

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, November 16, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Burton (for Mooney), Carlson, Cefaratti, Chakraborty, Chen, Chitwood, Chomentowski, Chung, Conderman, Demir, Garcia, Grund, Haji-Sheikh, Hathaway, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Khoury, Konen, Lampi, Liu, Long, Macdonald, Martin (for Glatz), McHone-Chase, Montana, Moraga, Naples, Nejd, Newman, Pavkov, Riley, Roberts (for Dugas), Rosenbaum, Ryu, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Stoddard, Streb, Than, VanderSchee, Xie

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Allori, Azad, Baker, Briscoe, Bujarski, Campbell, Collins, Farrell, Glatz, Hanley, Manning, May, Millis, Mogren, Mooney, Novak, Patro, Penrod, Rodgers, Saborio, Schatteman, Shibata, Staikidis, Stephen, Tan, Thu

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Dean, Doederlein, Falkoff, Heckmann, Kassel, Mini, Monteiro (for Nicholson), Teller

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Long: This is my fake gavel for today. Okay, let's start the meeting. I'd like to welcome you all here today for our final meeting of fall semester with Faculty Senate. Being passed around is a piece of paper for sign-in. We did not have enough sign-in sheets so if you would, when it comes to you, please sign in and write as legibly as possibly if you would.

Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

G. Long: Okay, the first item on our business is adoption of our agenda. There are no walk-in items. May I have a motion to approve, or I mean to accept the agenda? Laura Beamer. Second? Becqui Hunt. Any discussion? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

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

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 26, 2016 FS MEETING

G. Long: The next item on our agenda is the approval of the minutes from the October 26 meeting. We need a motion to accept the minutes. Richard Siegesmund. And Therese Arado second. Okay,

are there any corrections, changes or additions? Anything for the minutes? Seeing none, all in favor of accepting the minutes, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Abstention? Okay, so we approve the minutes.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Response to [resolution](#) regarding College of Visual and Performing Arts' Art Annex –
Page 3

G. Long: All right, moving right along, we have a number of topics of discussion today. I think should be an interesting meeting. Under Unfinished Business, we have a response to the resolution regarding the College of Visual and Performing Arts Art Annex. And I'd like to thank Senator Richard Siegesmund for bringing this to the senate's attention last month. The senate's resolution's already generated significant discussion and to share this, I'd like to welcome Sue Mini, who is the vice provost for resource and planning, and Paul Kassel, the dean of Visual and Performing Arts, to provide some response to the resolution, please.

P. Kassel: I think I'll be speaking for both of us. Just so you know, the day before I actually started my job, I was actually in the Art Annex schlepping bags of costumes out. I was made aware by Interim Dean Paul Bauer of the situation, and John Siblik and I, Director of the School of Art and Design, had been in discussion about this pretty much continually up into this very present day. And I'm grateful to the art faculty for putting this resolution forward because it did reveal that some of the things that we thought were being attended to had not been attended to. But I'm happy to report today that the entire punch list that we've discussed and that Director Siblik prepared is being dealt with and should be mitigated by the end of next week.

So to give you some specifics, I met with John Heckmann on Monday, and his team, Tom (I can't remember Tom's last name). So there was a lot of sludge and mud work, and that's all been cleaned up. There was a bunch of standing water in the loading dock that's been drained. It turned out one of the sub-pumps that we had inherited when we got the space was not functioning and so two sub-pumps have been put in place, one below capturing in the actual pump well, and one above in case there's additional water that comes through the joints. There are joint problems in the foundation which are being attended to. And some of the ground around that area is being attended to as well. And I'm happy to say that the plastic piping that John Siblik provided generously to the university is now no longer needed. So we'll see what we can do with that bit of equipment. But there are new pipes to pump out along the above grade. Those have already been installed, and they are moved to the back so we will never have the continuing problem of water pouring in and just being pumped out in a kind of unending cycle of unhappiness. The downspouts were disconnected and they are putting in what I know to be a sort of B-dry system. If you know anything about basement water, B-dry system is a pipe dug underground which water is put in and then it's sloped and moved out, and they put that in. The walls have been painted with KILZ and are being cleaned and a scrubber has been run through the hallways and will be run through again. Now the pièce de résistance is that we're going to create a hallway of plastic sheeting so any kind of air quality issues are going to be

mitigated. And that will go from the very front of the building to the back of the building where most of the entrances are to the art studio.

So the whole list will be done barring any unforeseen catastrophes by the end of next week. Going forward, we've already identified, as John Heckmann has asked us to do, individuals to take care of the facilities and keep an eye on things. And Justin (John remind me of Justin's last name) Justin Bittner is going to be the person on site to make sure that anything that does go awry or is not functioning fully, he'll report it, and John Heckmann has assured me that he'll have response within 48 hours and, if there is no response, we will make sure that that gets to the top of the agenda and gets dealt with immediately. Obviously, everybody's interested in making sure it's a safe and habitable and productive work space. So I'm happy to report that and Justin will be receiving training to make sure that the communication process is always effectively functioning.

So going forward, I'm very happy to report that, looking at spaces around the university, Grant Tower B is a real potential space. We got from Michael Barnes a complete list of the faculty and students who would be moved out of the current Art Annex and into Grant Tower B as a possible place. There are some issues still needing to be resolved before that's fully formalized, but I'm happy to report the architects have already begun looking at it, how to transform that space, and funds have been identified to help make that happen. And while there'll be a slight diminishment in square footage per student, I think the rooms are going to be nicer, a lot nicer, with windows and access to slop sinks, and it's a great repurposing of Grant Tower B. The ideal, or the optimal, timeline for that will be occupying for Fall of 2017. At the close of the academic year in May, the idea would be to start moving people out of those studios and into those spaces as they've already been retrofitted and prepared. However, I've been assured by John Heckmann that, should an emergency occur, or that we need to immediately vacate the annex, that can actually happen quite quickly, and they're prepared to do that should it be the case. However, with the onset of winter, it appears that that probably won't be a problem because the primary problem was water, and over the winter that situation is not as, isn't prompted as much by the weather.

So I believe that covers all of the issues that were outstanding that were identified in the resolution, but if I failed to miss something, please feel free to ask me a question. I'm happy to answer to the best of my ability or Sue here can also. Thank you.

G. Long: Well first I would say thank you very much for your attention to the request. Resolutions don't always come from the senate, but having this one come out and having you respond to it so promptly is sincerely appreciated, so thank you for that. But I would ask the rest of the group, are there any additional questions, concerns, anything that we'd like to ask Dean Kassel. You got off really well. Excellent, good job.

P. Kassel: Thank you. I believe the Lincoln Laureates are up at 3:30, so I might have to excuse myself a little early to make sure I attend that.

G. Long: Great, thank you very much.

P. Kassel: Thank you, everyone, for your time.

G. Long: Good job, thanks.

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

G. Long: Okay, next we have Program Prioritization update, Matt Streb, Matt.

M. Streb: Thanks, Greg. My update's going to be fairly brief today because the president's update will be released November 28. I know some people were told November 21. The report will be released the 28th and in the report it will have some kind of high-level changes that have already been instituted or are in the process of being instituted as a result of Program Prioritization. We'll give an update on each of the complex conversations that are going on. So those are the conversations on things like advising and external programming and retention and a variety of other areas. And then on the administrative side, each of the, all 236 programs, the president will say whether he's agreed with the task force recommendation or disagreed. And there will be a statement about each program talking about where the program is and what will be happening with that program going forward, whether the program should be enhanced, and if it should be enhanced, what types of parts of the action plan should be submitted to the EBC. If it's reduced, oftentimes we've asked for a reduction plan, those types of things. So you'll get a very clear sense of all 236 administrative programs, exactly what the president's position is and where we are related to those programs.

