

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Abendroth (for Carlson, Bateni, Beamer, J. Chen, Chitwood, Chmáissem, Chomentowski, Chung, Conderman (for Johnston-Rodriguez), Creed, Duffin, Fredericks, Glatz, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hanna, Hathaway, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Johnson, Konen Lampi, Liu, Lukaszuk, Wei, Maddali, McHone-Chase, Millhorn, Millis, Montana, Mooney, Naples, Nelson (for Arado), Newman, Ryu, Saborío, Schatteman, Schraufnagel, Shi, Siegesmund, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Staikidis, Surjadi, Than, Thu, Whedbee, Zheng

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Arado, Baker, Bishop, Boughton, Briscoe, Bujarski, Carlson, G. Chen, Crowley, Grund, Johnston-Rodriguez, Krmeneć, Li, Mogren, Moraga, Nejdí, Novak, Patro, Penrod, Plum, Powell, Rheineck, Riley, Rodgers, Scherer, Song, Stephen

OTHERS PRESENT: Andree, Bryan, Doederlein, Klaper, Kozoumplik, McCord, Wesener Michael, Torres

OTHERS ABSENT: Click, Gelman, Groza, Kortegast, Falkoff

I. CALL TO ORDER

L. Saborío: Good afternoon, everyone. This meeting is called to order.

Faculty Senate President **L. Saborío** called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

L. Saborío: First up is the adoption of othe agenda. Can I get a motion to adopt the agenda? Thank you, George [**G. Slotsve**]. And a second? Sarah [**S. McHone-Chase**]. Thank you. Are there any changes? I would like to propose an addition under Item X.A. It's a proposed budget resolution that I need to add to the agenda that resulted from our meeting with the FAC to IBHE last Friday. So it's a last-minute item. All in favor of adopting the agenda as amended, say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Any opposed? Okay. Abstain? Thank you.

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

L. Saborío: And now for approval of the minutes of the November 29, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting, I need a motion. Thanks, George [**G. Slotsve**]. And a second. Thanks, Laura [**L. Beamer**]. Any changes, additions, suggestions, corrections? Okay, great. All in favor of approval of the minutes, say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saaborio: And any opposed? Abstain? No? Okay, perfect.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. Using Lynda.com in the Classroom
Cindy Kozumplik, Training and Testing Lead, Division of Information Technology
<http://go.niu.edu/Lynda> (use Internet Explorer)
[Presentation](#)
[Lynda Courses for Students](#) – Pages 3-6
Cindy Kuzumplik, Training and Testing Lead, Division of Information Technology

L. Saborío: Let's move on down to Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. First up we had Kelly Wesener Michael, but she's not here yet, and so we're going to go ahead and ask Cindy to come up and talk about using Lynda.com in the classroom. Thank you, Cindy.

C. Kozumplik: You're welcome. Thank you for allowing me to come and present. How many of you know what Lynda.com is? All right, great, that is awesome. Hands down. How many of you are actually using it in your classrooms? All right, not so many. So that is why I am here, because I wanted to come out and talk to you today. I promise I will be brief.

So, what is Lynda.com? Lynda.com is an online learning tool that the university has purchased. And what we want you to do is incorporate it into your classroom information. It means that you might be able to assign a video to the classroom before your students come to class, and then you're not explaining what it is. Now explain how to use it in the future.

It's free to anyone at NIU. So if you wanted to look up something for your personal interest, you wanted to research information for your classes, you can log in and do that. There are over 5,000 videos. This is not just me sitting on my couch talking through YouTube. These are industry professionals, who are doing these videos. They've been contracted through Lynda.com/linkedinLearning to present these videos. You can go out and actually buy books by these people so you know they're actually pretty high in their industry.

You can refresh a skill. You can learn a new skill. You can enhance your own personal resume. So you wanted to always learn about photography, never had time to do it, never had a class you wanted to go to? You can go out and do that here. You can also create a shared playlist. So if you want to put a whole bunch of courses, the Lynda.com courses into your classroom, you can create a playlist and share that with your students. There are also some out there already that are industry professionals, who you can actually have your students follow a playlist learning Excel skills. Those are things that are out there and available.

So there is something called the learning path that's kind of like that playlist. You have the difference between a course and a video. The difference between a course and a video is a video is just you're going to have them watch just one segment of an entire course. If they actually watch the entire course, they can earn a certificate. And they can post that certificate to LinkedIn. If they have a profile, then they could have the certificate posted there.

So for example, I have my intern with me helping with the presentation today so if we were both going for the same job as trainers and he has Excel skills that I didn't, his were posted to his LinkedIn Learning, who do you think the employer might want to hire? Possibly the intern, because they could see that he went the extra mile and had done learning on their own. So as you're working with your students, especially your seniors or your graduate students, but we don't want to exclude those freshmen either, go ahead and ask them if they've got a LinkedIn profile to start adding their things. It's really easy. They've even improved it. I just did one last week, and all you have to do is say: Publish to my profile, and click enter. That's all. It's pretty simple. So they get those certificates.

Because we have a campus-wide license, you have sample exercise files that are available to you, which means that you don't have to come up with a criteria to create a pivot table, for example, if you're teaching your students how to use pivot tables. They have exercise files that already have that in there. All the students have to do is download it. You can actually ask them to submit you their work in that pivot table, if you want. You can also ask them, if you have a Blackboard course, you can ask them to publish the certificate to their Blackboard course to actually show that they've watched it.

So here is just an example – when we say the word, classroom – here are some examples of the courses that are available. You can flip the classroom podcasting. I'm not going to read all of them, because I know you can read. But just some examples of stuff that's out there. The difference between a course and a video.

I've already talked about publishing it. You can expand your horizons.

So I have a colleague over in the Division of IT who teaches in the College of Business. He was one of my very first adapters, literally Day 2 of us having our campus-wide license, he came and said, "I'm going to ask my students to go watch the video," because he wasn't feeling good that night for class. And so instead of totally canceling the class, he assigned the video, showed them how to, you know, gave them the instructions for logging in. And he said, "Post the video by the next class period" that you'd actually watched it. My first monthly report – because I write monthly reports on the top courses – his class – and that's that course, because he had 50 students watch that course. So what he did is, he said, "Hey, can you take my course syllabus and hand it over to Lynda.com?" And I said, "Sure can." And what they did, is they came back, and they took every course topic that he had in his syllabus, and they mapped the Lynda courses to do that. So if that is something that your college or your area is interested in, you guys can reach out to me. At the end of the slide presentation is my email address, and I can send your course syllabuses to Lynda. It takes them about two weeks, and they come back, and they have an example – I know it's kind of hard to read – but you can see that he has Creating a Business Case. And they've got a course on creating a business case. This is like for project management.

So what we're going to do now is we're going to do a demo. But just know that the URL is go.niu.edu/Lynda. And I also gave you all a lovely sticker. Go home and post this or go into your office and post this on your door or your computer. And then you're just logging in with your regular A-ID or your department ID and your password. Students will use their Z-IDs.

If you need more information, just general questions on something that doesn't work, you could contact the Service Desk. And then there is my contact information as well.

So, Raj, if you will go to the system. So this is what it looks like. I'm logged in here, so you can see the courses that I'm currently watching. Does anybody want to give us a topic that they want us to search. Don't be shy. Yes.

Unidentified: [inaudible] disease.

C. Kozumplik: I'm sorry?

Unidentified: [inaudible] disease. Liver disease?

