

TRANSCRIPT

FACULTY SENATE

**Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Baker, Bateni, Bishop, Boughton, Bujarski, Carlson, J. Chen, Chitwood, Chmaissem, Chomentowski, Chung, Creed, Crowley, Duffin, Glatz, Grund, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hanna, Hathaway, Hunt, Irwin, Jaekel, Johnson, Johnston-Rodriguez, Lampi, Lukaszuk, Luo, Maddali, McHone-Chase, Millhorn, Millis, Montana, Mooney, Moraga, Nejd, Newman, Novak, Plum, Powell, Ryu, Saborío, Schraufnagel, Shi, Siegesmund, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Song, Staikidis, Than, Thu, Whedbee

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Beamer, Briscoe, G. Chen, Fredericks, Guo, Konen, Krmeneč, Li, Liu, Mogren, Naples, Patro, Penrod, Rheineck, Riley, Rodgers, Schatteman, Scherer, Stephen, Surjadi, Zheng

OTHERS PRESENT: Andree, Barr, Bryan, Clemens, Doederlein, Groza, Klaper, McCord, Nicholson, Torres, Wang, Wesener Michael

OTHERS ABSENT: Click, Gelman, Kortegast, Falkoff

I. CALL TO ORDER

L. Saborío: Good afternoon, everyone. If you haven't noticed, we do have cookies out there with the refreshments today, just as a small way of saying thank you for serving this past year as a faculty senator. We have a very long agenda today, so let's go ahead and get started.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

L. Saborío: Can I get a motion to adopt the agenda, please?

J. Novak: So moved.

L. Saborío: Thank you, John. And a second? The second would be **Kryssi [Staikidis]**. Any discussion regarding the agenda? All in favor of adoption of the agenda, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Any opposed? Abstention? No? Okay.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 28, 2018 MINUTES

L. Saborío: On to the next item, approval of the March 28, 2018 minutes. Can I get a motion, please? Oh, we've got **George [Slotsve]**. And a second would be, okay, thank you, **Sarah [McHone-Chase]**. Any changes, corrections, suggestions to the minutes? If not, all in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Any opposed? Abstain? Okay.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

L. Saborío: President's Announcements – so today I just have two items that I wanted to discuss with you very briefly. And the first actually is a guest we have here, Alan Clemens, and he would like to talk with you about his presidential commission. Alan, go right ahead.

A. Clemens: Thank you. I don't typically use a mic, but I have little voice left. Thank you for giving me just a couple of minutes to speak to you. I know your agenda's tight. I'm here representing the Presidential Commission on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity. As many of you, or all of you are aware, there are five presidential commissions providing counsel to the President's Office regarding the institutional conditions within the Huskie community and the way that that impacts, in this case, five specific communities that are a part of the greater Huskie pack.

As a part of the natural ebb and flow of membership cycles, as PCSOGI looks at its 2018-19 commission roster, we find that we're in a down-cycle for faculty participation. And so I came to ask you to pass on to your constituencies a polite request for any interested parties. Without faculty representation on the commission, we suffer both from a diminished ability to understand what's happening in the classroom and as a part of the academic environment. And we also lose a potential connection to the rich research bases that many of you bring that could enhance the work of the commission and reflect on the quality of that counsel that we're able to provide the President's Office.

I know your agenda doesn't allow much, if any, time for me to respond to any questions, but I do know we have – I see Katy Jaekel out in the crowd and Sarah Klaper and others, that are familiar with the working of the commission. I'd be happy to answer any questions directed to me. But I just hope that you might take back to your constituencies a request that, as they sow the seeds of their involvement across campus for the 18-19 faculty involvement year, that they consider reaching out and joining PCSOGI.

L. Saborío: Thank you, Alan. And please feel free to email Alan. And once again, thank you for coming.

One other announcement I have, and this is just to close the loop on our discussion regarding faculty requiring the use of their own authored textbooks in courses. Yes, you can use your own authored textbooks in courses, but any revenues or royalties from the use of those textbooks or the

purchase of those textbooks must be donated. Because it is considered a conflict of interest. The policy on the conflict of interest is in the APPM, Section I, Item 10. In regard to the royalties and revenues, you can ask that they be donated through the Foundation. And you can contact the Foundation to set up an account with them. And this includes chargebacks and revenue from course packs, textbooks and any other miscellaneous charges that you might impose on your students in their course.

If there are any questions, feel free to contact me. Or another really good resource person regarding the conflict of interest policy is Murali [Krishnamurthi]. Okay, closing the loop on that.