The other thing that will be released on the 28th is Provost Freeman is going to release her action plan. The action plan is her response to the administrative task force and each of the seven college's response to the task force report as well. It's about 700 pages so there will be a lot for you to look into and a lot to read, but it will give you a sense of kind of the academic side of what is going on with Program Prioritization as well. So that's kind of where we are with Program Prioritization. Since this is the last meeting of the year and the report will be released on the 28th and we won't be meeting again until January – and actually I think I'm out of town for the January meeting – if anybody has any questions, don't hesitate to send me the email. I'm happy to answer that.

M. Streb: The other thing I was going to talk about very quickly – I'm also here in my role as faculty athletics representative for the institution – and this week the most recent NCAA graduation rates came out. And I'm happy to say – although actually I'm a little sad to say in some ways – for the last three years, we had the highest graduation rate in the Mid American Conference. This year we fell to second. So I was a little upset about that, but we still are doing very well. Actually, our graduation rate stayed exactly the same as it was last year. Seven of our sports actually have the highest graduation rate in the conference compared to their respective sports, including football, which is first. It's seven percent higher than the second place program in the Mid American Conference. And we have one of the top ten highest graduation rates among public institutions in the country. So while we haven't done as well on the field this year as maybe we wanted to, we're still doing very well in the classroom. The other thing I think it's important to note is that our student athletes graduate at a 21 percent higher rate than our student body as a whole. So I think, again, those are all positive news coming out from the athletics part of my job as well. Any questions, I'm happy to answer, otherwise that's all.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I've had this from alumni, and this is from the athletics standpoint. What was the logic of having that football game in Chicago with 10,000 people?

M. Streb: Well you'd have to ask our athletic director. The argument was that we would make more money off that game. The athletic program was told to be more self-sustaining as a part of Program Prioritization. If you have a mid-week football game in DeKalb, usually we're getting about 5, 4, 5, 6000 people to come to it. The idea was to try to engage our alums in Chicago, hoping they would be more willing to come out to Comiskey Park or U.S. Cellular or whatever, Guaranteed Rate Field, whatever it's called now. Unfortunately, we're not doing as well from a wins losses perspective this year, and so I think the turnout wasn't nearly as high as they'd hoped.

G. Long: Any questions on athletics or Program Prioritization? Helen Khoury.

H. Khoury: Matt, I'd like to ask you, you said that the final report will be coming out on November 28.

M. Streb: Yes. If I said final, it's a progress report. So it would be his report.

H. Khoury: Progress report. And now this is with regard to the administrative programs or is it also for the academic programs.

M. Streb: That's a great question. There will be some information on the academic side as well. What I've been asked to do is kind of – and Chris McCord has been identified to help implement the administrative side. The academic side, most of what's coming out of the academic side is the hiring plans that have already been put forward that I think most of us are aware of, the lines that were given. There is some discussion, I think, in the provost's action plan about her views on the categorization of different programs on the academic side. Most of what I've been working on is the administrative side. And frankly, most of that the report will focus on is the administrative side because the president really strongly believes that the academic side goes more through shared governance. And his involvement on the academic side is probably less important than it is on the administrative side. So there will be some information about the academic side. I think for the purposes of the people in this room the thing that you'll really want to pay attention to is the provost's action. There will be a lot of information there that will tell you, a lot of valuable information will be in there.

H. Khoury: Do you know when that is coming?

M. Streb: That will be the 28th as well.

H. Khoury: 28th as well? Thank you.

G. Long: Got another question over here.

P. Stoddard: I think one of the things many of us are curious about is the relative allotment of resources to the academic and the non-academic sides of the university. And by presenting, I mean I understand the rationale for doing it that way, but by presenting an administrative report and an

academic report, we don't really see how those resources get re-allotted. Is there going to be any sort of way for people to make that assessment.

M. Streb: Paul, that's an excellent question. I can tell you that I share that concern as well. I think that, when this is all said and done, you'll get a chance to look at kind of where we've invested and where we haven't invested. I can tell you that one of the few places that we've invested in right now, which I think is important, is in tenured and tenure-track faculty, right? That's the one thing that we've essentially gone ahead already and said, we need to do. And so I think there were 60 lines. Now, in fairness, I think some of those lines were failed searches and things like that, but we have invested again in trying to hire tenured/tenure-track faculty. Most of those decisions were based on Program Prioritization and the categorizations of the programs there. But in terms of will we see, you know, we cut this much from administrative programs and we invested this much in academic programs, I don't know if you'll see exactly that. But you'll get a pretty good sense of kind of where we're investing and where we're not, I think, once the report comes out and once the full – back in May – when the full thing is done, I think you'll have a much better sense of that.

G. Long: And one question I have, and it may not be something you can answer. I'm certainly going to ask this again at the University Council meeting, but do you have a sense of how they're structuring shared governance's input into with the Executive Budget Committee and discussions on Program Prioritization because, you know.

M. Streb: That's a great question. I don't have a great sense of that yet. I honestly don't know the answer to that. What I can say is, as it relates to Program Prioritization, the EBC has not done much yet. And what you're going to see, frankly, in the president's report is the president is going to say, yes, I believe this program should be enhanced; and as a result of it being enhanced, you put in your action plan you want to do these three or four things, and I am telling you now to go submit those things to the EBC. So the EBC, as it relates to Program Prioritization, hasn't really been activated yet. But it's a great. I don't have a sense of how shared governance will play a part in that.

G. Long: And we've talked about it and the two constitutionally identified representatives would be the chair of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, which is Sarah McHone. And then the faculty chair out of

M. Streb: Which is Marc, right?

G. Long: No. Oh, there you go, sorry, and Marc Falkoff. So these are our two representatives on the Executive Budget Committee, but up to this point I know that, at most, they've attended one meeting and there hasn't been a lot of information shared. And so I was just curious how we make sure that goes forward in a way that this body, as well as University Council, has a chance to work through our representatives to provide some input.

M. Falkoff: Yes, you're correct, we've been to one EBC meeting where the degree to which Program Prioritization is factored into decisions was discussed, and it has been minimally the one place where it has had some impact was with the faculty lines and prioritizing faculty lines, the prioritization task force recommendations has played an important role in that. And moving forward, my understanding is that, for the most part, task force recommendations aren't planned to

take effect until the next year, right? So that's partly just to corroborate. Our understanding is that we're going to be invited back with some regularity to the EBC meetings. The provost also is part of the APC [Academic Planning Council], and these kinds of discussions come up with some regularity at APC meetings. So, at the very least, I don't feel that the APC members are out of the loop to any degree. To the degree that I can act as a conduit for concerns of faculty to the APC, I'm sorry, to the EBC (vegetable soup), I am very happy to serve in that function. So either through your APC representatives or just knock on my door or send me an email and I'm happy to do what I can and happy to report back to you all at these meetings too.

G. Long: Okay, great. If you and Sarah can be helpful in that regard.

M. Falkoff: Yes, of course, Sarah.

G. Long: That would be wonderful. Okay, any other questions for Matt? Okay, thank you.

V. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

G. Long: I've got a few president's announcements. One is a reminder that at 4:40 today, so immediately following the senate meeting, the Northern Illinois University Annuitants Association is sponsoring a town hall meeting titled Latest Attacks on Your Pensions and Healthcare. The speaker is John Carr. He's a lawyer and lobbyist for the State Universities Annuitants Association. So that's just something, if you're interested in, it's in Sandburg Auditorium at 4:40, so I just wanted to pass that information along.

The salary study for faculty, that is progressing. Last month you had identified that you might like to have some more input on this. I've shared that with Kristen Myers. She should be in contact with you all. It hasn't come out yet, but it will come out soon to request any participation involvement you want to provide, particularly with regard to writing salary narratives. So, what's your experience been over time here at NIU with regard to salary. So you will be receiving something in the very near future that solicits your participation. Certainly there's no obligation to do so, but if you would like to participate, there will be that opportunity.

All right, and since our last Faculty Senate meeting, there have been two major events. The first, Go Cubs. Sorry, I needed to say that. I know it's not shared governance, but. And for those of you who don't care, sorry.