C. Kozumplik: Liver disease? Let's see if it's out there. Got to remember some of these are like industry courses, so that may not be out there. Try liver disease. I don't think that one's going to be out there. How about we just do pivot tables? Thank you for trying, though. Try pivot tables, Raj. Just go ahead and click on enter up there. Just click enter on the. Nope, it's gone, okay. So what you'll do here is, when it comes back, it's going to show you all of the different courses. So you'll see that it matches almost 1400 different courses that are out there. So it comes up with a course. So you can see there's different versions of Excel out there. I do believe there is Excel 2016 out there if that's what you're teaching in your classroom. So you'll see that in there as well. Can you scroll down for me, Raj. You'll see the difference between a video. A video is three minutes and 29 seconds. One of the handouts that I included for you guys is this list of some office skills along with – and this is in your handout – some soft skills. This is like interviewing tips, writing a resume. This is the stuff that we're going to be putting on the DoIT training site. But these are things that we've got all of the courses that are here. One on the back says Communicating with Empathy, Managing your Time. Students and faculty don't have any time managing our time, do we? Body Language for Leaders. These are all things that would help your students going forward. It's a lot of those things that we don't have time to teach in the classroom, but they're important as our students go out and do things in the real world.

Raj, if you'll go out and look at the certificates for me. So click under the little pound sign. Go ahead. This is all of the different examples of certificates that I personally went out earned by just watching them. The nice thing is you can pause it, you can watch it, you can do anything you want, you can go back to it, you can rewind it – that's what I usually have to do.

Can you go to the playlist, please? So you can actually create different types of playlists. The one that's there by default is my playlist. And then you can base it on the different areas that you're looking at. So if I wanted to go under skills – go ahead and go there – you can see the different types of ones that I've got in this one. So Business Ethics. Maybe you're getting ready to look at

teaching ethics to your students in some fashion of what you're teaching. You can see there's a corresponding business ethics course.

Questions?

Unidentified: Are there any assessments or is it you just watch a video and you get these certificates?

C Kozumplik: So the question was: Is there any assessments? Some of the courses do have built-in assessments with them. They'll give you like a pre-test and a post-test. But what you can also do is, if you watch the video, you can create a Blackboard assessment after the fact with your own questions and tie the grades to the grade center and stuff like that as well. Not every course has them. Not every course has exercise files that you can download as well. It kind of just depends on the course. Like all the Excel and the Microsoft ones, they do. But maybe Making Be a Good Listener may not have the exercise files with it. Good question, though, thank you. Any other questions? Yes.

Unidentified: Is this a yearly subscription that NIU has?

C. Kozumplik: We are currently in our third of our third-year subscription. We are working on the recommendation for another three-year contract.

Unidentified: How much does it cost?

C. Kozumplik: It's about \$72,000 a year. But what we were finding – and you're probably going, well it's a really lot of money – what we actually did in the Division of IT is we personally stopped teaching Office classes because we had this. And that was two people's salary. And now we are able to give this to the entire university. There were groups around the university that were buying the licenses themselves. The Division of IT was looking at purchasing 200, and one of the academic units was buying 200 licenses. Those two departments, by combining it for the entire campus university, saved what would have cost those 400 licenses. And I know College of Education was buying some for like a certain month, and that was also. We told, we decided that it was close to almost \$80,000 with three or four departments doing it. So we moved to the campus-wide license; we got it for all the students, faculty and staff and saved money. Question in the back?

Unidentified: [inaudible]

C. Kozumplik: The questions is: How different is this from Coursera. I have not actually looked at Coursera, but I just know that, from my experience with Lynda is that I don't know if that has exercise files with it and if you can publish your completed work to your LinkedIn profile. I'm not sure about that. If you'd like to do a comparison and let me know, I'd be happy to share that with.

Unidentified: Coursera [inaudible]

C. Kozumplik: You can do that exact same thing here. Yes.

M. Haji-Sheikh: The question I have is, I'm looking at this, and it looks like there are people who put stuff up on there, but then in my area, it's pretty rudimentary stuff, very, very rudimentary stuff.

C. Kozumplik: What area do you teach if you don't mind me asking?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Microelectronics.

C. Kozumplik: Okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: And I just went through and there's one from the Electronic Foundation, one module only. And it's about four-hour module, but the question I have is, you know, are, what is their feedback system? Are they adding material from us as part of how they build up their portfolio? Or are they getting, you know, do we get to charge them if we give them something good.?

C. Kozumplik: That's a very good question. So what we can do is we can always give them suggestions on how to improve it. And then they keep building it in. When we first started, there was only 3500 courses, or 3500 videos. And now we're over 5,000. And it's probably over 6,000 by now actually, too. So if you've got a suggestion, I'd be willing to take it out to them and see if there's stuff in the works to produce more information.

J. Lukaszuk: I have a quick question. Are the videos close caption?

C. Kozumplik: Yes, there's actually a transcript available that they can use that as well. So you can actually play them if you're one of those people that like can read faster, you can actually play it at one-and-a-half times speed or something like that as well. Other questions?

If you do have any other questions – I know you guys are on a tight schedule, and I feel like I've already went over a little bit – so if you have any other questions, please feel free to email me, reach out. If you are interested in having your course syllabus turned into the lovely little spreadsheet format, please reach out to me as well. If you want to gather a few from your departments and do it as one whole group, we can do that as well.

Thank you very much for your time.

B. Reinvigorating Huskie Pride
 Kelly Wesener Michael, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs

L. Saborío: Next up, we have Kelly Wesener Michael. Welcome.

K. Wesener Michael: Well thank you, and my apologies for being a little bit late. I was unable to get here just in time, so thank you for your patience. I'm here to talk a little bit about Huskie Pride. In the beginning of the academic year, one of the priorities that Acting President Freeman put forward for us is reinvigorating Huskie Pride, and we've had a small working group, really working to do that across the campus or in different constituent groups.

In the fall we really focused on our students and getting out and rewarding those who were wearing red and black on Fridays to show their Huskie Pride, being a part of that community, and really helping students celebrate that. We know that cultivating a sense of loyalty and belonging amongst our students, faculty and staff makes everybody successful and enjoy their work environment or their learning environment all that much better. And we want to continue these efforts. We've worked with the cities of DeKalb, Sycamore and Genoa and gotten out and recognized some of the businesses that are showing Huskie Pride by wearing red and black, posting on social media. And we now have NIU flags that fly at each one of the city halls in each one of those municipalities. So that's some of the work that we've done. And working with city councils to recognize that important partnership with some resolutions and a little bit of celebration at the city councils.

I'm here to talk a little bit about some of the things that we're trying to do this semester internally with our audiences. We're asking our faculty, our staff and our students to really come together and, again, be intentional about wearing red and black on Fridays. We would love to celebrate your effort. So if you are getting folks together, you get your class together, tell them to wear red and black and take a picture, post it to social media, and I'm happy to share those instructions with you. We would love to then come and celebrate with your class by giving out some swag and to thank your class for participating in that if that's your department, whatever that is. We want different constituent groups on campus coming together showing their Huskie Pride and posting on social media so that we're able to share that with the greater community and beyond.

And we're just excited to be here. And we know that the more that we can really come together as a community and celebrate all that we have to offer our students, the better that student experience is going to be. I have some Huskie Pride clings that go in windows that we're happy to provide or some Huskie Pride pins. Certainly let me know. I will get instructions on posting to social media. I will get them to Pat so she distribute that. And we really welcome any ideas that we could do as a community to really get folks invested in being a Huskie and really enhancing the student experience.

Any quick questions? If you have questions along the way, certainly let me know. And I look forward to seeing those posts on social media. And Go Huskies!

L. Saborío: Okay, thank you.

C. Program Prioritization update
Chris McCord, Acting Executive Vice President and Provost

L. Saborío: So next on our Items for Faculty Senate Consideration is Item C. Program Prioritization update, and we have with us today Acting Vice President and Provost Christ McCord. Thank you for coming today, Provost McCord.

C. McCord: Thank you for having me, and especially because I don't have a cool product to share with you. I don't have window clings to share with you. No swag, sorry, just a report.

Program Prioritization has been a facet of our campus for several years now, and I'm here to report on the impacts. Those impacts are, of course, ongoing, so this is, if you will, a progress report. So

I'd like to briefly run through some of the goals and some of the process that we went through, and then focus really on the impacts of this activity. Those of you who were in the leadership forum yesterday, I apologize, you're hearing pretty much the same thing. I've tried to condense this a little bit.