V. EXECUTIVE SESSION

If there are no questions, let's move on to the executive session. We have to go into executive session, so I need a motion and a second, and then we're going to vote. Can I get a motion to go into executive session. Thank you, **Kendall [Thu]**. You're awfully quiet, just the hand. And a second.

J. Novak: Second.

L. Saborío: All right. Yes, we need to leave. So, all in favor of going into executive session, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Thank you. We are now in executive session.

- A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council, Linda Saborío – Scot Schraufnagel
- B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor, Sarah McHone-Chase – John Novak

G. Slotsve: I now move that we leave executive session. I need a second.

Unidentified: Second.

G. Slotsve: Thank you. And those in favor of leaving executive session, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Slotsve: Thank you.

G. Slotsve: Before we return to the rest of the session, I would just, on behalf of Faculty Senate, like to present Linda with a gift thanking her for her service provided this year as president of the Faculty Senate. There are large [inaudible] and thank you very much for undertaking the job and it's been a pleasure working with you this year [applause].

L. Saborío: Thank you, that's really appreciated, thank you. Is that why you're all so quiet? Thank you, I appreciate it. Do you want me to open it right now, or can I wait? I need to open it right now? Okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: And remember, she's not going to be in faculty university governance next year, so this is it.

L. Saborío: I'm not on any committee next year. Oh this is really nice, thank you, wow, this is beautiful. Isn't that beautiful? Thank you! [applause] That was very nice, I'm overwhelmed, thank you. Was not expecting anything.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

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

L. Saborío: Okay so let's move on, you know me, I like to stick with my schedule, keep the meeting moving. So we do have one item on our consent agenda. It's to approve the list of faculty candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the university. It's on pages 4 and 5 of your agenda. And it does look like we have a few seats that still need to be filled. So if you're interested, please contact Pat or the dean of your college. So can I get a motion to approve the consent agenda?

T. Arado: So moved.

L. Saborío: So moved, Therese. And a second? **John [Novak].** Any – well it's consent agenda, so there's no discussion. All in favor of approving the consent agenda, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Any opposed? Or abstain? No? Okay.

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: Okay, Reports From Standing Committees – this takes us to Item VII. D., Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. And we have Keith Millis here who is going to help run us through three different elections here. So go ahead, Keith, the microphone is all yours.

1. Nomination of the 2018-19 Executive Secretary of University Council, who shall also serve as President of Faculty Senate per NIU Bylaws [Article 14.5](#) – Page 6
 - a. [Therese Arado](#) – Page 7
 - b. [Michael Haji-Sheikh](#) – Pages 8-9

K. Millis: Can you hear me without the microphone? Well today we'll be selecting our next Faculty Senate president and University Council executive secretary. So we have two candidates, Therese and Michael. And their letters of acceptance were included in the March agenda packets and again are included in today's agenda packet. So we will be using our clickers. So, if you don't have a clicker, please get one now.

L. Saborío: Can you just slow down a little. She's having trouble – not quite ready yet with the clickers.

K. Millis: Yes. We'll tell you when to vote and how to vote. Okay, when we're ready, you'll be clicking 1 or A for Therese Arado – you see it up there – 2 or B for Michael, and C for abstain. And polling is open.

L. Saborío: Make sure you get the smiley face, right?

K. Millis: Has everyone voted? All right, well, let's close the poll.

M. Haji-Sheikh: You're stuck with it.

L. Saborío: The winner is

K. Millis: The winner is A for Therese. [applause]

1/A-Therese Arado – 38 votes

2/B-Michael Haji-Sheikh – 10 votes

3/C-Abstain – 0 votes

L. Saborío: Therese, would you like to say a few words? You don't have to.

T. Arado: Thank you everybody.

L. Saborío: That's basically what I said too.

2. Election of University Council Personnel Committee representatives for terms to begin in fall 2018. Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting. Voting will be by college; EDU, EET, HHS, LAS, and VPA have vacancies to fill this year. Votes will be counted following the meeting and newly-elected UCPC members will be notified – walk-in

K. Millis: Okay, our next item of business is to elect our UCPC representatives for terms to begin in the fall. Now when I call your college name, please raise your hand and keep it raised until you've received a ballot. Complete your ballot and leave it at your place. Ballots will be collected and tallied after the meeting.

So please raise your hand if you're in the College of Education. The next college is College of Engineering and Engineering Technology.