Second, the election season is finally over and I'd like to offer just a very brief comment. On the presidential election and the politics of division. I was saddened to read Monday's headline in the Northern Star. I don't know if you saw this: Racial slurs prompt report. And this describes an experience by one of our sophomores, Daniel Eiland. And it says, basically, a pick-up truck donning Confederate flag and swastika pulled alongside him with four male occupants, one of which held a gun at his legs, began calling racial slurs and telling Eiland he doesn't belong in the town. This story went on to tie this incident to elections results and, I'm sure as you've likely noted, the media is full of a number of similar examples of hate speech and hate crimes across the country. There are a lot of marginalized groups who are very concerned with regard to the current status. And what I would just like to say on this is, regardless of your party affiliation, it really is incumbent upon us as

faculty to remember that we are role models and that we should listen to and demonstrate respect for differing opinions. And I think within the classroom it's particularly important that we continue to emphasize critical thinking and evaluation of evidence, especially as relates to diversity and civil rights. So just a quick comment on that. I know that we're all doing our best, but anything we can do to encourage an awareness of these issues as social justice and civil rights and to demonstrate through our behaviors how we think we should interact with students and be role models, I think there's value in that.

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. [Religious holiday observance](#)

Proposal to refer to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Pages 4-6

G. Long: Next on our agenda is number VI. Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, and you'll note on pages 4 to 6 a proposal to refer something to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. As a little bit of background on this, each semester the university community receives an email regarding the university's encouragement to respect and reasonably accommodate religious observances of individual students, you see it on page 6, got a copy of it here too if you don't have that. And while I think that's an important reminder, it receives very little attention. I mean, honestly I don't think we need to raise our hands, but how many of you remember receiving that this semester? I don't. I'll be honest, it's not. You get lots of emails. It's not something that crossed my desk, I mean that crossed my attention.

So what I did was, President Baker received a letter from a parent, and the letter, I mean if you read it carefully, it's in your agenda packet. If you read it closely, you can certainly make a complaint that the student had a responsibility to tell the professor and, you know, earlier time, and so the student's not blameless in this regard. On the other hand, I wanted to include the story for you because I think stories help us remember better than an email. And so if there's any value in this just from the standpoint of as a prompt to think about as we're looking into spring semester beyond, religious observances are important and not everyone has the same belief set. So when this was shared with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and you'll note on your agenda packets in the text box at the top of page 4, the Steering Committee recommended that this topic be referred to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee to do two things: 1) to develop a syllabus statement that, you know, we could recommend for inclusion in syllabi regarding religious observances; and 2) to work with the Commission on Interfaith, it's a new presidential commission that was recently established, to identify specific religious holidays of which faculty should be aware. Because right now the memo we have doesn't list anything specific and, for most of us, I have to admit my ignorance, I do not know what is the, you know, a specific high-level religious holiday in one religion vs. another vs. another. So we're asking for some assistance on this.

So may I have a motion to have this referred to the Faculty Rights and Responsibility Committee.

G. Slotsve: So moved.

G. Long: Second?

T. Pavkov: Second.

G. Long: Okay, any further discussion on this? Okay, all in favor of the referral, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay, good. Thank you.

B. [Brand Research and Refresh](#)
[NIU Brand Research](#)

Harlan Teller, Interim Vice President, Marketing and Communications

Abby Dean, Senior Director of University Marketing and Creative Services

G. Long: All right, with that, it's my pleasure to introduce our guests for today, Harlan Teller and Abby Dean. They're here to provide an update on university marketing and branding.

A. Dean: Thank you. And thank you, everyone, for your time in allowing us to come and speak today. I'm going to speak very quickly. We have a lot to cover and I know that your time is precious so I'll move quickly. But I will say that I've provided a full brand perception study PowerPoint deck to Greg and Pat so they can get it out to you if you have any, if you want to dig deeper into the information, because we're going to go very surface-level here.

First I want to just sort of address, it's very new at NIU to consider ourselves a brand and to talk about brand. And so I just want to sort of acknowledge that and also just sort of talk about what do we consider when we talk about brand. Brand is really sort of jargon in the marketing profession, and what it means is our reputation and our identity, our image. What do we convey to others from the outside and also what do we convey inside to everyone else? And that includes all forms of communication: written, spoken, personal interactions, anything that's graphically done, all forms of communications including personal interactions, accomplishments of our faculty and staff as well as the accomplishments of our current students and alumni, and the current work that everyone is doing here. All of that folds up into what we consider our brand or our reputation.

To talk about ourselves in this way, it's new here, but it's not new nationwide. We've got some really great examples of long-standing institutions who consider themselves, who talk about themselves as ??? who demonstrate it very succinctly and cohesively time and time again. Stanford, as well as Michigan State University, I really enjoy Michigan State because they have it all over campus. So you see at the bottom as you're looking at it, bottom left, that's actually their parking garage. So their tag line is "WHO WILL? SPARTANS WILL." And so it says on the parking garage thing: Who will raise the bar? Spartans will. Or, this is will call: Spartans will call. So they're living that brand throughout the entire university, not only in what they send out to prospective students in their advertising, but also everything that's on campus. It all agrees, it's all cohesive. It's making a point and a statement about who they are.

So for the last two years, my staff and I have been really seeking to understand what really is the NIU brand? What do others consider it to be? What do we internally consider it to be? And so we've undertaken quite a few exercises to understand this. First is a collateral audit, and what that

means is we asked all of the departments at the university who communicate with perspective students to give us the printed materials they're giving to students. Now I want to, there are 17 different departments who communicate with perspective students before they come to school here. That's 17 different communicators, 17 different ways of communicating. And so right off the bat, it was really clear that there was a need to see some cohesiveness, and I'll get to that later. But we also did a student recruitment journey map. What that means is we wanted to map out what does the experience look like to a perspective student from the very first communication through that first class that they sit in a class and learn from all of you. We did the brand perception study and you may remember that. That was now two Octobers ago in which we surveyed ten different groups, five internal, five external, on a number of different attributes. We've reorganized our clearinghouse, which is how we vet communications that are branded, and we've also had lots of communication, or lots of conversations with campus and university partners.

So this is just a little bit of that collateral audit, those 50 to 60 communications that our perspective students see. What you can see from this is that nothing looks like it comes from the same university. We also saw five different logos being used. Some were legacy logos. Some were the presidential seal on information that really wasn't coming from the president's office. Some was our athletic logo, which for recruitment material could really get us into trouble with the NCAA. So what we want to see here is something that looks like a strong family of communications instead of communication from 17 different print places. That's going to help us build trust with the people that we're trying to recruit.

We also took a look at how we're communicating about ourselves. And to give you a good example, we're all very used to speaking to each other. We have our own jargon here as an institution. And we have it within our own departments, but then we have it as an institution. We have to remind ourselves that, when we're recruiting, we're talking to 15-, 16-, 17-year olds on the freshman end who won't understand really very readily that institutional jargon or that speak that we all take for granted that everybody understands. So, as an example, something that was in a piece of collateral for a 16-year old to understand, "Environmental education courses focus on methods of teaching the core concepts and skills that environmentally literate³ students need. Environmental education courses prepare formal and non-formal educators to use community and out-of-classroom resources to enhance school curricula and non-formal education programs in diverse settings."

That's a wonderful offer, it really is. But a 16-year old won't be able to really digest that and understand what we're offering. So instead, we offer something to the effect of, "Whether your goal is to be a classroom teacher, provide public service or pursue a career in research, NIU can help you learn the core concepts and skills you need. Using the area waters and woods as our classroom, you'll learn how to plan courses that teach students and others how to be better stewards of the earth." So we're trying to get this amazing opportunity, this offer into something that will be readily understood by who we are trying to communicate with.

I wanted to share the top findings of the brand perception study. Again if you'd like to dig further into the research, Greg has that and can provide it to you. But the top findings that I wanted to share: Our current student experience is phenomenal. And how do we know that? Because they were one of the ten groups that we surveyed. They were also the most positive about NIU, by far

and away, about the NIU experience. So what that tells us is that the experience you are all providing to our students, they consider that to be top-notch. We got very, very high marks on that. And that is as a result of your hard work. So that's a very positive place to be. If they were some of our lower ranked groups, that would be an issue we would have to contend with. But right now they're saying that they love this institution. They feel like you are giving them personal attention, the attention they need, and they feel like that's going to benefit them in the future.