The fundamental goal of Program Prioritization was to better align resources with mission. One of the particular motivations – that should need no motivation – I mean that should be a thing that any organization is about at any time. But that motivation was particularly brought home to us by the 2014 site visit from the Higher Learning Commission that, frankly, faulted us for not having a strong enough connection between resources and mission, and called upon us to do something about it. We have also received similar expectations from our Board of Trustees, from the Illinois Board of Higher Education, from the Illinois legislature. So in addition to the intrinsic motivations to simply make best use of our resources, to become better data-informed, to become higher quality, we've had a lot of external drivers moving us in this direction as well.

The process played out over a number of years. The heart of this – those of you who were involved will recall – was we allocated essentially every facet of the university to either an academic program or an administrative program. We had about – I have the exact number written down somewhere – no, they're up there – 223 academic programs, 236 administrative programs. So a program was sometimes more granular than a department. If you were in an academic department, each of your degree programs. If you had an independent stand-alone minor or certificate, each of those was considered a program. On the administrative side, programs and units aligned a little more, but we had distinct activities that sometimes were carried on within a single unit that were classified as different programs.

Each program was called upon to write a narrative. How many program authors in the room? A few. I was too. Those were structured documents. You had word limits. You had data fields that were included, etc. And the goal of that was to try and build something that could be evaluated in something like an apples to apples manner as best we could.

So two task forces were empaneled, one to review all the academic programs, and one to review all the administrative programs. Again I recognize a number of members of task forces in the room as well. I happened to serve on the administrative task force. The academic task force was made up entirely of faculty. The administrative task force was largely made up of staff with some faculty presence as well. Roughly speaking, the 2015-16 academic year, the fall was dedicated to developing the narratives, the spring dedicated to the task force review of those narratives.

Reports came out. You will recall that those reports took the form fundamentally of categorizing every program either as a candidate for enhancement; candidate for sustained sounds funky, but it was a candidate for sustain; candidate for reduction; candidate for transformation; candidate for review for possible elimination. Those recommendations were made public. There was a comment period. Based on the reports and the comments, divisions were charged with developing action plans. All of that went to the president. The president evaluated all that material and issued some guidelines about: either this should move forward; this should be further considered; I don't agree with the task force here; I do agree with the task force there. And then we moved into the implementation phase.

One aspect that came sort of organically out of this process, to me I think one of the most important and valuable parts of it, the structure, the formal structure called for us to evaluate each of those 400-and-some programs separately. We quickly realized that, while that brought enormous value to take a close look at each program on its own merits, there was an equal value in looking at connectivity between programs. The example that pops most quickly to mind – we had 13 programs that identified themselves as having essentially a communications function. The thought crossed our mind that, if we had 13 separate communications functions going on on campus, we maybe weren't harnessing our communications skills as best we could.

So we formed a number of what we dubbed complex conversations to bring together people from across the campus in each of these areas. Some of these moved very quickly to resolution of what they ought to be doing moving forward. Some have already, not only identified their actions, but have completed those actions. Some have identified where they want to go and are working through implementation. Some of those conversations are still ongoing. Some of them are, indeed, complex, and so they are taking some time to work through.

Throughout this, we've tried to worry about assessment. We have gathered information from the participants. We've monitored the costs of the project itself. We have done our best to track some of the impacts of it, both quantitative and qualitative. I'll be reviewing some of that material with you. I will readily acknowledge our tracking of outcomes and impacts is imprecise, partly because it's an ongoing project, it's a dynamic project. This is not a controlled experiment. It is not always easy to isolate the impact of Program Prioritization from other factors at work. But nonetheless, we feel that we can give a pretty authentic sense of how this has impacted the university in multiple facets.

So that's what I'd like to talk about: What are the impacts? And the impacts are truly multi-faceted. There are financial impacts. There are curricular impacts. There are organizational impacts such as how units are aligned. There are impacts such as changes in the way units collaborate with each other, the way individuals interact with each other. There are units that have refocused to change their priorities, change the processes. I have a category here called Additional Student Impacts, because there were just cool things we did – we think there are cool things we did for students – that we didn't know where to put otherwise.

And part of the goal was not just to conduct an evaluation, an assessment of where we are and where we ought to be, even though that's valuable in its own right. Part of the goal was to change culture, to change organizational culture, to be more data informed, to do things differently moving forward.

So first, what did it cost? So I'm going to give you a slide in a second that will give you a more detailed accounting of this, but what did it cost to implement this program? You can see a bottom line, just under \$300,000 were spent in order to implement this program. Some of that was spent on external speakers. We brought in, for example, people from other universities who had gone through similar Program Prioritization efforts. We brought them in to get their expertise. We brought in a trainer. We bought some software. But most of the expense remained, if you will, within the university community, within the ecosystem if you want to say it that way. And the single largest expense were the support provided for the task force members. The 42 task force

members really devoted an enormous amount of time and effort and energy. We offered those individuals, if they were faculty, we offered them the opportunity of a course buy-out or a stipend. Staff were offered a stipend. Administrators, such as myself, were not eligible for that and did not participate. Some of the faculty donated the support to their departments, say to their travel fund. But this is where the bulk of the support went, was to acknowledge the extraordinary effort we were calling for from the task force members. Now I want to be clear. This is direct cost. This is not attempting to capture people's time and effort in preparing narratives and serving on the steering committee. There is a lot of effort beyond what's reflected here. This is the direct cost explicitly tied to the project, itself.

So what kind of impact did we get for that effort? Well, there's at least two senses in which we can identify that. Procedurally, we have changed a lot of our budget processes and changed a lot of our funding priorities and criteria in light of Program Prioritization. I'm working very closely with our new chief financial officer to build the budget development process for the coming fiscal year. The criteria that came out of Program Prioritization are deeply embedded in that budget development process. We are looking at, not only explicitly Program Prioritization outcomes, but more than that, the criteria that informed Program Prioritization are the criteria that are informing budget development, not only in this current exercise, as we went through the process of what we called unfunded requirements and any number of budget exercises. Program Prioritization factors are the factors that are informing budget decisions.

Beyond that, we can look at simply ways in which we directly can see money moved. Sometimes money moved in. Sometimes money moved out. Sometimes, if you will, money moved sideways, that is programs, units, divisions, internally reallocated funds. Some of those were very, very directly the consequence of Program Prioritization in unmistakable ways. There's a gradation. Some of them were strongly influenced by Program Prioritization, but not necessarily solely caused by it. Others, the connection was a little softer. Those boundaries are necessarily imprecise, but I think the distinctions are real.

So this is where I need to look at some reminders. So what are some examples? What are some enhancements? Well one important enhancement is we made a significant investment in advertising and recruiting to attract new students. We've invested new funding in honors courses. We are having a one-time expense – we were running two separate childcare facilities – we have a modest one-time expense at enhancement to merge those two into one. We are investing in major gift officers to bring more funding in through advancement. And we invested in the Employee Assistance Program to merge the Employee Assistance Program and training functions within HR and better serve the campus community. They're internal reallocations. In the research office, Jerry Blazey has redirected considerable amount of the research funding available to him. Some of the research centers that we had operated are on the exit glide, and Jerry is redirecting the funds that had been devoted to those research centers to new research projects. Again that, I think, is directly correlated. A more subtle kind of reallocation: Facilities has been able to shift the balance of what they fund out of general revenues vs. what they fund out of bond revenue to move more expense to bond revenue so that more general revenues dollars can be released. So that's a different kind of internal reallocation.

Some reductions – we are a personnel-rich or personnel-heavy budget. No surprise, most of my examples of reductions are reductions in the personnel area. We eliminated a vice president position. We eliminated an associate vice president position. We eliminated an associate vice provost position. Career Services has trimmed some of their leadership positions. The Building Services has restructured the way they operate in order to be leaner. The R&R [Records and Registration] and Testing Services have trimmed staff. All of these were not just things people happened to do. They were budget reallocations, staffing reallocations made in direct consequence of Program Prioritization.

