere, but they have a nice campus. We had the usual welcoming and wonderful things that Western is doing. They are working to try to get more international students. They currently have about 500. They would like to double that in the upcoming years. That's the main thing that they had to talk about.

Let's see, moving on, we met with State Senator Jill Tracy, a Republican from the 47th senatorial district in Illinois. She started off talking about understanding how the budget situation affects university communities. She talked about the grand bargain a bit, and then immediately pivoted over to workmen's compensation, at which point she was called to the mat and said stop talking about workmen's compensation, you're here to talk about the budget impasse and so forth. She seemed, I mean, the audience was not terribly receptive to what she had to say, so they asked her a lot of questions and pointed out things that they disagreed with. When pressed, she seemed to agree with much of what we were saying about the importance of higher ed, how investment in higher ed

is one of the two things you can invest in that will boost economic development in the region, the other being infrastructure. But, although she seemed to agree to that, she did not seem overly keen on pressing those issues in the senate. I got the impression that she was torn between what she wanted to do, what she thought was right, and being loyal to what the governor would like to do. And those two things were not necessarily in sync.

Afterwards, we had our caucus meetings where the four-year publics get together, the other groups get together as well, but and we usually start our caucus meetings with a ring of whoa. We go around the circle and talk about all the horrible things that are happening on campuses. This is a very enlightening, uplifting part of the meeting. But just to give you some sort of ideas, Eastern, the money is tight. They're discussing program eliminations, but they haven't eliminated anything yet. They were forced to take some furloughs that they hadn't planned on. SIU-Carbondale has run out of unrestricted funds, which means they are getting tight. University of Illinois-Springfield has filed an intent to strike. They're very concerned that tenure denial is being used as a cost-cutting measure. ISU is still worried about the proposed increase in health premiums. Some of you wrote me about that last time I reported on it. Apparently, AFCSME has brought a suit to prevent that increase, so it's in the courts at the moment. UIC will run out of money toward the end of the budget year. They're not hiring new people. UIUC claims that they're in financial distress, but they did get a mid-year raise, their first, they point out, in three years. So they are really feeling the pinch. Governors State eliminated 22 programs, more are being proposed, more eliminations. The senate there is pushing back. So, yeah, the story from around the state is not a happy one by and large.

So if you're interested in making a statement about the budget impasse, I will remind you that there's a Teach Out tomorrow. Northern has a bus going down. There are 27 people on it. There might be some room for others. They're going down to Springfield to take part in the rally. If you think you might be interested, the bus will be leaving from the visitor parking lot at 7:30 tomorrow morning, but there's no guarantee you'll get a seat at this point. So, if you're up early and think you might like a trip, go see if they have room for you. I suspect they will, but.

Anyway, I think that's all I have. So if there are any questions?

C. Carlson: What report do you give about NIU?

P. Stoddard: NIU, I give whatever, I mean, I think I reported on the president's missive where he said that there would not be furloughs, but that there would be cut-backs. And, you know, generally, I think, what we hear from the president is basically what I try to report.

G. Long: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you, Paul.

1. March 17, 2017 [meeting report](#) – Pages 8-10
- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Cathy Doederlein, Greg Long, Holly Nicholson,
Rebecca Shortridge, Kendall Thu, Leanne VandeCreek

G. Long: No report from UAC to BOT.

XI. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

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

1. [Preferred Name Option](#) – Pages 11-13

G. Long: From standing committees, we've got Kay Jaekel talking about preferred name option.

K. Jaekel: So in your packets that Pat has graciously sent out is the report from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee about the preferred name option. You'll recall earlier in the semester, we had Drs. Edghill-Walden and Molly Holmes come chat with us about the systems that are in place that allow students to either change their names to the ones they are proper, or change their names to ones they prefer, whether they be nicknames, etc. Particular, concerns were raised by faculty regarding: Is this an initiative that could potentially punish you or serve as some sort of venue for grievances? After interviewing both Molly Holmes and Dr. Edghill-Walden, the answer to that is no, that's not the intent of this program. Rather the intent is to allow students to be given a venue to indicate the name they wish to be called. And, as such, will be handled in a developmental, educational way. I did put a small caveat on there. I don't know everybody's intent. So if you like purposely troll the student and refuse to not use a gender preference – I mean I don't know what that would look like. I can't imagine anybody would do that, though. Are there any questions or concerns?