We know that we have very little visibility on some real key audiences, mainly freshmen, prospective freshmen students, and their parents. We've been pretty quiet in the media. I'm sure you've noticed. We don't have a lot of, our advertising budget is not large. So instead of piece-mealing it and doing a little bit here and a little bit there, we wanted to first wait for the research to understand how best we can communicate. And then we need to make one big push because the way the budget is, if we strung it out over the entire year, we're not going to make a dent in the third largest media market in the country, Chicago. So we're holding that back, we're not holding it back, we're working on a plan right now that will go into effect January 1, in which we will have advertisements out there so that we can gain better visibility with those two markets.

The reputation of major is the number decision driver for prospective freshmen. It's also number one for transfer students. What that means is that how well they view their specific program, the program they're interested in, that's going to drive them to enroll in the institution better than anything else. And so one of the things that we're working on is really hyper-focused communication regarding each one of our programs. It will take us a while to get through all of our programs, but we will be reaching out to all of you to talk about how do we better communicate about the amazing programs that you offer and teach.

Emails and word of mouth are two of the communication sources that we could improve upon. Emails, that wasn't a surprise. We had, I'm sure, you've either heard Dani Rollins speak about it, or you know about. We've really had to sort of tear our email communications down and build it from the ground up, because the logic in there wasn't exactly what it needed to be. But now, if we were to field that study today, I'm certain we'll have much higher marks on that. They've been working very hard on that.

And then word of mouth, that's where we have to bring in peer-to-peer communication. Students are very savvy regardless of what generation they're in, you know, if we're talking about the freshmen, transfers, adult students. They're very savvy about what they're looking for. They understand that it's our job to sell the university. It is not our students' job. So when our students, whenever possible, if we're using our students' own words in quotes, that's going to go so much farther than anything we could write or say about the university, because it speaks directly to the education that our students receive and the experience and how they feel about it. So we'll be using that a lot more frequently in our communications.

And then, finally, faculty and staff felt the most critical about the university. And I will say this was fielded two years ago in October. Everyone was writing their Program Prioritization narratives. We had a lot of, we were texting a lot with the notifications of crime on campus. There were a lot of things that were happening all at once, and this, unfortunately, when the study was fielded. So there were a lot of things going on. However, we still need to consider what is behind these feelings. And

while we have the quantitative data, we would love to hear some qualitative as well about that. The one thing I do want to say, though, is: If we look at the very bottom bullet and the very top bullet, what that says is we still come to work. You guys still show up, and you give a top-rate, a top-rate experience for our students, even if we're not feeling as great about the university as our students are. And that is to be commended. It's a difficult situation to be in, but we're still showing up and doing it well for our students.

I'm just going to show very briefly these, but they will be in the deck that Greg has. What we asked when we surveyed, here we go, the uniqueness rank – we asked them to give us three attributes they considered unique to NIU. We asked them to rank NIU on its quality for each one of the 18 attributes. And then we asked them how important is that attribute to their decision on where to go to school. What we want to see when we do a survey like this is agreement between the uniqueness rank, the quality and the importance, because that means what is most important to them we rank the highest in and they consider most unique to NIU. So, as you can see, we don't have any agreement here with the freshman audience. And just to show again, okay, I got that wrong. Strong program reputation is number 2 for freshmen, it's number 1 for transfers. But overall academic reputation, strong reputation in the area of their program and then good value. Those are 1, 2 and 3 in terms of decision drivers for freshmen.

This is the transfer students and, again, you can see absolutely no agreement here across those measures. And then the parents as well. And these were parents with children of high school age. There is still no agreement. So we're going to be working hard to try to bring better agreement between what is important to them in making the decision on where to go to school, how they rank NIU for that, and what they considered unique to NIU. And how we're going to do that is, again, aligning our messaging to be more specific about programs.

With the conversations with the university partners, a lot of what we were hearing is that the brand standards that are online at niu.edu/marcomm, it offered too little direction to campus communicators. It assumed a certain level of expertise in writing and marketing. It was not easily navigated. And our campus partners wanted more templates or more examples on what to do and maybe what to avoid.

So taking all of that information into consideration, we've taken a harder look at our brand standards and have just recently republished them to be a little bit fresher, a little bit newer and to also provide that direction that we weren't giving previously. So I'm going to again gloss over this because of time, but I do want you to know this is all online at niu.edu/marcomm if you're interested. If you ever have any questions, please feel free to email me at amdean@niu.edu.

So when we talk about building a narrative, a narrative is important because it's what we say about ourselves. And again, what we want to do is align what we say about ourselves with how students make decisions on where to go to school. And they've told us, they've given us that ranking. So overall academic reputation in the area of major, good value, all of that hinges on your work, right? So we're going to be talking a lot more about our faculty's work. And the way we're going to do this is to look at each one of these three pillars. We'll look at each department, each college. What do you offer within the college. How do we talk about the program based on these three core concepts: career success, big university advantages and then individual attention or small college

culture. Every single one of our divisions, our departments, our colleges, can speak to these three in very real and impressive ways. And so we're going to be helping campus communicators figure out how to build this narrative so that at once we are unique within each one of our divisions and departments, but we're also supporting the main NIU brand. And we will all benefit from a stronger brand.

We've also given some direction in terms of tone. So narrative is what we say about ourselves. Tone is how we say it. We want to make sure that we are inviting, we are personalized whenever we can be and we are charged. A lot of research is showing that building excitement in the recruitment process is key in recruiting. If you think about it, deciding where to go to college, that a \$100,000 decision regardless of whether you get some student aid or some scholarships or whatnot. That's a very large purchase, and you want to feel good and excited about that. Again, we'll help campus communicators not only with building that narrative, but then how to put that narrative into practice in terms of realizing a personalized, inviting and charged tone. So things like using a student's name whenever possible or including real person's quote. Again, that peer to peer communication we're going to be using very heavily for the personalized side of it. We're looking for ways to convey inclusiveness to use encouraging and aspirational ideas, that sort of thing. And then with charge, we're going to use short ??? words to build that excitement.

We've given a little bit more, in the past we've said just use these three words: personalize, inviting and warm. And think about that when you're writing. Instead now we're giving more examples. So with personalize, be who you are, discover who you want to become. For inviting, open up and try new things. There's a lot of things within that we can talk about being inviting at the university. And then charged: Come to take on the world. Leave ready to change it. And we've got some adjectives, some directional adjectives there as well.

Now in terms of marrying the narrative with tone, we also have examples and I've just selected a few for the purpose of speeding this up. As a quote for personalize: You'll get to know your instructors and work closely with them as they share their expertise and passion with you.

For inviting, our faculty care about the person you are and the dreams you have. We're here to help you achieve success in all areas of your life.

And charged: At NIU, our people and resources are organized around you. Our purpose is to help students like you get what you need to lead the life you want today and after college.

So we're helping not only how do we say things, or what do we say about ourselves, but how do we say it.

We've got a little more about tagline at the university. One of the things that we noticed in the collateral audit is that we have lots and lots and lots of taglines. And as I was speaking with Greg a little bit quite a while ago, I liken it to a commercial example. For example, Allstate, everybody knows the tagline there – You are in good hands with Allstate. Regardless of what insurance you're talking about, it's the one tagline because that's the promise that they're giving you. So when we talk about the NIU promise, Your Future. Our Focus. And so that is another departure from what we've done in the past. Each college had a unique tagline. We've got a tagline for the conference

centers. We've got a tagline for just about every department. And so we are consolidating with the use of just one tagline. Now that is to say, if there is a tagline with the institutional logo, that will be the tagline. That is not to say that the colleges can't use their previous taglines as themes in communication. We encourage that. That is something we don't want to walk away from. It just cannot be used in conjunction with the university logo.