On the curricular side, the most important investment we can talk about here is the investment in faculty. Over the years, as Acting President Freeman often says, 700+ days without a state budget, we were very, very cautious about faculty hiring, very limited. Coming out of Program Prioritization, we made a conscious decision to reinvest in faculty and to devote those faculty hires to the programs that were highlighted by Program Prioritization. That did not necessarily mean that they were targeted at all the programs in the enhanced category, because Program Prioritization, again, the task forces made recommendations about enhancement. That went through further steps downstream to result in action plans and final determinations. But the Program Prioritization process deeply informed the hiring process that took place. The criteria were largely informed by the Program Prioritization. And I'll say this is a real investment. This is actually, as I look at the numbers, this has brought us back up to the faculty levels that we were at before the budget downturn.

M. Haji-Sheikh: It's still less than it was prior to.

C. McCord: I'm not saying it's back to the highest it ever was, but for the last several, you know, we were significantly down the last few years. We have recovered in faculty positions. We have recovered to where we were circa FY14. And that's the whole point of prioritization. It doesn't just put them back where they were. It put them where investments were targeted. And no, by no means did it fill every position that we wanted to fill. As dean, as acting provost, I know very well the many positions we would like to fill that we haven't. But I stand by the statement that we made a significant investment informed by Program Prioritization in faculty positions.

We also made significant decisions about curricular programs based on Program Prioritization. We had programs that were targeted for transformation, programs that were targeted for reduction. There was an opportunity to evaluate new programs. Each of these has a story. I will note there's a perception that on the academic side, that mostly what we did was target minors and certificates. There certainly are a number of minors and certificates that were targeted for reduction or elimination. But there were degree programs, and there are degree programs that have moved forward through the curricular process – again, nothing happened outside of the shared governance process. But there have been degree programs. There are two research centers, I believe six degree programs. Foreign Languages has undergone a major overhaul of its degree structure, really very striking overhaul of its degree structure coming out of Program Prioritization.

It has caused a lot of restructuring of the university. Now, that may be more to me where I sit than to others where they sit in the university. But to me, this has been substantial and impactful. And these are just a few samples of some of the changes that have happened. Enrollment Management,

some of you may remember, Enrollment Management at one point was in Academic Affairs. It then moved to Student Affairs to form a unit of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. It's now been merged with Marketing and Communication to try and effectively connect those resources. Student Affairs was realigned to report to the executive vice president and provost. The vice presidency was eliminated. Other pieces were realigned. Career Services, for example, was moved into Academic Affairs as part of undergraduate studies. The Office of Student Academic Success was eliminated. So again, a number of unit realignments took place. A very important one, in my mind, is for many years, our online and off-campus programs operated really quite separately from our main campus, on-campus programs. We are now in the process of moving online and off-campus academic programming, course delivery, into Academic Affairs and merging it more solidly with the rest of our academic mission.

In addition, people are collaborating. You don't always have to merge units to get people to work together. There have been a number of places where units were brought into awareness of each other's operations. It's easy in a large organization to do what you do and not realize that somebody else in another unit might be doing something very comparable. One of the things that Program Prioritization brought was these task force members' ability to look across and say, "You, you and you, you need to talk to each other." So many collaborations have come out of this, some big, some small.

The task force recommended considering merging the law library with University Libraries. Upon reflection, leadership's decision was not to merge that, but the two libraries are working together more effectively than they have in the past. Some offices realized that they needed to refocus their efforts. I mentioned that there were some places where a single unit would have multiple programs within it. The office of General Counsel actually had more – I think this is an accurate statement – the Office of General Counsel submitted more programs than they had staff. The guidance back to the Office of General Counsel was: You need to focus. You're trying to do too many things. You need to focus. Eliminate some of these activities. Focus on your core mission of providing legal guidance to the campus. And they have done so. They've dropped a number of activities. An important change that this, by no means was Program Prioritization the only venue calling for an examination of our charge back systems, but it certainly accelerated the process of reviewing our charge back systems. Charge backs, if you're not familiar, is a process by which one part of the campus charges another part of the campus for their services. A well-known example that's up here is WiFi, phones, Ethernet connections. Historically, the funding model for IT on campus was built around charging units for those services. That has now been abolished. That didn't make them free, right. Money had to be reallocated, but money was reallocated, and we have a much more sensible service model for IT now than we did heretofore.

Some other things I think are worth mentioning: We looked at aspects such as the need to improve the situation of the Asian American Center. This is a place where students saw the call and, frankly, stayed fairly relentless that there was this call, and we've in no small part because of the students' insistence that we not forget them, we will be moving the Asian American Center from the rather dilapidated facility that they have been in to a better space. The Northern Star, it became very clear to us that the Northern Star, like many campus papers, was not going to be able to stay afloat if we didn't do something. Understand that the Northern Star has been very proud of its heritage as an independent student newspaper and very reluctant to do anything that might seem to make it

beholden to the institution. However, it was the only – if I have my facts straight – the only public university in the state of Illinois whose student newspaper did not receive some sort of institutional support. So when we went through a Program Prioritization-informed process of reevaluating all of the student fees, there was a decision made to reduce some of the fees, including the athletics fee, and create a fee for the Northern Star to basically insure its continued operation, even as we remain very dedicated to maintaining editorial independence for it.

So I've probably already taken too long. I'll go lightly over this. We did a survey of essentially program narrative authors, as a proxy for unit leaders, and asked people about the impacts on how they operate, what they do. And you can see some of the responses. So these percentages are what percentage of the respondents said they were either very positively impacted or moderately impacted, moderately positively impacted – I hope that's the right way to say it – by Program Prioritization in these areas.

Administrative programs, likewise, saw a very positive uptick. And again, I'm very gratified by things like 85 percent reporting increased collaboration, 75 percent reporting increased data-informed decision-making, increased sharing with other units. We have to be doing things like that if we're going to continue to move forward as an institution.

So just a brief summary, I think we have moved the needle. I think it has shown that an institution should overgo a comprehensive evaluation of itself at least once a century, whether it needs it or not. And our goal is to not wait a century to do it again. President Freeman had, I think, a useful analogy for this, which again those of you who heard this yesterday, bear with me, I'll repeat the analogy.

You might go years and years without really cleaning out the basement or the attic. And then one day you finally muster up the energy. Maybe even think of the family home that's just your house that you've been in, but your parents were there, and their parents were there. And it's just been accumulating stuff for decades and decades. And then you finally clean it out. So after that, you've got two choices, well three, because you could sell: You can wait and let it accumulate stuff over and over again and then go back and do another sort of gut. Or you can say, okay, now we're going to find a way to keep things orderly moving forward on an ongoing basis so we don't have to do this again. That last one is called continuous improvement model. That's what we're trying – we're not there yet – but that's what we want to work toward. Rather than saying, let's do the kind of heavy lift that Program Prioritization implementation was in this last cycle, let's try and find a way where we make this more of an ongoing part of who we are and what we do. Let's find a way to merge it with things like program review, accreditation review, so that we're not duplicating efforts. But let's also not do something where you do this massive lift all at once. I readily admit that's easier said than done, but that's our aspiration. That's what we're working towards, is to in some fashion really embed in a meaningful way some prioritization process as an ongoing basis. I don't have an architecture to share with you today.

Questions?

M. Irwin: Thank you, Chris. A lot of detail in there. I want to ask a specific question about something I didn't hear you speak much about. I've been thinking a lot lately about the gap between

what athletics generates and what they spend. And I know that a lot of the programs listed in the reports were athletic programs. Can you say anything about NIU's investment in athletics and whether that will shift.