Unidentified: Does the [University] Council vote on those or is it just Faculty Senate?

K. Millis: They all vote.

L. Saborío: You all vote, yes, because the UC members, you are voting members of Faculty Senate.

M. Haji-Sheikh: [inaudible]

L. Saborío: Yeah, you're good.

K. Millis: College of Health and Human Sciences, please raise your hand. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Please raise your hand if you're in the College of Visual and Performing Arts. Okay, I think we're good there.

3. Committees of the University 2018-19 – Election of candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate. Ballot packets will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting. Votes will be counted following the meeting and those running will be notified of the outcome – walk-in

K. Millis: Our final item of business is to elect faculty members who are running to serve on various committees of the university. Everyone should have a ballot packet at their place. Please complete the packet only if you are a voting member of the Faculty Senate, and leave it at your place. Packets will be collected and tallied after the end of the meeting.

L. Saborío: Has everyone had a chance to vote? I think we're still voting, or have you all finished? Another minute? No, we have some people who are still voting.

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

L. Saborío: Okay, we're going to continue with our reports, and Sarah McHone-Chase is up next for Resources, Space and Budget.

S. McHone-Chase: Thank you. Our next meeting is a week from this Friday, so I can't remember, is it May 4? Okay. And we will have the president and the provost as guests. And I mention this because, if anyone wanted to submit questions for them to answer during RSB, I think our deadline for questions is tomorrow. And you could send those questions directly to me or to Pat Erickson. And that would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

L. Saborío: Great.

VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

L. Saborío: Okay, Reports From Advisory Committees. I do have a report, the FAC to IBHE. It's not a written report this month. I decided to do an oral report, because we just had our meeting last Friday down at Eastern Illinois University. For the March meeting, though, which was at Trinity International University over in Chicago, the IBHE executive director, Al Bowman, joined us. And he explained that the recent change in the quarterly board lunches is to allow the board members to have more interaction. And then perhaps he suggested every other lunch meeting could include a constituency group. Bowman's goal with legislators is to avoid another budget crisis and to stop the declines in appropriations, thereby, reducing the pressure to raise tuition rates. The board approved a modest two percent increase in requested funding, and there was some debate as to whether that was too low. Another request was for \$100 million increase in MAP funding, and the goal there is to increase that amount over time to cover 90 percent of eligible students, which would be nice. He mentioned that there is an idea floating around to create a merit scholarship program for students in the top ten percent of their class, and they are working with ISAC on a proposal, which would also be very nice.

For the April meeting, like I said, we met in Eastern Illinois University. I'd never been there before. It's really in the middle of nowhere isn't it. The president and provost of EIU – sorry EIU fans, and there are a lot of alums that are from EIU, sorry – talked about falling enrollment numbers at EIU. They went from 12,000 to a little over 7,000 students. That's a huge drop. And that was an impact of the budget impasse. The new president said that he started the first day of the budget impasse. It was like, welcome to EIU. During the crisis they put together, it's called a visualization project, which is similar to Program Prioritization, but they just didn't prioritize their programs, they talked about how to better collaborate. The project includes new college alignment, a new college – the Health and Human Services, two new schools, a sharper mission and student success restructuring, as well as other items.

What are you all looking at? Oh, okay.

After lunch, caucus chairs reported to the committee. Some items we discussed – and you’re looking at one of them overhead here – the importance of a liberal arts education. We’re continuing our discussion about how to address that. The religious exemption bill, which you’re looking at up here, and the three-year teacher prep program. Yes, some concerns regarding the three-year teacher prep degree were: how to complete 120 credit hours in three years, plus the requirements for teacher education; the lack of financial aid in the summer; where does student teaching fit in; what gets cut if hours are reduced; how will this affect quality and student success; and, if enrollment drops, how would this affect performance-based funding. A lot of questions there for the three-year prep program. I know, impossible.

The WIU representative from Western, oh boy, you talk about, outlined a situation at his institution. There was a faculty vote of no confidence in the administration, the entire administration apparently, not just the president. And the vote of union members to authorize a strike due to lack of agreement with a contract. They apparently took a three percent cut in their salary in order to avoid furloughs, and administration is prepared to offer then one percent back. So they’re considering a strike. What can I say, right?

For our next meeting in May, we plan to lobby in Springfield on Thursday before our Friday meeting using the Make Illinois Great Again Through Funding Higher Education info-graphic document. [laughter] I know. We have to talk about that title, right, because you all get it as somewhat cynical, but I’m concerned that some Democrats might look at it like Republican agenda and just toss it. Make Illinois Great Again – what is this? We might have to come up with a different title.