G. Long: On something like this, I'm asking the group, so we've got a report from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Do we want to take a vote to say we support what they're recommending? That we support the report? Do we just accept it as is. How would you like to respond to this?

J. Manning: Move to support.

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

G. Long: Okay. Any further discussion? Okay, all in favor of supporting this report, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Thank you. Thanks. Thank you for your work.

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

5. [Policy Library update](#) – Greg Long – Pages 30-46

G. Long: Okay moving along here. No report from Academic Affairs, Economic Status of the Profession. All right, so we jump down to number 5, Policy Library update. I'm basically taking advantage of the fact that, since this is my last meeting, I'm doing a lot of talking, sorry about that. What I'd like to do, put it up, this was presented to the University Council last month, and I want to give you an update, but I also want to provide a little bit of background. And I will admit that I made a mistake. There was, when I wrote my summary of services, for whatever reason, I thought the entire summary of services went out to all of you, because half of the summary of services was about, yeah, this is what I've done, but the other half is recommendations for moving forward. And so, since I thought all of you were going to get that, and I find out that you didn't, that's added as an information item. But I'm going to talk about that a little bit as we talk about the Policy Library, because, without knowing the background of this, it doesn't necessarily make sense why we might do a, you know, look at a policy library. And last year, when I first began this position, I had very, very little knowledge of NIU's Constitution and Bylaws. Quite frankly, it wasn't until I became Faculty Senate president that I read our Constitution and Bylaws, cover to cover. And when you realize that, you realize, oh, we have lots of problems. And so we spent a lot of time last year benchmarking things, because we realized first we had to deal with, you know, what do we have for our Constitution and Bylaws. That report in there will give you more detail, but look at this document. This is 155 pages. This is just the University Council Constitution and Bylaws. I will challenge any of you to find another university that has a constitution and bylaws that is this thick. I looked up several of the universities, Illinois publics, and you're talking anywhere between five pages and maybe 30 pages. Seeing what we have here is pretty crazy, and the reason that happened is that back when the constitution was written in 1985, we were very concerned as a university to maintain our independence. And so in doing so, what we did was, we took a number of things that were policies and procedures and we codified them as bylaws. So we have, you know, many, many pages of bylaws devoted to things that you're not finding in other universities' constitutions and bylaws. You know, for example, 20 pages, plus, of bylaws related to grievance procedures? No. You're not, you don't even typically find a reference to grievance procedures in other universities' constitutions and bylaws, or if you do, it's simply a reference to, go find them in a policy, or go to HR, or whatever. But to have them be codified as bylaws is really unique. So we did a lot, lot, lot of looking into this. And so came up with kind of a three-prong approach that's mentioned in this document.

The first is, let's get it to where we can actually change bylaws in University Council, because when they were, again, when this was written in 1985, they wanted not to make change easy. According to Anne Kaplan, she would say, you know, they intentionally were trying to make things resistant to change. So for those of you who don't have the history, the basic idea was, University Council's roughly 60 people, and the way it was written is, you had to have two-thirds of the entire body, so you had to have 40 people endorse any type of bylaw change. Well, that's problematic when our average attendance over many years has been about 42 or 43? So in doing this last year, was able to share a number of examples where, you know, we had votes of 38 or 39 people, and it would represent 90 plus percent of the body's wishes, but would still not pass because we didn't hit that 40-person threshold. So in the April meeting of last year, we were successful in changing that

threshold for bylaw amendments such that it's much more in keeping with, you know, what would be reasonable and common in other university settings.

As part of that discussion, one of the things that pushed that is, if you take a look at our constitution and bylaws, the bylaws, themselves, we've got things like placement of critical personnel matters as a bylaw. It's like, that's not a bylaw. You know, we have descriptions of different positions. Again, those aren't bylaws. And so they need to go somewhere else. And the discussion had been, well, perhaps those could be moved, you know, out of the constitution and bylaws to create a more efficient, more logical, coherent document, and then put them into the APPM.