C. McCord: Yes, I'll do my best. The message coming out of Program Prioritization was that athletics needed to become more self-reliant, or more importantly, less reliant on university funding. That university funding took the form both of general revenues funding and student fees. Athletics, I think it's fair to say, has truly taken that to heart. They are looking for ways to become more self-reliant, less reliant on university funding. They have taken budget cuts like every other division. They've laid people off. They've also been very aggressive about trying to find other revenue sources so they can reduce dependence. If I'm looking at the numbers correctly, since Sean Frazier's arrival as athletic director, they have more than doubled the sort of what you might call local funds revenue that they generate by premium seating and sponsorships and the revenue-generating activities you would expect from an athletics program that's trying to be self-supporting. If I'm reading it right, they've basically doubled that and are still working to increase that more. And as they do that, institutional funding is being reduced in both categories. They've seen their 02 funds reduced. They've also seen their student fee, which has been a non-trivial part of their support, is going to be reduced for the coming year. And I will note two specific examples coming up. They're going to play Florida State, I think this coming year. They get \$1.6 million for that. That's very intentional to generate revenue. Any day now, may even be up today, any day now, a naming rights opportunity for the Convocation Center is going to be announced. Again, that's very much to generate revenue so they can be less reliant on institutional funds. Michael.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Follow up on Mitch's comment. I was going to ask a different question, but this really brought up a fair question. In the, I believe was it the Northern Star or the Chronicle, it said the football team's average attendance is now down to like, what is it, 11,000 a game. How can they be increasing revenue when nobody is showing up?

C. McCord: Okay, an honest answer, real honest answer is that I don't know. But I'll try and do a little better than that. Attendance is in no small part connected to the fact that we play like Tuesday night in November. Why do we play Tuesday nights in November? Not because you draw a big crowd on Tuesday nights in November, but because of the television contract. So you take the loss in personal attendance in the stadium for the revenue you get from the television contract. So those are the kinds of trade-offs you make.

And I think there are also more of their revenue comes from – if I understand correctly and, again, please understand I am no expert; this is based on what I think I know. If somebody proves me wrong, I was wrong. I believe, gain, their revenue growth has come in things like premium seating and sponsorships and other activities rather than just, you know, sort of the routine ticket sale.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I don't quite understand that particular view of finance, because you have to connect to an audience somewhere in. A college team has to have a home base. At this point, we could just wander around the country with this type of audience and just call an NIU label on it. I mean, they need to do something to connect back to the community. I've talked to a lot of alumni, and they're just, you know, they're not fans of the present athletic director. And I think with the – I

went by the football game – you know, 7,000 average, which means like 2,000 coming out on a Tuesday night or Wednesday night.

C. McCord: Again, out of my league, which is the MAC Conference, isn't it. Okay, sorry. Yes?

V. Naples: I attended the multi-hour meeting last spring with a variety of the different administration and the coach and all of that. And we got a conflicting group of numbers, and I was unsure when I left the meeting exactly how much revenue was created by this and how much expenditure was created by that. Is there a way we could get a detailed breakdown made publicly available about what the expenditures and the revenues coming in are, so we can do a more accurate evaluation of where we are with the athletics program, in general, and football, in particular?

C. McCord: Okay, so to be clear, you're speaking about athletics – when you said you were in this multi-hour meeting, that was specific to athletics.

V. Naples: No.

C. McCord: I just want to make sure I understand.

V. Naples: No, it was not specific to athletics. It was the overall financial meeting that Resources, Space and Budget people were invited to, and a variety of other faculty and staff groups on campus. A lot of the time was taken up by Sean Frazier talking about how much, my interpretation only, forgive me, how much the athletics program had suffered by not getting financial increments, and that they had taken, if I recall correctly, an overall \$200,000 cut out of a \$28 million-plus budget? That didn't strike me as a very large sacrifice on their part. And there were no specific numbers we were able to walk away with to analyze where the revenues were coming in, what was most valuable, what was not producing revenue, vs. expenditures.

C. McCord: Understand, you asked is there a mechanism. I'm sure the answer is yes. I'm not sure I can tell you, standing here, exactly what it is, except that we are aware of the need and are trying to make continuing efforts to improve our transparency. Sarah McGill, who's come on board and who I'm enjoying working closely with as our new CFO, I think shares the president's expectation for as much transparency as we can appropriately provide. So I think we understand the need is across campus, but we also understand there are particular questions and concerns about athletics.

V. Naples: I was just particularly concerned about, if you will recall in 2015 they had the program where that if 6,000 students attended each of the six home football games, that there would be a one-semester tuition waiver prize awarded on a lottery basis. And that was never awarded, because they could not get that many people to come to meetings. This was information I presented at the Board of Trustees, and there was a newspaper headline with a picture of several of the students that were obviously attending the football game and that article that followed, but the next column to the right of it was saying that the enrollment continued to decline, and it was the first time in 34 years it was below 18,000. So these were juxtapositions about where are the financial emphases being placed, because a nearly \$1000 a year fee for the athletics program is astonishingly high. And students had come to me for a long time personally in the various classes I teach and in other capacities saying that this was a burden that really was difficult on them and they weren't getting

any benefit of it, because they didn't have the capability of spending the time to go to these games, and they didn't have the interest.

L. Saborío: If I could just jump in here quickly, Provost McCord. I believe that the RSB Committee is considering inviting Sean Frazier to one of their meetings this semester. So if you have additional questions that you would like for him to address, then please contact your RSB Committee representative, and they will make sure to put your questions or include them in their agenda. Sounds like we have a lot of questions for him. Thank you.

C. McCord: Scot?

S. Schraufnagel: Regarding Program Prioritization, I guess I'm worried about – so we've got program review every eight years, the Assessment Office, as you know, has us do status review every four years. And in terms of academic units, you know, I can imagine program review in eight years, status review four years and then sandwiched in there another round of Program Prioritization. I'm wondering to what extent can we use the existing program reviews and status reports to help inform the academic side of Program Prioritization where maybe the administrative side – I'm not sure they have that same system already in place.

C. McCord: An excellent question. Again, I'm not sure I heard your last phrase perfectly, but it's okay, I will say it this way: Academic programs, for a variety of reasons, have let's say a rich history of assessment and reporting, which is not paralleled on the administrative side. For many of the units on the administrative side, this program review was the first time perhaps ever that they had really been asked in a systematic way to explore these issues. And we were unusual among universities in that we did both the academic and administrative sides. Many universities, when they go through this exercise, just do the academic side. Okay, so that's just some background.

Your point is well taken, and we fully agree. We flipped it the other way when we could, and we took the results from Program Prioritization and used them to inform program review. The challenge is an obvious one. Program Prioritization gets its power by doing everybody all at once. Program review does a roughly-speaking one-eighth of the programs every eight years. You got to sync those up somehow, and that's part of the challenge. And so if you move to, like I said, a continuous improvement model, where you're sort of looking a little bit every year instead of a whole bunch all at once, you can resolve that tension. And so that's where we see ourselves going, but again, I can't tell you anything more detailed about how we're going to get there than that.

Oh yes, sorry.

G. Sirotkin: I just got interested with this six year [inaudible] that were announced for 2017. We have like bleeding situation in the Math Department. We are losing faculty like three per year or so. And we didn't get any positions, and as far as I understand, Department of Mathematics was ranked pretty high on the Program Prioritization. So I was wondering who decides the distribution of those positions and the distribution of positions for the next year? And if we can see where the positions were announced and how it correlates with Program Prioritization, because 60 positions is like one-and-a-half per department, and considering that we were ranked pretty high, we would expect two or so, and we get zero. So I was wondering what's the information about position distribution.