We've got three options for sub-brand logos. So these are the ones that are not university focus, but college focused and then departmental focused. So the college focus, you can have it with or without the tagline. Notice it is the one tagline and not any others. But then department focus would have the college underneath or the division underneath if it's administrative. Yes.

M. Cefaratti: I had a question about the tagline, if we're going to reconsider that one at all, just because it's very broad in terms of Your Future. Our Focus. It could be like an investments kind of commercial. I understand we're trying to be inclusive with our students and say "your" and "our" and one of the top things is to encourage a sense of belonging, and those words absolutely do so. But at the very beginning when we look at the Spartan one, there is Spartan in the tagline.

A. Dean: Yes

M. Cefaratti: When we look at Stanford, there's Stanford in the tagline. And I can only go back to my previous experience with the Learning Today. Leading Tomorrow. That was indicative of learning and so that definitely fit a university. So I have some concern about the Your Future. Our Focus. Even though it is encouraging our students to think about their future and that's what we are going to focus on, I understand where it's coming from, but is there any discussion around making it more NIU unique or reflective of NIU? Maybe with the huskie or Mission? Everybody loves the dog.

A. Dean: That's true, although what do we do when Mission passes away, unfortunately. Well, you know, dogs don't last as long as we do, right. So if we're looking at Mission, I think we want to be careful with that. But it's a point well taken, and I think for the time being, there is a lot of work to do in terms of branding at the university. We are severely decentralized. Right now I would love to see us all get under one page. And then, once that work is done, then we can talk about shifting and changing that. But I think for the time being, we need to be consistent and, until that happens, I think we need to lessen the amount of change because we do see change frequently. We have seen change with logos, with taglines, with a lot. I want to be consistent and that consistency is going to bring us strength. And then we can talk about diversifying that. Does that make sense? But it's a point well-taken and I appreciate it. Thank you. Any other questions for the time being? Yes.

H. Khoury: Thank you for the work you're doing. I was wondering, what do you think of trying to address or try, you know, graduate students.

A. Dean: Absolutely. Graduate students were

H. Khoury: You mentioned only the undergraduates, freshmen or transfer. So what type of questions were raised for the graduate students? And then the other thing is you mentioned university partners. Who are the university partners that you are referring to?

A. Dean: When I say university

H. Khoury: We need to be specific, you know, if we're just saying university partners have been asked.

A. Dean: Sure. I meant partners within the university that we work with. So, communicators within the colleges, communicators within the divisions, people who are not communicators. When I say university partners, I mean.

H. Khoury: So it's not from an outreach perspective of university partners who are outside the university?

A. Dean: Correct.

H. Khoury: Okay.

A. Dean: Sorry about that. Thank you for the clarification. And to your point, graduate students were also surveyed and that information is also within the deck that Greg has. So you can dig into that a little bit deeper. Obviously, with graduate students, they're really hyper-focused on the program. They want to know what it's going to be like to be within that program, more so than transfers, more so than freshmen. That's their key focus. But you'll get a lot more information from that.

M. Haji-Sheikh: It's all fine and good to have uniform branding, but you use the Allstate, okay. That doesn't get me to go out and buy Allstate just because I know what their logo is. In fact, I don't buy Allstate because whether I have experience with someone else. And it may not be someone within necessarily a very good brand. It may be who they actually cover and what they do. So insurance is not a very good example, because many of us who are homeowners feel that sometimes an insurance that's name brand is not who you end up within your household insurance. And the whole point about, you know, that you were saying about the not identifying the tagline to the identity of the school is. I mean that could be any school, Your Future. Our Focus. It could be any place on this planet, okay? It doesn't have any central. It doesn't tell me it's Northern Illinois University. All it tells me is: Hi, I like you. Your future is my focus.

A. Dean: Again, it's a good point. What I would say is we're never going to use the tagline exclusive of anything else. The tagline is meant to reinforce the brand, not to stand in place of it. So we would never just throw the tagline out there without the university shield and logo. So while your point is well-taken, it's not exclusive of identifying the university. The tagline identifies what our promise is, not who we are. Does that make sense?

M. Haji-Sheikh: No, but that's okay.

A. Dean: Okay. So we've also in the past had a lot of colors. And admittedly, in the brand guide, we essentially said, use any color in the rainbow that you'd like to. So now we're pairing that down quite a bit, and these are the colors that are approved for use within the university publications. But

we've also given an idea of how often you should use those colors. We should really be owning the red, black and white of NIU instead of any of the other colors. Those colors can help in terms of providing a little bit of depth here and there, but they certainly should not be up front as often as they have been in the past.

What will bring a lot of depth to our communication is excellent photography. So we're providing within the guide ideas and samples of what are good photographs and why. And what do we want to use? You'll notice that none of these are posed. Again, students are very savvy. A posed photo says that the rest of this was posed and is not authentic and real. So these are all images of our students on our campus, and we're continuously looking for opportunities to take these sorts of photographs. And so if you've got anything going on that you think is a really stellar visual, please let us know and we'll send photographers there, and we can capture some of these amazing images. This helps students understand what it's like to live on campus, what it's like to learn on campus, and really what it's going to be like at NIU.

G. Long: And when you go back to the pictures, there is a repository of pictures that already exists such as a photo library that we could already go in and select from.

A. Dean: Absolutely. Yes, we do have a photo library online. Again if you just type photography library, or image library, pardon me, you'll be able to see what's in there.

We've developed some graphic elements. Again, it's to support and reinforce the brand and so we can use that shield outline as a content outline. We can use it in a background. Sorry it's a little bit small, it's hard to see. The background over there in black and white, and the white you really can't see. But it's the repeated use of the outline of the logo. And then just using those colors, you can see, very boldly.

We've also provided templates. They're bold. They're clear, easy to use, and they're going to make it very easy to be brand compliant in our communications. I included all of these to show you just how explicit the templates are. So it will be very easy for our campus communicators to use the templates because of all of the direction in terms of, for example, the copy shouldn't start until .5 inches from the bottom of that red line. That's how specific these templates are, so they're very, very easy to use.

The clearinghouse – I just want to mention the clearinghouse is something, it's the brand management tool that we use to be able to vet communications that are branded, that are going out to any group of 50 or more. What it does is it gives not only a chance to make sure that the brand is correct, we see a lot of brands that are stretched, that are not put together correctly, that are just different. And again, we need to be pretty strict on how we execute that. So not only does it give us an opportunity to do that, but we can also give another set of copy editing eyes. The university standard is AP Style, so we can give it a once over for that. I know that I am terrible at copy editing my own writing. My brain knows what I intended to write and that might not be what my fingers wrote, and so it's nice to get another set of eyes on things. You would not believe the small errors that we catch just through this simple process.

And then finally, it's an opportunity to amplify your voice on campus. When you submit something of yours to the clearinghouse, we're going to put our marketing knowledge against it and say: How can we better share this message. This was intended for this piece, but what about writing an NIU Today article and then sharing it online, on our Facebook or Twitter. What about, you know, is this important enough that we need to send it directly to students in the emails? What else can we do to amplify this message? And the clearinghouse is, it's a little bit lower there, but again, it's niu.edu/marcomm/clearinghouse. It's a very easy form. We're going to ask who your intended audience is because that will dictate how we look at it in terms of the copy. But then we'll ask you what's the intention. Where do you want this information to be? And we'll take it from there.

Finally, we've been rolling this out on campus continuing to speak to any group who will allow us to speak. And so we've covered quite a few groups, but we will speak to any group that really wants to hear about this and can benefit from it. So, if you're working with campus communicators or anybody within your departments, I'd be happy to come and speak or add clarity where there is not enough clarity.

And finally, we're going to be holding workshops as well for communicators. So we'll take them through the process of building out the narrative in terms of those three main benefits. How to apply the brand of voice and then how to build those communications from there. And that is it.