Any questions for me regarding the last two meetings? I’m enjoying these meetings. Can you tell? Get to meet people from around the state and get to hear their problems and you go, wow, it’s not that bad where I am.

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

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 2.1](#),
Officers of the Faculty Senate – Page 10

SECOND READING/ACTION

L. Saborío: Okay, let’s move on then to Unfinished Business. We have the second reading today for the proposed amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 2.1. Can I get a motion and a second, and then we can discuss this if there’s any discussion. Motion and second first. Thank you, **Rebecca [Hunt]**. And a second? Nobody wants to second it? Thanks, **John [Novak]**. Okay, any discussion regarding this proposed amendment?

This is in the ESP [executive secretary of University Council/president of Faculty Senate] timeline. I know there was some concern regarding the nomination letters, and we do have a deadline already

established in-house for submitting letters. And nomination letters will be provided to Faculty Senate members one week before elections. So there shouldn't be any concern there about receiving the nomination letters on time. Anything else? I know, Kendall, you presented this last time. Okay, so then we need to vote. Clickers or no? Should we use clickers? We should use clickers. Okay, we're going to use clickers for this, so let's give Pat a moment to set up the system for us.

Okay, so we have 1-Yes in favor of the amendment, 2-No, and 3-Abstain. And if you push 4, you're just not here. 1-Yes, 2-No, 3-Abstain. Okay, has everybody had a chance to vote. Okay.

1/A-Yes – 43 votes

2/B-No – 2 votes

3C-Abstain – 1 vote

L. Saborío: Okay, so the amendment passes. So thank you.

X. NEW BUSINESS

- A. [Proposed resolution](#) supporting March For Our Lives – Pages 11-12
Christine Wang, Speaker of the Student Senate

L. Saborío: Okay, now we're going to move on to New Business. And Christine Wang is here to talk with us about a proposed resolution supporting March For Our Lives. It's on pages 11 and 12 of your packet there if you want to take a look at it. And Christine, if you could grab a microphone, okay.

C. Wang: Hello everyone. I just want to present this resolution – you guys haven't read it yet. It's a pretty strongly worded resolution that supports the March For Our Lives that happened on, I believe, March 21. Considering the events that took place on our own campus, I believe that it is appropriate for us to support the students who are opposing the work that the – at least the lack of work that is being done to correct this problem. And this was actually brought forth by Kelsey Barr, who is currently a student. And I'm going to hand it over to her to talk a little bit more about it.

K. Barr: Once again, my name is Kelsey Barr, a junior here on campus. I just kind of want to briefly introduce myself. I was actually here in 2009 as an incoming freshman the immediate year after the shooting. And I just want to emphasize how much I remember, how our campus felt at that time. I also want to emphasize how well NIU did with making sure that NIU remains a safe place and a place that students want to come and attend school. And honestly, that's why I'm back. I thought that the way that NIU handled the shooting was dealt with such class. And they just did such a wonderful job. And I love NIU and I love my school.

Now the reason why – or what prompted this resolution, for me, was I wanted to just show some solidarity with these students who were marching for their lives, thus the name of the resolution. Now the idea is to stand in solidarity, not to combat anyone's second amendment right. The idea is just for us to have some common ground gun laws, rather than, if you will, common sense gun laws. So in that way, the idea is that people who don't want to carry weapons feel safe. And those who do, still feel that their rights are not being impeded upon.

So that's what I'm hoping that NIU will back us for and the idea of providing a safe place for all students to go to school. And in many respects, I feel personally that NIU has a little bit of a duty to the rest of the nation to stand and to offer, if you will, a "adult" voice, considering some of our legislators have stated that these kids who are, these "kids" who are marching are just that, and their opinions aren't valid, and they don't know what they're talking about. So I feel that maybe if we can lend a "adult" voice to this discussion, then maybe the legislators who aren't listening would take an opportunity to listen.

And once again, thank you so much for hearing me out today.

C. Wang: So I just wanted to provide a little bit of background on what actions have already been taken on this resolution. The Student Association Senate passed this with a nearly unanimous vote with only one abstention. And this was fully supported by our students. This is something that our president of the Student Association also supports, and our president-elect. I think this is something that the students want to bring forward. And, like Kelsey said, we want to bring an "adult" voice and that we have this duty to set an example to other institutions because of the events that happened on our own campus.