Well that was where we started at the beginning of this year and, guess what? The Steering Committee and the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee was very, very adamant about the idea, and I agree with them too, that the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, the APPM, as a document, as a policy library document, if you would, is really poorly organized. It's very difficult to use. If any of you have had the privilege of trying to go to it, it's 83 separate pdfs. The entire document is not all searchable at one time. And it has not been reviewed or renewed any time recently. In going through it, there are still references to the chancellor. There's references to using microfiche, you know, I mean seriously, it's, you know, from an organic standpoint, you can see how things develop over time. But what has happened is, organically, things have developed over time, but we've not gone through and reorganized and made it, made them easier to use. So that was part 2. It was like how do we, you know, what could we do for the bylaws. And that leads to the policy library concept.

With a third part, and I do want to emphasize this as a recommendation. Having been at NIU now for 26 years, been on senate for a lot of years of this, I can say that, as a body, as a Faculty Senate, we had very little power. And many, many universities, faculty senates are largely responsible for academic and educational policy, all right? Our role is simply as a caucus body. We talk about things, and then we funnel them up to University Council. From my perspective, that's a weakness and that, you know, one major reason to think about moving ahead with, not only the policy library, but the discussions on changing the constitution and bylaws, is to give this body more reason and more purpose, to have meaning in what we do, rather than simply being a funnel of ideas moving up.

So that's a little bit of background to, as prelude to what I want to show you here now in terms of what we've accomplished. And I know I had a clicker here momentarily. So basically, as I mentioned, when I took this position, we started looking at things much more carefully, looked at the constitution and bylaws, looked at the Board of Trustees Regulations and Bylaws, Academic Policies and Procedure Manual and the Business Procedures Manual. We've looked through all of those, and policies exist in all of those. And sometimes they exist, the same policy or a variation, exists in a number of them. Remember our discussion from last month when I said that there are five separate policies in these governance documents for how one evaluates the president, you know? So that's, you know, they exist everywhere.

Just from a definitional standpoint, we're saying they're statements of principles and conduct in the governance and management of the university's affairs that are consistent with purpose and mission. And we're talking, again, university policies, not divisional, not department. But they must

be abided by, and they must promote operational efficiencies, reduce institutional risk and establish requirements for compliance. And I will say that all of this has been developed in collaboration with the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee and the Office of General Counsel, so they're, the things that I'm sharing with you and talking with you about have had lots of feedback, internally at least, from our committees.

And so, as I mentioned before, they exist, policies exist in lots of different locations, oftentimes having contradictory information in them, you know, who's involved, who's not involved, how long is the process. And, again, since they exist a number of places, how do you find them? So there's no real clear organization and access to it. And importantly, we don't even have a way of managing policies. We have no document that says, you know, when you pass a policy, it's going to be in effect for x amount of time. Or, when you pass a policy, it's going to be reviewed on such-and-such a basis. I think I may have mentioned this before, but we had a grievance earlier this year that was based on a policy that was paper. It was based on paper, and it was from the time when clerical staff were given pay bumps for going from typewriters to word processors. Okay, now imagine how long ago that was, and that was actually a grievance that was heard and actually support because it existed, right? Now, again, had that been under any sort of a management process where you're saying, no, every policy gets reviewed, you know, x number of years, which is what we're proposing, then something like that would no longer, you know, there's no reason to encourage people to move from typewriters to word processing. For any of you who are really young, and if you told me you don't know what a typewriter is, I'm going to leave.

A couple of things about understanding our policies. One, and this is important, and think of the policy hierarchy that exists at the university. So, obviously, you know, this is done in a hierarchical fashion so every, you know, the highest box you've got the federal, then down to the state, and then NIU Board of Trustees. Then we've got university-wide policies, and those are what govern the entire university system, that's what we're really looking at when we're talking about a policy library is university-wide policies. We're not talking divisional policies. University-wide policies. Then you've got college and divisions may develop policies, as well, but they cannot conflict with anything higher up on the list. So I mean that's part of an alignment is that policies must, you know, follow within the overall structure of how it's organized. And then the lowest level of policy hierarchy is the department level. So just letting you know that is from a legal standpoint, organizational standpoint, how the policies are structured.

And, according to our constitution, there are three policy-making bodies. You have the Board of Trustees, and they have the overall basically, you know, management of the university. They have fiduciary responsibility for the entire university. Basically, the buck stops with them on virtually everything, right? You've got the president, and the president is delegated with the operational tasks of running the university, and he has the ability to make policy based on that. And then we have University Council, and University Council is responsible for academic and educational policies. But those are, from an official standpoint, the only three policy-making bodies that exist on campus for university-wide policies. Any questions on this?