H. Teller: On the issue of the tagline and the approach to brand, let me just say a couple of things. When I got here, one of the things that I looked at, looking at the website, looking at our collateral, looking at everything that we were doing as a university, it was very clear to me that, if you just looked at the communications and the way we branded ourselves, we were an institution that didn't exactly know who we were. Now we may know who we are, but we didn't present ourselves that way. So I think what we've tried to do over the last couple of years is to bring some consistency to the way that we present ourselves, both visually and the way that we speak about ourselves. This is the second iteration of the brand narrative. Not everybody's going to love the tagline. I mean, there's some days I like it better than others. There are infinite combinations of words that you can put together in a tagline. I felt that the tagline that we had – if you think this is generic, I thought the tagline that we had previously was even more generic. I think what a tagline is is that it encapsulates a brand promise. It's a punctuation mark. It's not the be all and end all of the brand. You have to back that up with the way that you speak, the way that you act, the way that you behave, the interactions that the user has with the brand and their experience. You talked about Allstate, that you wouldn't use Allstate. I wouldn't use State Farm. The reason I wouldn't use State Farm is that, when I was going to NIU 40 years ago, I got three moving violations in six months and State Farm dropped me like a hot potato. And I don't think they want me back, and I don't want them back. So actually, Allstate is my insurance provider. So it's also the experience that you have with the brand that makes a huge difference in terms of whether a user will engage with that brand or not. So we have to back up what we say about ourselves with the experience. Now what I will say is, if you look at the brand survey – and I commend that to you, it's a lot of work. It's the first-ever benchmark survey of the number of audiences that we looked at. It's never been done here at NIU. It's the first time – is that the user experience with regard to our current students, both graduate students and undergraduate students is highly, highly positive, which means that, if we can get people to campus to experience our value proposition, they're happy. And so our challenge from a marketing and communications standpoint, is to provide the underpinnings and the overall and the

wherewithal from a communications standpoint, to encourage more students to come to this school. So that's kind of where we're at, but I certainly take your point that the experience you have with a brand, its tagline, a set of messages, a spiffy collateral piece is not going to override bad experiences with a brand.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Ever since we switched to the new logo, it is so impersonal, so block-lettered, so boring, that along with the tagline, if I'm a kid, I'm an 18-year old kid, I'm looking at this place going: Wow, what is that. Maybe, it looks like a castle. Cool. I mean I don't know who came up with it, I don't really even care, okay? You know, you're here and it's a chance to pass on a critique, and the critique is I personally have never liked it. I think it doesn't stick to me as a user if I was a kid. I take a look at the Spartan helmet or the Michigan M or, you know, those immediately tag me to think about those places, okay? And the branding to some extent is unique. It just doesn't, I mean I just said I would be surprised that, if you actually compared this with five other pictures, people and then told them to pick it out later, somebody who ??? NIU, I bet you'd have trouble.

H. Teller: Okay. I take your point. I have no ownership of the logo.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I know you don't.

H. Teller: Here's the deal. I got here. I looked at a lot of the communications we did and I would agree with you. I think our communications, in general, was highly institutional and very impersonal. And it reflected a certain Oedipus complex that we tend to have here. We're very proud of Altgeld Hall. We think it's a cool building. We have tons and tons of pictures of the castle. I think that the 45-person task force that was put together in 2010 to put together the initial brand work, I think to some extent you're seeing the results of the fact that you had a 45-person task force to put together in 2010 to do the brand work.

M. Haji-Sheikh: [Inaudible]

H. Teller: Absolutely. So I think what that committee I think looked at was: What do we have that's unique here. Hey we have a castle that's unique. So they put together a logo. I totally agree with you, it's an impersonal logo. It's not a logo that I would have picked. I made a strategic decision when we went to the new narrative and we went to consistent brand guidelines that the time was not at this point right to change the logo. But exactly what you're saying is absolutely to the point. We have totally changed the way we look at visual communications. If you look at what you're talking about here, we don't have parallax view type atomized pictures of small people and large buildings and very kind of artificial kinds of things that really play up the vastness of the corn fields and the buildings. What we're looking at, again, and it goes back to the tagline and the narrative and all that, is that they have much more authentic looking photos, very personal, very diverse, with real people doing real things inside of buildings, outside of buildings where the buildings are not humongous and they're totally engulfing people. That's the way, that's the direction we've tried to go from the institutional to the personal in terms of the visual presentation. I totally accept your point that having a logo that is a castle is not necessary reflective of that visual strategy and at some point, we may want to revisit that and look at that again. I'm not sure during my tenure that's going to happen.

M. Cefaratti: I think the benefit that I had from seeing the presentation, and I just wonder if others will react to it in a similar way, is I saw a best practices presented. And then I saw the Your Future. Our Focus. I had the benefit of seeing the personalization or the uniqueness vs. a more generic tagline. And what I would be interested to hear is I think of, so I'm a University of Maryland alumni, and we say, Fear the Turtle. A completely silly thing, but that's our tagline, and it kind of sticks and it's unique. So what I would love to see, and I don't know enough about it, is looking at some of the other universities that we do identify as ones who are doing best practices with a united message. And I understand you're, I'm taking these steps, this kind of a ????. So maybe as you consider those next steps, and maybe you already have, because I see some evidence in your presentation that you have. So I would just say look out and see what the other universities are doing that make their taglines unique. And it's not a message in isolation, I understand that.

H. Teller: Thank you.

G. Long: So, perhaps one more question. We want to make sure that we can continue with the agenda.

T. Pavkov: I want to just thank you for a positive presentation. I think that, when I came here four years ago to manage a fairly complex unit, we didn't have brochures, we didn't have anything. We went out and kind of built around and then we were criticized for using Word Cloud. We're getting over that, and now we're getting some support, and we're getting some expertise that we never have had before. And so we might quibble around the edges on some of the wording. I mean I think the active voice, the actionable kind of personalized approach really adds to our communication and puts us, not on our back feet, but kind of out over our skis a little bit, not too much, but a little bit. And so I want to thank you for bringing that. And I guess the only request I have is we be consistent and that we continue and sustain the support because we have at the operational level that I'm at as a chair, many times I've experienced a lot of zigs and zags along the road, and I want a straight highway this time so we can get to the end where we're confident in our communication and we know we're getting results and increasing our enrollments and feeling good about ourselves.

A. Dean: Thank you, Tom. I appreciate the kind words, and I share your want for that consistency. That's the drum I beat. It's consistency always. And so we're happy to partner with anybody at the university on communications at any level. You know, we can consult, we can help build it, whatever it is. And we're working very closely with each one of the college communicators as well to build those communications. Thank you.

G. Long: Thank you both very much for coming. We appreciate it.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. [Resolution](#) regarding accommodations for students with disabilities – Pages 7-10

G. Long: On to our agenda, under number VII, the Consent Agenda, we have no items on that. Under New Business, we do have one item under New Business. I would ask you to please look at

the background information and proposed resolution regarding the Disability Resource Center. That information is on pages 7 through 9 of your packet. And I'll give you a little background information on this first and then we'll hopefully move to a resolution. I would like to introduce two people who are here. As we have a conversation, we'd like to, they can add some context as needed. Ms. Debra Miller is the director of the Disability Resource Center. So she's been in that role for a year and a half now, roughly? And I will mention too for anyone who has struggled with it, the Disability Resource Center has had five different directors over the last eight years. And so, from a consistency standpoint, that makes it very challenging. And if you read the email and information that Deb provided, you'll also see that they are particularly short-staffed right now and in need of support. The other person I'd like to introduce is Katy Whitelaw. Katy is the brand new university technology accessibility officer. So that's a new position that was just created, really very pleased about that. I'm hoping that, over time, she's able to get greater support. In many universities, that's a stand-alone position. In Katy's situation, it's been added to her list of responsibilities. So it's kind of a 20 percent kind of an allocation, but, from my standpoint, it's a step in the right direction. It's at least some ability to enter into discussions and talk about procurement. And when we procure software, we make sure that it's accessible. And we talk about website creation and other aspects, we've got somebody now in the Division of Information Technology who is an ally looking at technology accessibility. So I'm very pleased with Katy's new position and also add a tip of the hat to Deb Miller for the work that is being done.