C. McCord: Sure. So the allocation was informed by Program Prioritization, but was in no sense, algorithmic. I'll risk too long of a digression, I apologize if I wear your patience. So you may be aware, the university's structure right now is all positions are swept back centrally as soon as they're vacated and then those funds are reallocated centrally. So the first was the provost and the CFO reached an agreement on how many faculty positions were going to be awarded. Those sat at the provost level. So the provost invited proposals from the deans in a very structured way, who in turn developed proposals from department chairs in a very structured way. So I can speak, having been now at both levels. Within the college, departments submitted proposals. Those were rank ordered, prioritized within the college. Those college priorities then went up to Academic Affairs, to the Provost's Office. This year, in this cycle, it just sort of happened to be true that I submitted those to myself. I was dean at the time we were developing the proposals. I was acting provost by the time it was time for the Provost's Office to act on them. So the Academic Affairs staff took all of the information available for the deans and, if you will, inter-leaved those requests perfectly willing, where we felt we needed to, to not just inter-leave the orders. We didn't go: Everybody's first, then everybody's second. We really did our own best evaluation and, in some cases, reversed rankings even within a college and said the college asked for this over that, but we think these are more important. So ultimately, this cycle that's underway for this coming fall, se moi. I mean, ultimately, at the end of the day, I made the final decisions about those. I made it on the basis of layers of advice, but these were my decisions. Last year, Provost Freeman, then-Provost, made the final decision about how those 60 positions would be allocated.

G. Sirotkin: And the information is publicly available if I want to, you know, make a table for these positions are in these faculty, and the Program Prioritization.

C. McCord: The honest answer is I don't think they are. I don't think that we ever publish: These are the decisions. Obviously, they are shared back with the deans, the deans disseminate among their colleges as they think best, but we do not typically make that a public document that's posted on the web or anything like that.

Unidentified: We could FOIA it, right?

C. McCord: You probably could.

G. Sirotkin: Are the deans instructed to use the results of Program Prioritization when they make their recommendations, because it seems like.

C. McCord: Absolutely. Yes, in fact, essentially, it's a pretty close approximation that the expectation is, if a program was not in Enhanced, there needed to be a particular explanation why it should be considered for hiring. So we started with a very heavy bias toward the Enhance categories, informed again, the recommendations from the task force weren't the be-all and end-all. I will note one particular program that was put in the Reduce category that is, in fact, one of our best revenue, both revenue and intellectual opportunities. As dean and then again as acting provost, I happened to think this one particular recommendation was not appropriate, and I reversed it. So there are not always and with exclusively Enhance only, but still heavily informed by the thought process that went into it. So yes, it absolutely was a fundamental starting point. It says something

about the situation we had been in. Go 700 days without a state budget. Go years with declining enrollments, and you find yourself in a situation where you cannot fill all of the valid requests that you have. So the fact that departments didn't receive positions did not mean they had invalid requests. It means we had limited resources, and well let me leave that at that.

Any other questions, comments? Thank you for your patience, I appreciate it.

[NOTE: Following the Faculty Senate meeting, Provost Chris McCord contacted the Faculty Senate Office stating: "Could you let the Faculty Senate know that I misspoke. The faculty hiring plan for FY18 that (then) Provost Freeman approved was published as part of the November, 2017 Academic Affairs action plan. It can be found on the Program Prioritization website at <https://www.niu.edu/program-prioritization/>." Provost McCord's follow-up information was shared electronically with Faculty Senate members on January 29, 2018.]

L. Saborío: Okay, I'm just going to go off-script here for a moment and I think it would be remiss of me not to mention the recent passing of one of our colleagues, Cliff Mirman. He was the chair in the Department of Technology in the College of Engineering.

M. Haji-Sheikh: We lost two this [inaudible].

L. Saborío: There will be a service, a memorial service on Saturday at 2:30 in the concert hall for anyone who is interested. Thank you.

D. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award – [call for nominations](#) – Page 7
Submit written letters of nomination to Faculty Senate President Linda Saborío
no later than noon Wednesday, Feb. 14, 2017.

L. Saborío: Okay, now onto Item V. D., the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. We have a call for nominations, it's on page 7 of your packet. This is an award that recognizes an NIU faculty member for special service to the faculty, however you want to define special. And you have a list there of previous recipients of the award. So any nominations, please submit a written letter of nomination to me no later than noon on Wednesday, Feb. 14. Any questions, you can let me know.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs Committee – Clanitra Stewart Nejd, Chair – no report
- C. Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession – Laura Beamer, Chair – no report
- D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Keith Millis, Liaison/Spokesperson

L. Saborío: On to Reports from Standing Committees. Let's start with Keith Millis and the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. I believe you have a couple items for us.

1. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the President of Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of University Council – See Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 7](#) – page 8

K. Millis: Thank you for the script. We have two items today. The first is the selection of the committee to evaluate the president of Faculty Senate and executive secretary of University Council who, you may know, is Linda Saborío. You know, I will botch your names. This evaluation committee consists of two faculty members of Faculty Senate who are not also elected faculty members of the University Council, plus one alternate; two faculty members of the University Council and one alternate; one student member of the University Council and one alternate; one Supportive Professional Staff member of University Council; and one Operating Staff member of University Council. Richard, you're going to help me. So, why don't you pick two, or pick one and then another one. So this will be: The first name is George Slotsve. And then the second name is Scot Schraufnagel, Political Science.

S. Schraufnagel: What is this for?

K. Millis: This is for the committee to evaluate Linda. And then we'll be picking one more name for an alternate. Mark Riley. Mark?

L. Saborío: He's not here.

K. Millis: Okay, well he's an alternate. So we're going to put that aside. Now we'll be picking two faculty members of the University Council and one alternate. The first is Kendall Thu, Liberal Arts and Sciences. The second is Gary Chen, Engineering and Engineering Technology. Gary, are you here?

L. Saborío: I don't think he's here. We'll let him know.

K. Millis: Okay, you're recording these things. And then we'll need one more, this is the alternate. Lin Shi.

All right, the next one is one student member of the University Council and one alternate. Okay, thanks. All right, Keith Stiggers, student representative, College of Law, okay. And then the alternate is Chloe Milot.

The next drawing is one Supportive Professional Staff member of University Council. Aline Click. Aline? Okay.

And then one Operating Staff member of University Council. Barb Andree. Hi Barb. Okay.

2. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor – See Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 7](#) – Page 9

K. Millis: The next is the selection of a committee to evaluate the faculty and SPS personnel adviser, who is Sarah McHone-Chase. This evaluation committee consists of three faculty members from the Faculty Senate plus one alternate. Why don't you just pick one at a time. The first name is Ismael Montana. Did I get your name close.

I. Montana: Sure.

K. Millis: Okay, thanks. The second, John Novak, Music. And the third name, Reinaldo Moraga.

Unidentified: Is it two or three

K. Millis: Yes, how many have we drawn. Two? Oh, that's three. And there's one alternate. Thank you. Eric Mogren.

And then the last one is by default. This evaluation committee includes one Supportive Professional Staff member of the University Council. However, no drawing is necessary for the selection. Since University Council has only two voting SPS members, whoever was not drawn for the previous evaluation committee will automatically serve on this committee, and that would be Cathy Doederlein.

Congratulations, Cathy. And I believe that's it.

L. Saborío: Thank you, Keith. That was exciting.

E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Sarah McHone-Chase, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

L. Saborío: Okay, next up we have a report from Sarah McHone-Chase from the RSB.

S. McHone-Chase: Thank you. For RSB, I just want to report that there will be a predictable budget shortfall that the committee is going to be helping to address in the coming year. This is exciting for us, because RSB has never been part of the budget development process before. So there will probably be, I believe, two people from RSB who will be in the budget development process this year. And that's my report. The acting president and acting provost will be part of – I think it's Feb 2 – Feb 2 meeting. If you have questions that you would like us to bring to them, you could – well, it's an open meeting, you could be there – but the questions have to be submitted to them by the 26th, right, okay, thank you, by the 26th. So you would submit those questions to Pat Erickson by Friday of this week. And that's all I have. Thank you.

L. Saborío: Thank you very much.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Linda Saborío – [report](#) – Pages 10-17

L. Saborío: Okay, Reports from Advisory Committees. The FAC to IBHE, I do have a report. It's quite long, pages 10 to 11 [10 to 17] of your packet. We met in December down in Springfield, and let me just flip through here. You have a written report, so I was not planning on reading the entire thing, because it does look like we're starting to lose some of your focus here. A couple of things you might want to look at, though is the outmigration. Forty-seven percent of Illinois residents enrolled out of state this year, and it seems as if they are going to neighboring states and enrolling in four-year institutions there. This is something that we need to definitely address.