All right, so, when we talk about a policy library, it's going to be online, and I'm going to show you a picture of it in a moment. But it's the idea that centralize all university-wide policies. There's no reason not to make it efficient for us where we can find things and not have to search multiple

documents. So you'd have it be centralized for both administrative and academic policies, and it's a digital presence so that you can access it readily, you know, because right now, there are still some offices that have, you know, the big blue book, I think it was, or red book, you know, where tons of different policies were involved in it. When you have a policy library, the policies that are there will trump anything that is, that exists on paper. That's the whole point, that our policies are in a centralized location. And I would also say, as part of this process, to reassure you, that as we're talking about this, there is zero attempt, there is no attempt whatsoever to alter the content of any policy as we're moving it into a policy library. That's, I really want to emphasize that, that in the process we're going to find where there's redundancies or contradictions, or so forth. And I already have a page of notes on that particular topic. But as far as this task goes, the creation of the policy library, the creation of the website, uploading information into it, they are not going to be changed in that process, all right? So I just kind of want to reassure you that that there's nothing being done that's going to change anything other than efficiency immediately. We'll be moving to some other things as we move forward because, again, part of this is figuring out how do we manage policies? We have no directions right now about how policies are managed. So we have been working with the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. We've met every other week, you know, throughout the semester. They've had a number of versions of what we're calling a policy on managing university policies, you know, it's kind of cumbersome. But those, legally, that's what we're kind of talking about there. But a document like that does say who has authority, you know, how does the university determine that a policy vs. guideline or procedures necessary? Who does the research and drafting and advocacy of policy? Who approves it? Because, again, right now we're missing a lot of that information. And the document that we've been working on in Rules, Governance and Elections and with the General Counsel's Office is working to address this.

Similarly, you know, how do we maintain, distribute and periodically review policies? One of the suggestions or one of the ideas in the documents that's being proposed is that, while I'm, while we will be moving all of our current policies up into the policy library unchanged, that there would be a three- or four-year review cycle by which each of those policies would come back and be then rewritten using a template that's going to be consistent across all policies, you know. So be very nice to know, you know, where it came from, who's responsible for, when it was implemented, so on and so forth, that we've created a template that policies will be able to be, be able to fit into as we go forward.

Then where's the policy library housed and managed? At this point, it's not been 100 percent officially determined. The expectation's that will probably be a, the policy librarian will be out of the Office of General Counsel, but that is not yet, there is nothing official in that regard at this point. It's still, still working on it.

This gives you a little bit of idea of the tasks and how we're going along with them. As you know, the policy guidelines approved. Well that's, I expect to mean we just sent out to the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee a, what I think is very close to final draft of that document. And so that's getting very close to approval. The policy submission template was meant to be a good idea, but one of those things that didn't work, because there are a lot of policies that exist that aren't, you know, in our governance documents, but the divisions have. And so back in November, I sent out a, you know, nice letter and was with Provost Freeman, some others, and we had this nice Excel spreadsheet and said, you know, would you fill in all of your policies, because that would

have made it ever so much easier for us. And it's, and that was sent out with a mid-November request to get back to us. And it's now, what April the 26th, and we're still working on collecting university-wide policies. We've got a lot done, but there's still more to go. I think once we get the policy library up, and if you happen to be in a division that hasn't submitted your policies, there may be enough peer pressure that would say, you know, basically get your ass in gear and give it to us. But that is one of our challenges right now.

Certainly the idea of gathering policies is ongoing. Reviewing, summarizing and reorganizing, that's going to be something that has to be ongoing as well.

Website structure and design – I have got to offer big thanks to Dan Ihm and Holly Nicholson. Dan is from DoIT, and Holly is marketing and outreach. Both of them have done a lot of work in putting both the infrastructure of the policy library together, as well as the design for it. So we're getting really close to having that be unveiled. In fact, at next week's University Council meeting, we hope to show an even more evolved version of this than I'm showing you today. I mean this is, we're spending a lot of time on this, even now, continuing to make it move. So this isn't something that will remain static in any way, shape or form. I mean, when you're talking about I'm retiring July 1, I am, I can't wait. On the other hand, I really am committed to seeing us get as much of this done by July 1 as possible. So it's a priority for me as far as work and attention to task.