But again, if you would look at the letter that's been written, you'll see the number of needs that still exist, and they're very significant. My particular background relates to disability, and I find our inability to serve students in an efficient and expeditious manner and to meet their needs to be really very disappointing. And so, quite honestly, when this was presented to the steering committees in Faculty Senate and University Council, both groups looked at this as an opportunity to provide a resolution and bring this forward to gain more attention. As a parallel, one of the things that I don't think was necessarily brought up much with the Art Annex resolution, was that simply by bringing it up, there was a significant amount of discussion that occurred even before it reached, you know, came back to us, because it's like, oh, there's a nudge, there's people out there, this is something for us to look at. The hope with what we're talking about right now with the Disability Resource Center is the same thing, that we provide a nudge, and I will tell you that Sue Mini has already left but she and I have already had a couple of discussions on this topic just because, again, the steering committees suggested that we bring this forward as a resolution.

So I'd like to ask, you've got a draft of the resolution in your packet. Certainly it's open for editing if you want. We just didn't want to try to draft a resolution in present tense with everyone here, it doesn't work well. So at this point I'd like to ask for a motion to accept the resolution.

S. McHone-Chase: So moved.

G. Long: And second? George Slotsve. And then discussion on this. Anyone have any questions, any things they want to ask about? Yes.

M. Cefaratti: I'm sorry it might be in here and I'm scrolling through it, but was there any discussion about, we have had, unfortunately, several students with very serious medical issues. And we have tried to – where they've received treatment and they cannot be around other people

because their immune systems are so low after some of the treatments. And so is there any discussion on our use of DRC to support extending classes or getting access to those students as well. Maybe this is just a question truly about

G. Long: No, may I. Deb, would you be willing to take a microphone and respond please?

D. Miller: Good afternoon, thanks for the question. If students are enrolled at this institution, it is their civil right for access to that material, that classroom setting, not necessarily with other students, but absolutely we would have to work with that student to have access. How to do that, I wouldn't answer right now, but certainly.

M. Cefaratti: That's really helpful, because we have a couple of professors who are doing their very best to make sure that they still have access to the materials, and the discussion of reaching out to DRC has come up a couple of times. And so they may be reaching out to you on that one. I appreciate the help with that.

D. Miller: Sure. And I would just mention, if it's framed in a disability set, I would say, under any umbrella, I would caution faculty not to do their best with that student without the endorsement of the DRC. So basically, if a faculty member is working with a student and treating them differently than the other students for whatever reason, that puts faculty at risk for treating that student differently and could be determined as discriminatory, even with the best intentions. But if it's disability based, you really need to have the endorsement of the office on campus mandated by the university to endorse that practice. So I highly recommend that the students register with our office.

G. Long: Are there other questions on this? Sarah.

S. McHone-Chase: I don't think it's in the resolution, but I'm wondering if by not completely supporting the DRC in a way that we should, it's not just a, from my point of view, a moral failing, but also is the university opened up to some sort of financial losses, some sort of legal repercussion?

G. Long: Oh yeah, we can. If you're so interested, between Deb and Katy and I, we can supply you with a number of documents that identify universities that have been successfully sued because they have not been either prompt in providing accommodations, they've failed to provide accommodations. Technology accessibility is a particular area of risk for a lot of university, because I mean, if you think about it, any videos we produce and we post online, they ought to be captioned, right? And yet we, as a university, have no mechanism to make sure that happens. As a university, we have no long-term strategic plan for dealing with technology accessibility.

D. Miller: Well they have to be captioned if you have a student in your course who requires that as an accommodation.

G. Long: Right.

D. Miller: So if you post a video, if you don't have a student that requires that accommodation, you don't have to go out and caption everything.

G. Long: Right, although we have worked very closely with the NIU Media Services such that all of the videos that are posted on the NIU home page that we see, that if you pulled it up, they are actually captioned because that was a concern for a long time. Because if any of you have ever played with the automatic captioning capabilities of YouTube, you'll see they're about 70 percent accurate, which sounds at one level really good, except that that 30 percent where they're putting in alternate words, yeah, not so much, it's a mess.

D. Miller: And I would say under the 2008 Illinois Technology law that YouTube is not compliant with that standard so we cannot use that captioning feature for YouTube within the classroom setting. I mean you can use it, but we're out of compliance if you have a student in your class who is deaf or hard of hearing.

G. Long: Right. And what she means by that too is, understand with YouTube, if you click the little cc button, sometimes it will come up and it will tell you if it's captioned or if you're going to do it on the fly. And it's the doing it on the fly that that's where we're missing the boat. So if someone has already put it together with captions, like I've created a number of videos and they're all captioned and if you called them up on YouTube, you could readily, you know, the captions fit. So that's good, but otherwise, yeah, if you're doing it where it's working on the fly, not so much.

D. Miller: And we would help you with that if you have a student in your class who requires that captioning on your materials, we would help you with that.

G. Long: Yes, Helen.

H. Khoury: Greg, two suggestions. You're saying to immediately address the staffing. Do you think it will be stronger if a specific date or range, you know, but before a certain date this should take place. Because I think they are having budget issues, that's why.

D. Miller: Dr. Khoury, I would say off-the-record with our HR system the way it is now, I think that would be limiting if we put the dates. I don't know if we could enforce that. I think it's a great idea, I just don't know if.

H. Khoury: But please, something should take place.

G. Long: But I think part of it is by us having a resolution. And like I saw, again, I can tell you right now between when the Faculty Senate Steering Committee met last week and today, we've had, I've already had multiple discussions on this topic with administrators. And certainly, if we put this forth as a resolution, even without having a specific deadline, it does give us the opportunity to revisit this come spring semester and say, hmmm, so what has happened? I mean, from our standpoint, as the Faculty Senate, I think that's one of the roles we could have is to insure that, when we put forth a resolution, that it actually does result in some action and some follow up. So I think it becomes our responsibility rather than setting a date for them to comply by that we say in the January meeting or the February meeting, I'd like to get an update in terms of what's happened and if there are things that we need to continue to advocate for, that would give us the opportunity.

M. Streb: Greg, this very issue is actually addressed in the Program Prioritization report that's coming out.

G. Long: Right, yeah, I know there are multiple ways in which this is being looked at. Yes.

H. Khoury: I also wanted to mention that, other than the hard of hearing, we have a population of visually handicapped students on campus, and they have many challenges, not only when they go to take quizzes or exams, but also in the classroom. So they need somebody with them too.

G. Long: Well and actually with students with visual impairments, the majority of them can get by with magnification of some sort or using screen reading software so they can hear it. But there is definitely a subset of students who are blind who need to use Braille, and that creates one of the biggest challenges, I think, for

H. Khoury: So they need assistance.

G. Long: Because Brailleing a textbook is a very expensive proposition, and we don't have the in-house capability of doing that. So that is an ongoing concern is how to deal with those students.

H. Khoury: Thank you.

G. Long: Anything else? I'm assuming from the lack of conversation on this that you think this is a valuable thing to pursue?

Unidentified: Sure.

G. Long: Okay, any specific recommendations on the resolution? All right, hearing none, all in favor of sending this resolution forward, say aye, please.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: And opposed? Okay, it passes, excellent.

IX. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – no report

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: All right, moving on, we now have reports from advisory committees. No report on the FAC to IBHE. The UAC to BOT, the only thing I would say on that is there is a Board of Trustees meeting tomorrow and certainly, you know those are all posted ahead of time. If any of you are ever interested, I would encourage you to go. Otherwise, the complete transcripts of those meetings are usually posted fairly soon after the meeting so you can look at them as well.

X. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs Committee – John Novak, Chair – report

G. Long: As far as reports from standing committees, the first report we have would be from John Novak. He's not able to be here today, but he did send a quick note saying that wanted to report that his committee is looking at the classroom recording policy and they have their next meeting November 30 at 2 p.m. to continue the discussion on this. So they're looking at issues of how you would deal with classroom recording. This body had looked at that a couple of years ago and we looked at it again after having a consult from the Office of General Counsel, we realized there are more things that needed to be done to look at it, in particular the original document didn't address video recording and so wanted to be much more specific in terms of how it works out. So that's an ongoing project there.