There was significant discussion about dual credit. It seems as if some out-of-state public and private institutions are offering dual credit to Illinois high school students, our students. And they've determined that between 9 and 11 percent of students who take these dual credit courses enroll in the institution offering the dual credit. So there was some discussion on how to handle that. Should we limit it to nine credit hours? Do we charge? And what not.

And then the IBHE legislative report. Sorry, Laura, but it looks like they are going to re-introduce legislation regarding the community colleges offering a bachelor of science in nursing. It's not going away, is it?

So, if you have any questions regarding any of this report, please feel free to email me or come by my office. Sometimes I'm there alone, and I do have a coffee machine.

1. [Proposed budget resolution](#)

L. Saborío: Okay, now for the added item. I just attended another FAC to IBHE meeting this past Friday. So I don't have a written report yet, but at our last meeting, the suggestion was made that Faculty Senates and Councils might enact resolutions regarding the state budget. And this would accord with the IBHE, which is asking legislators and the governor to exclude higher education from any impasse by considering it with the same sanctity given to K through 12 funding and provide a full stable budget for higher education in Illinois.

You have some background information here. There was a letter that was sent, and there's also, you can look at the website if you want to read the full letter. Basically, I just pulled out a few of the quotes from it, but it was sent by the HLC to the governor and members of the General Assembly. And what they said was that, "In February of 2016, I wrote to you with many of the same concerns about the lack of a state budget that I'm going to reiterate today. However, these concerns have grown exponentially since that time. As the accrediting agency, I'm tasked with assuring quality. I must warn you about the accreditation consequences of the failure to provide sustainable funding for Illinois higher education." And then it went on to state that, "HLC is obligated to implement its system of sanctions and public information to alert the public about the impact of educational quality."

This is a huge concern, right? You can see why we had a discussion about this. Furthermore, the IBHE was recently contacted by the HLC and asked what truth there is in rumors of another budget impasse. So they are concerned about this. IBHE stated that at this point, there are only rumors floating and, until budget negotiations begin following the governor's budget address on February 14, there is no definitive answer regarding the likelihood of another impasse. So, go ahead and flip it to the next page.

We have a proposed resolution. Something was drafted by a faculty representative from UIUC at the meeting, and then I've tweaked it a little bit and also asked for some input from Carolinda Douglass who works with accreditation. And so what you're looking at is the proposed resolution, which I would like for us to discuss today and then vote on. This is my walk-in item. So I'm going to read it out loud; I know that you're reading it along with me out there. Can you see it?

Whereas, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) has reiterated the consequences of the failure to provide sustainable funding for Illinois higher education. In June 2017, the HLC stated in a letter sent to the Governor and members of the General Assembly that Illinois institutions of higher education cannot be placed at risk again as happened in the budget impasse of 2015-2017. Without a stable budget for higher education in Illinois, Illinois institutions of higher education are at risk of losing accreditation.

And whereas, without accreditation, institutions cannot operate as institutions of higher learning. For example, students would be ineligible to apply for financial aid, and researchers would be ineligible to apply for federal grants. Furthermore, such a status negatively affects transfer of courses and programs among colleges and universities, reduces private sector confidence, and destabilizes crucial processes for assuring the quality of an institution's programs. Thus, without fiscal stability, higher education institutions in Illinois cannot be operational nor meet the Illinois public agenda to provide effective and quality education for all people.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Northern Illinois University urges the Illinois Legislature to adopt a process and budget that will provide sustainable funding to Illinois institutions of higher education.

We need to do a motion and a second, and then we'll have a discussion. Can I get a motion?

S. McHone-Chase: So moved.

L. Saborío: By Sarah. And a second? Okay. Let's open this up to discussion. What are your thoughts on this. Oh, I apologize, we also have a list of where this will be sent – legislators in Illinois. If you have suggestions for other individuals that we need to add to this list, just email them to me. Okay, so go ahead, Kendall, let's have a discussion.

K. Thu: I think it's a really good idea. I like the language. My only question is: Are other universities doing something comparable to this.

L. Saborío: Yes.

K. Thu: I assume they are.

L. Saborío: Yes.

K. Thu: Okay.

L. Saborío: So at the FAC to IBHE, I think there are around 12 public institutions with representatives at the meeting. And UIUC, the rep from UIUC, drafted a resolution, which is comparable to this one. I tweaked the second paragraph more than anything, because hers was very brief. Just basically, she said that we would have to close our doors and so I wanted to give a little more detail than that in the second paragraph. And we will be one of the first, though, to approve a resolution and start sending it out to legislators. The others, their faculty senates and councils meet later than ours, I mean in the month. They meet later in the month, beginning in February. And there is some urgency, because February 14, as you know, is the governor's budget address. So we wanted to get this out to them before the address. Plus, I didn't want to be the last institution to do it at the end of February if we waited. And I do plan on sharing it with the other reps. They asked that we do that, whatever was passed by our individual faculty senates. Okay, go ahead, Virginia.

V. Naples: Is there any merit in sending a copy of this resolution to the people who have stated they would like to be the nominees for their parties for the new governor's election?

L. Saborío: New governor? Okay, good suggestion, we'll put that down. Thank you.

V. Naples: At this point, it's probably fewer than a dozen people that would need to receive that letter, but I think that's a good investment of a 50 cent stamp. They might be able to put that information to work in forming their platforms that they're trying to use to convince people to select them as the appropriate candidates for the governor's position.

L. Saborío: Absolutely. I think one of them is already on the list. If not, I don't know, I don't have the list in front of me. Rauner's on there.

V. Naples: He should be on there twice.

L. Saborío: Yep. Any other discussion? Any changes to the language, things that you would like to tweak? No? It's good? I got some input – Carolinda provided some valuable input for that second part about the Higher Learning Commission and the damage. Did you have your hand up?

J. Hanna: I think that something could be put in there about closing doors. [inaudible] without accreditation, universities [inaudible] quite as good as they are now, but they'd still be okay. But I do think that, without the financial aid and federal grants, it really would be the door closing situation. So I don't know [inaudible] just saying institutions of higher learning can't operate [inaudible].

L. Saborío: The original – I can read it if you want. “Loss of accreditation basically results in an institution closing its doors to students.” Do you want me to put that back in there? No? You’re all going, “no.”

S. McHone-Chase: Maybe along with that, we could

L. Saborío: It seems a little exaggerated, but that’s why I didn’t want to.

S. McHone-Chase: Sorry, I didn’t mean to interrupt you.

L. Saborío: Go ahead, Sarah.

S. McHone-Chase: I thought maybe along with that, we could talk about the outmigration of 47 percent, because they’re not exactly the same, but we could talk about how we’re already experiencing the outmigration of students and, without accreditation, we’re literally closing our doors, and we’ll experience this even more so, loss of, like students are not going to be going to our schools anymore.

L. Saborío: I know, we’re looking at, do you have a suggestion for a sentence that you would like to put in there so we can vote on this today? Yeah, I don’t want to come back to it.

A. Hanley: I have a suggestion.

L. Saborío: Okay, good. Go ahead.

A. Hanley: I would suggest that at the end of “ineligible to apply for federal grants comma exacerbating the already high outmigration of Illinois students to neighboring states.”

L. Saborío: Comma “exacerbating.”

A. Hanley: Yeah, comma after the federal grants, I think.

L. Saborío: “Of students to other states”?

A. Hanley: “Of students to other states.”

L. Saborío: “Illinois students”?

S. McHone-Chase: Sometimes in the past when I’ve discussed this problem with legislators, I’ve also talked about how when these students leave to go to other schools in other states, they don’t tend to come back to be taxpayers when they’ve finished their education.