So, as we get the website structure designed, you know, this spring and over, you know, and beyond, we're going to be uploading policies. The University Council has a graduate assistant. Right now we have two of them. They've both been tasked with taking web-based training so they can start uploading policies into the policy library website. So we're going to, you know, have them working on uploading policies.

We will, moving forward, we've got a policy submission template that we're asking people to do so if, you know, whoever's going to be presenting or proposing a policy will have to create. And we've got an impact statement that says, you know, who's this affect? You know, what's the possible impact? If there are any conflicts. And then move on from there.

Reconcile and deal with any discrepancies, and I think this final point is the one that's perhaps most important, is that we set up a periodic review schedule such that even this initial document that we're creating, the policy on managing policies, even that will be reviewed on a three- to five-year cycle, whatever we decide on, to see if it works. How can we make things better? We can't just remain stagnant, I mean, in these times in particular, we have to be as flexible and as nimble as possible. And this gives us that chance to operate in that fashion. Any questions on that? Okay.

So, just to give you an idea, we already have looked at the Board of Trustees Regulations and Bylaws. And I used constitution and bylaws, the APPM, general procedure manual and Human Resources. We have those basically ready to upload into the policy library once the, you know, website is finished. So we've got those started and, again, we're continuing to get additional policies from other divisions.

So, you know, when we get this together, we'll know, you know, the who, when, how and responsibility of how this works. We'll have a, we're advocating for policy librarian. This is a task

that, particularly over the first few years, is going to be a very intensive task. And I will say that every president in the shared governance system, so the Operating Staff Council, SPS Council, Student Association, myself, we are all very much in favor of having this be a position where you, you know, where you have to have it. It can't be an add-on to someone, because if it does, we're going to find ourselves in the same position as we move forward. This requires significant attention and also may well be tied in to someone being a, working in the compliance, you know. So this policies and compliance are related, but different topics. But same person could potentially be doing both.

And here's something that I also want to really emphasize, because when I talked earlier and I said, you know what, would argue that let's try to maybe, you know, take the bylaws that don't really exist as bylaws and move them into a policy library, if I'm sitting where you're sitting, I'm going to be really doubtful on that. I'm going to think, you know, how does that protect us, all right? And the way in which it protects us, and I'll, from my standpoint, is the policy library committee, because the composition of that, we've got four administrators and you've got five constituencies, you know. So we outnumber the administrators in this kind of an arrangement so that you would hope that, when a policy would come through, it would be vetted, that, you know, the policy library committee would be in general agreement with things. But this kind of structure allows us to insure that, you know, for thinking in a conspiratorial sense, that the administration can't override the wishes of, you know, the representatives from SPS Council, Operating Staff Council, your Faculty Senate president, your Resource, Space and Budget representatives. I mean we have that suggested in that fashion to provide support and some level of security, if you would.

All right, we'll make this a little bit fancier, but to show you as a visual, because, I mean, this is hard. I have to say, we have spent a lot of time on this, and it is, it's a lot more conceptual than you might imagine. I mean at first glance, it's like, oh yeah, just put your policies together and organize them. And yet the reality is it's been a task. It's been a challenge. So at one of our most recent Rules, Governance and Elections Committee meeting, Greg Brady came in. He's the acting general counsel for the university. And we talked about, so, like what would this visually look like. How would, how are we talking about this. So you, you'll see that the Board of Trustees is at the very top. And then you've got the president and University Council. So those are the three, you know, policy making bodies. Then that leads into the PLC, the Policy Library Committee. And there are two basic streams that come out of that. One would be relative to senior cabinet administrative operational kinds of policies. The other would be University Council, shared governance, academic-type policies. And I think it's also important to note and, will this work, yes, how about that, that there will be a 30-day comment period. So again, now only are we going to be able to be informed of policies, be able to find them readily. But when they're being proposed, there will be an opportunity for individuals to comment upon them, which again, represents a change from how we've ever done policies previously. So again, trying to be more open, more transparent, more inclusive in this process.