- C. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – Paul Stoddard, Chair - no report
- D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Rebecca Hunt, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

G. Long: Then Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, Becqui?

R. Hunt: My report is basically the same as it was last month. We continue to work on collecting the policies and we're also working on the design of the policy library's portal.

G. Long: And I would add to that there was a meeting on Monday where we met with a number of senior administrators on campus to talk about the collection of university-wide policies, because there are already documents that exist such as the Constitution and Bylaws, the Board of Trustees Bylaws and Regulations, the Academic Policy and Procedure Manual, the Business Procedure Manual. There's human resource documents. So there are a number of repositories, if you would, that already exist, so we have ready access to those. But we also know that, within divisions, that there are policies that have not yet been digitized and so the effort right now is to try and, you know, go to the divisions and say, share with us the policies you've got so we can start organizing them and, you know, bring you that back in the spring to talk about it in more detail. Any questions for Becqui or me on that one?

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

G. Long: Okay, well then nothing from Resource, Space and Budget Committee.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- A. United Faculty Alliance update – Virginia Naples, UFA President

G. Long: And our last item of business is comments and questions from the floor, and Virginia Naples has a few words she'd like to say about United Faculty Alliance.

V. Naples: Thank you, Greg. It was nice to see that you remembered to stick the little topic on there. But before I talk about the union, Michael Haji-Sheikh had to leave because he has a class he has to continue to teach. He left me a statement he asked me if I would read. And he says he's interested in the Faculty Senate looking into whether or not the university is shifting facility support to the departments. He's talking about a specific issue with a pump in engineering that was part of the equipment that was provided, I believe, with the building originally and has not been able to be fixed. And the rest of the statement he left was: I was told that facilities equipment was built for the micro-electronics lab would now be the responsibility of the department and the faculty. And he would like the Faculty Senate to see if this is a new policy or a policy change and if this is the case. And he suggests that we also need a campus-wide list of those kinds of items that need to be changed and looked at.

G. Long: What I can say having been in a number of meetings that I know that John Heckmann working under Al Phillips in Administration and Finance has identified a number of those things. But I think it's a, certainly an important policy question to ask about. And we can certainly gather more information. And in two weeks, because next week obviously is Thanksgiving. But in two weeks, the University Council meets and Al Phillips will be here for that. And so that might be another opportunity to ask that question directly. But we can certainly follow up on it.

V. Naples: That would be very helpful. I'm sure Michael will be pleased.

Now what I would like to do is talk a little bit about the updates with the United Faculty Alliance. The first thing that I would like to draw people's attention to is that we are actively seeking people to be departmental representatives and we are going to want that to take place as quickly as we can. So anyone who is interested in facilitating this process or participating would be more than welcomed. And if you have any questions, certainly get into contact with me, and I'd be happy to provide my personal email address if people don't want to use the university email address, and I can spell that. It is [Xenosmilus@aol.com](mailto:xenosmilus@aol.com). And I would respond to both email addresses. By the way, xenosmilus is a saber-tooth cat I named. So that's kind of distinctive.

And the other things that I wanted to mention is that relatively recently, as in the last day or two, there has been movement from Gov. Rauner saying that the healthcare costs are going to go up dramatically, and we are going to lose benefits, and that may take place as soon as January, and they're potentially talking about deductibles doubling. So this is a huge issue for the faculty. Part of the reason I'm bringing this up is that there was a message from the clerical staff union that they have been very concerned about those issues and those issues will affect not only the clerical staff, but also the faculty. So that is something that we really need to be concerned about. They have passed along their proposals for what they would like to see negotiated with the administration within the last day or two, and the administration is looking at that. That is posted on their websites or their bulletin boards, so that's a matter of public information I thought I would pass along in case anybody's interested. Many of their goals and interests are going to parallel ours.

G. Long: Thank you.

V. Naples: Thanks.

G. Long: All right, are there any other comments, questions from the floor? Yes.

C. Carlson: I was wondering if in a future meeting we could discuss the new DoIT's printing that's going to be going into effect. I'd like to know how it's affecting other people and what they think about the policies now.

G. Long: Okay, could you be a little more specific because I'm not entirely certain what you're asking about.

C. Carlson: Okay, in our area, they're removing every printer from every office and making some centralized printers. And we're very concerned about

G. Long: Confidentiality, I'm sure.

C. Carlson: Confidentiality is a big one. Who's maintenance, I mean, what are we going to do after hours, you know, if I'm in a public printer and I'm printing something for a personnel committee and it jams and I can't get it out, what do I do? And then I also feel it's just disrespectful of our time when you have to walk. They say it's implemented in the administrative office, but there it's a much smaller area than our other buildings. And so I'm just curious what other people thought. I'd just like to see a discussion on it.

G. Long: Okay, thank you.

T. Than: Sorry, this is not related to printing, so if anyone else has discussion on the printing, I will wait.

G. Long: Any other questions on the printing.

T. Pavkov: I would just second your comments. There are some real gray areas about this. We're hearing information, you know, and it's not real precise, and it's going to have an effect on how we sustain customer service for students. And so it is a significant paradigm shift in the way we think about something that's been pretty normalized over time.

G. Long: Sure, makes sense to talk about it. Yes, anyone else on that particular topic.

V. Naples: I'm very much in favor of going as green as we possibly can on this campus. I'm a biologist and I understand the environmental impact and the significance of that. But one of the things that is a problem that many people across departments have relayed to me is that, when printers in their departments die, they are not replaced. People have talked about individual printers being removed and consolidated into a single printer or a few point sources in their department. That has been the policy in biology for a very long period of time. And relatively recently, those printers have been dying and none have been replaced. And while I understand that a green policy is

an ideal, there are times you just plain have to print. And I don't know what the solution is to this, but I would like to see people be aware that we cannot go entirely to reading things online, delivering content online, or things like that. Occasionally, we need to do it the old fashioned way with pieces of paper. The other thing is, at least in biology, none of our staplers work either.

G. Long: Okay. All right.

T. Than: I'm not sure whether, okay, so my concern is I appreciate that after the elections, the university has created a safe space for minorities to come together and speak of our experience or concerns. But at the same time, I would like to know whether our university is trying to, post-elections, trying to even re-evaluate our engagement with the communities. And also, because after the elections it makes me think that whether our role as scholars and as a place for higher education has more or less significance in our community, and whether or not we are engaged enough with the people in our communities around us, right. If not, how can we do better as a community. I'm not sure whether there is any committee or task force doing that because I think this is a time to look into that, right. So while we are creating space for communities or for minorities to speak out after the elections, at the same time, we also need to re-evaluate our role and relevance of higher education, the value for diversity, all this, you know, these unities. This is the concern that I have.

G. Long: Well I think part of it's probably being addressed through the chief diversity officer, you know, as far as looking at some of those topics. But in terms of the specific details you mentioned, I'm not aware of specific plans. So it's something that should be, I think, further discussed.

T. Than: Yeah, like if, you know, community doesn't see the value in our institution, what can we do better, right, so that we can prove that we have ??? for them, right?

G. Long: And that's hopefully where the marketing people will also help because, I mean, you know, as they said, and I think one of the most important things they mentioned is the students think we're doing really well. We're all really frustrated with the situation, but once they're here, they're finding out that it is a high-quality education. So again, that's part of a marketing aspect too, as you're talking.

T. Than: Not necessarily to students only, but to the local people, right? We don't really want to be isolated from them.

G. Long: No. Yeah. We want a much better relationship with the community.

T. Than: Exactly. Yeah.

G. Long: Okay. Like I say, as a specific activity, I'm not aware of anything right now. Anyone else?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

G. Long: All right, anyone want to move to adjourn? Hamid and who else? Mark Riley. All right, thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.