L. Saborío: I know. So can we go back to Anne. Was that a friendly amendment? We don’t have to vote on it, oh thank you. Feel free to amend this. Any other language changes? Good suggestion, we got that in there. Okay, go ahead.

K. Staikidis: I just wondered if we might want to actually put the 47 percent in? If that's an accurate number, I think 47, no?

L. Saborío: It's just an approximate. They're still working on the data on that. It's alarming, isn't it? When you actually see that percentage, it's quite alarming. And you can also look at data, I have other data if you want to look at it, but it shows outmigration versus in-state migration. And so they used to somehow balance, or they were close to a balance, maybe 3,000 net loss. It's now, that net loss is at 16,000-something. So even, students aren't coming into Illinois; they're just leaving. And then surprisingly, the data does show that international student enrollment is up a little bit, which I find interesting. Okay back to this. Sorry, that was a little off-script there. Any other additions.

A. Hanley: Janet wants to revise my

L. Saborío: Okay, friendly amendment, Janet, go ahead.

J. Hathaway: I'm debating. I'm just wondering. I really love Anne's language, but I wonder if it should stand on its own in a sentence, because that sentence has to do with, for example, "students would be ineligible to apply for financial aid." So it makes it seem like this has the potential to exacerbate the high outmigration of Illinois students to other states.

L. Saborío: Okay, "as a consequence," or "as one consequence," is that what you're thinking? Give us some language here.

J. Hathaway: I like what Anne just said.

A. Hanley: "This has the potential to exacerbate"

L. Saborío: "This has the potential to," sorry.

K. Thu: Rather than "has the potential to," which is a little bit wishy-washy, "This will likely exacerbate the already high outmigration."

Unidentified: Do we need to clarify Illinois students, what we mean by that, because it's not – students could be any grade level or any?

K. Thu: It could be a high school or college students, and it is both high school and college students.

A. Hanley: You could say "the outmigration of Illinois students to institutions of higher education in other states."

Unidentified: There we go.

A. Hanley: Just the word, "directly losing."

L. Saborío: That would clarify it.

Unidentified: Yeah.

L. Saborío: Good, we got that language in there. Those are all friendly amendments, right? So we follow protocol here.

K. Thu: We could say something about the potential outmigration of legislators.

L. Saborío: That we could put in a [inaudible]

K. Thu: Only for our internal documents.

L. Saborío: Okay, Keith.

K. Millis: Going back to that first sentence of the second paragraph. I like what you did, but I agree, I think it needs more punch or something. We're trying to persuade them. And I'm not sure, but it could be something like: comma "institutions cannot fulfill their mission as institutions of higher learning," or something like that.

L. Saborío: At the end of that paragraph?

K. Millis: No, at the beginning of the second paragraph, the first sentence of the second paragraph.

L. Saborío: Okay.

K. Millis: I agree with the philosopher. I think it needs a little punching. We want to persuade.

L. Saborío: "Cannot fulfill their mission."

K. Millis: "Mission as institutions of higher learning."

L. Saborio: Okay.

K. Millis: Cannot complete their mission, something like that.

L. Saborío: Oh oh, we've got some grumbling going on, you like that? No? Anybody else. Yes, I see you grabbing the mic there, go ahead.

K. Duffin: In the sentence down in the middle of the paragraph that starts, "Furthermore," "Furthermore, such a status," that status is getting pretty far removed from what it's referring to, namely the lack of accreditation. I recommend removing "such a status" and just saying, "Furthermore, lack of accreditation negatively affects"

Unidentified: "Loss of accreditation"

L. Saborío: "Loss of accreditation"

Unidentified: “Loss of accreditation”

L. Saborío: “Loss of accreditation” there? Remove the, okay.

Unidentified: “Will”

Unidentified: “Will”

Unidentified: “Will likely” I would say “will.”

Unidentified: Just “will”

L. Saborío: “Will” yeah, it will. That came from Carolinda, there, that language. That was good language there. Okay? We’re going to have to change “reduce” too.

V. Naples: “Reduce” should be singular. “Destabilize” should be singular.

L. Saborío: She’s got it. Okay? Any other suggestions?

V. Naples: “Destabilize” there you go.

L. Saborío: She’s getting there. Anything else? Read the whole thing again, see if it makes sense?

V. Naples: Would it be better to say “Institutions in Illinois cannot operate, nor meet the Illinois public agenda” rather than “be operational”?

L. Saborío: So we took it out above. Okay.

K. Thu: Don’t you have to put a comma after “public agenda” if you’re going to put a comma after “operate” English professors?

Unidentified: Yes.

L. Saborío: Okay, go ahead, Janet.

J. Hathaway: In the first sentence of the second paragraph, if the first “institutions” should be “colleges and universities” so that way we don’t have “institutions” twice, but also maybe it’s more inclusive. Sorry, Pat.

L. Saborío: I know, she does not like it when we do this. She’s like, “I don’t like it.” Or you could say “higher education” right?

V. Naples: “Loss of accreditation” You’ve got “will” and “affects.” “Loss of accreditation will negatively affect”

L. Saborío: She's got a line through it, I think.

Unidentified: There's a strikethrough.

V. Naples: I can't see it from here.

L. Saborío: She's got it.

Unidentified: Oh, I can't see.

L. Saborío: You just can't see it. She did it, yeah. She put a strikethrough so we'd know where it was. Anybody else? Yes.

M. Abendroth: I don't know if this would be too strong, but the very last sentence where you have "Thus, without fiscal stability, higher education institutions cannot operate and remain open." Or if that's too strong, then just. I know you wanted to have stronger language.

L. Saborío: Is that the same thing?

Unidentified: I don't know.

L. Saborío: The same thing? No.

Unidentified: [inaudible]

L. Saborío: Somebody's going to get paid, just not us. Go ahead.

A. Newman: If you're talking about those commas in that last line, "Thus, without fiscal stability..." Do you want it to read that you can't meet the Illinois public agenda to provide effective? Or is it that you cannot operate to provide effective? Is it both? In other words. The comma that. I mean it works with or without the comma, but there's a slightly different meaning. So if you're suggesting – I can't see it now.

L. Saborío: We should take it out. Wasn't it out in the beginning?

A. Newman: If you pull out the comma there, you'd pull out the comma there. But if you have the comma, then what you are suggesting is you cannot operate to provide effective and quality education?

L. Saborío: There shouldn't be a comma there. I don't have one on mine.

A. Newman: Well, you had commas in both places, right? After "operate"? And after "agenda"? And what I was wondering is – I mean it works without and it works with – the meaning is slightly different. "nor meet the Illinois public agenda to provide effective and quality education for all people." Is that what you're saying.

L. Saborío: Yeah. I'm pretty sure that's what

A. Newman: I think you meant. I don't think you want. You don't need the commas.

L. Saborío: You don't need a comma.

A. Newman: Yeah, I think it's stronger without.

L. Saborío: I didn't have one in. I don't know, it got in there by mistake.

K. Thu: My bad.

L. Saborío: Okay, we're good? Do we need clickers to vote or should we all just.

M. Haji-Sheikh: We can do it by voice.

L. Saborío: We can do it by

M. Haji-Sheikh: [inaudible]

L. Saborío: Yeah. Okay, so all those in favor of

M. Haji-Sheikh: Wait a second. I move to approve this by unanimous consent.

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

L. Saborío: That works too. All in favor.

Members: Aye.

M. Haji-Sheikh: It's approved.

L. Saborío: I hope you didn't have a question there, Mitch, because your hand was going up at the same time that we said, "aye." Okay, great. Okay, thank you, everyone. Then the next step is I will start sending this out tomorrow. And if you have suggestions for additional legislators that you would like to include, please email me.

[Approved budget resolution](#)

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Barbara Andree, Cathy Doederlein, Alex Gelman,
Mark Riley, Linda Saborío, Kendall Thu

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

L. Saborío: Okay, we need a motion to adjourn.

H. Bateni: So moved.

L. Saborío: Before you all leave. And a second? Thank you, Becqui.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.