This gives you a very, kind of rough view of it. But as you'll see – and I apologize that I don't have the actual link here for you – but we've got policy categories, Board of Trustees, governance, facilities and safety, so on and so forth. On the right-hand side, you'll see the contact us, just added, recently updated, withdrawn, proposed. So want, you know, imagine if you could go to a site like that that would have all the university policies and even from the staff standpoint, the employee

handbook, links to those kinds of things, this would be, you know, this would be a benefit to the university, which is why, from a shared governance standpoint, we have taken it on, because, you know, it's surprising to me that it hasn't been done before, because there are a lot of other universities who have policy libraries. Again, we're not on the leading edge of things. But it's also been nice, because when you can look at all the work that's been done at other universities, we've done a lot of benchmarking to see, okay, what are typically the components of a policy library and how are they describing how they handle policies and so forth. So we have a lot of information, if anyone wants to look at it, to share with you in terms of what other places do, because that formed the basis for how we thought we would modify ours.

So our next steps as we're finishing this up would be to complete the policy management document. I think that's probably within the next couple of weeks. Continue to collect policies, look for inconsistencies. The identify a policy librarian and policy library committee, that's going to be a challenge, particularly in these budgetary times. I would say, however, that President Baker has made numerous verbal commitments to the policy library, and we've seen things written down that are supportive of the policy library. And yes, I recognize it would be a new position. On the other hand, you know, this is a small investment in terms of what we might get back in return in terms of efficiency and lack of clarity, this will be something that helps the university move forward in a much more positive, proactive way.

We'll also need to start to begin to use the policy template and submission process and initiate a review process for all current and future policies. So this, again, this just, at this point, this is a clean-up effort right now. It's, we're cleaning up, we're organizing, we're putting things together. Future faculty senates, future university councils will have to address this in terms of the specifics. But as far as a strategy to get us started, this is what we've spent a good portion of this year doing, is getting it to the point where we're ready to share with you and let you know what's up. Any questions? Okay, cool, that's it.

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

G. Long: And then the, let's see, last thing on this would be Jimmie Manning. We don't have a Rules, Governance, all right, I mean Resource, Space and Budget.

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. United Faculty Alliance update – Virginia Naples, President

G. Long: So we move on to number XII. Comments and Questions from the Floor. Turn it over to Professor Naples from United Faculty Alliance update.

V. Naples: Right. We are in the process of assembling the bargaining team and putting together information for questions we want to address. We have had several successful membership meetings and are actively soliciting information from any of the members of the bargaining unit. If anybody would like to talk to any of the executive boards or attend any of the meetings or other meetings, we would be delighted to have you and have your input. The United Faculty Alliance

certainly does support the Teach Out in Springfield tomorrow, so we are hoping that we will get a good turnout of, not only faculty or staff, but also other university interested community members. And I think that's pretty much what we need to talk about at the moment.

G. Long: Okay. Any questions?

V. Naples: Does anyone have a questions?

G. Long: Yes, I was going to say, any questions?

L. Saborío: There's a bus going down to Springfield, right?

V. Naples: Yes, Paul just talked about that. It's leaving from the visitors parking lot, Paul?

P. Stoddard: That's where I hear.

V. Naples: 7:30?

P. Stoddard: Yeah.

V. Naples: So bright and early in the morning, wake up bright and shiny and get there.

P. Stoddard: There will be snacks on the bus.

V. Naples: Very important for academicians and friends of academia that there will be food provided. It's a great incentive.

G. Long: Any other questions for Virginia? Are there any other comments and questions from the floor?

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

G. Long: Okay, then I would just call your attention to on Item, on XIII. Information Items, please note Item B. next year's meeting schedule. I'm not paying attention to it, but you should. Would encourage you to take a look at that.

- A. [Shared Governance Recommendations](#) – Greg Long – Pages 47-48
- B. [2017-18 Meeting Schedule](#) – Page 49
- C. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- E. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- F. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- G. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- I. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council

- K. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- M. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- O. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- P. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- Q. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- R. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

G. Long: At this point, it would appear that we're ready for adjournment if anyone would like to move to adjourn.

G. Slotsve: So moved.

G. Long: George. Second?

S. Farrell: Second.

G. Long: Second, Sean. All in favor.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: All right. Thank you and God bless, take care.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.