So if there are any questions, we'd be happy to take them now.

L. Saborío: You're both very articulate young individuals, right? Very articulate, thank you for that. Any questions regarding the resolution? We need to do a motion and a second first before we actually have a discussion about this. Can I get a motion for the resolution. Okay, thanks, **Mitch [Irwin]**. And a second? Okay, **Kendall [Thu]**. Any discussion, questions for them? All right, should we move to vote then? All in favor of accepting or endorsing the proposed resolution supporting March For Our Lives, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Any opposed? Abstentions?

Unidentified: [inaudible]

L. Saborío: Are we voting up there? Vote 1 for aye; 2 for no; 3 to abstain, I guess then. Everybody's looking at the screen above me, I should have realized there was something going on above me. That's okay, we'll just do it again. We started out with 48, we went to 47, now 46. Someone did not vote, that's okay, we're going to close it.

1/A-Yes – 43 votes

2/B-No – 2 votes

3/C-Abstain – 1 vote

L. Saborío: Congratulations, Christine and Kelsey. Thank you for coming today. [applause]

XI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. [Recognition](#) of faculty members who have completed their terms – Page 13

L. Saborío: Let's move on to Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. A. is recognition of faculty members who have completed their terms, on page 13 of your packet. And I just wanted to say thank you for your time, your dedication and your input. Please continue to participate in shared governance so that our voice is heard as faculty. And we do need your participation for shared governance to succeed. So if you're not serving on a committee, other than me – I think I'm allowed a year off – please consider serving on a committee.

- B. Open Q&A Session
Chris McCord, Executive Vice President and Provost

L. Saborío: Shall we move on? You ready? All right. So for our Q&A session today, we have our Acting Vice President and Provost McCord is here to answer any questions you might have for him. He has agreed to attend Faculty Senate once in the fall and once in the spring per the president's suggestion. And so we could just go ahead an open this up. It's a Q&A session for you all if you have questions about enrollment, facilities.

I have one question to start us off. So how would collective bargaining affect any attempt to address salary inequities among faculty right now?

C. McCord: Great questions and, like so many things, as we move into collective bargaining for the first time, there's a lot of new territory we're exploring. There is a part of which I can say, let's frame it this way: There are two aspects, at least. Clearly the salary study points to issues that are absolutely natural to be addressed within the collective bargaining, and I'm quite sure that issues of inversion/compression are absolutely appropriate and legitimate topics to bring to the bargaining table and to work through collective bargaining. So that pathway very clearly exists, and we certainly expect the Faculty Salary Study, which was just conducted, to inform, hopefully in an objective way that the parties can make shared use of, to look at that issue and arrive at what we can do about it. I will note that in the agreement that we earnestly hope will be ratified by AFSCME and by the Board of Trustees, the long-standing negotiations we've been working on there.

There's, I can say, a cognate component of salary inequities that's being addressed through that collective bargaining unit, and we look to very serious discussion at the bargaining table. I can't, of course, at this point articulate what the university's position would be. Certainly expect that will be very appropriate to be part of the collective bargaining.

The collective bargaining process, as I understand it, allows for maintenance of existing practice and so we are looking very carefully at what response to the Faculty Salary Study can be legitimately explored while we're still in sort of that maintenance of practice mode. But large scale adjustments, large scale response to the issues raised there clearly will have to come through the bargaining agreement, will have to be negotiated at the table.

L. Saborío: Thank you. Any other questions? Okay, please take a microphone.

D. Boughton: I have a question. It's a question about budget. Last week we received notice that there was a reorganization in the School of Art, and three staff people were laid off, two Civil Service and one position is the only kind of position that there is in the university. The question I have is whether other units in the university have been affected by this kind of action, and can we look forward to further action of this kind in the current budget situation we find ourselves in.

C. McCord: So, of course, closing the budget gap, every division of the university had a budget gap target assigned to it. Every division had to develop its own approach for how it would allocate that gap within the division. And so every division had to make choices about what actions it would take, where would it try to enhance revenue where it could. Where would it have to reduce expenses. Once that decision gets distributed down, for example, every college, every unit, every unit across the support units, had to make decisions about: Was it going to cut non-personnel expenses? Was it going to cut personnel expenses? Did it have opportunities to address personnel moves through leaving positions vacant? So the way it cascaded down to particular decisions about layoffs was very, very localized. It depended on the particular circumstances of each unit. So there are certainly other units – I don't have off the top of my head how widespread – I can certainly say the largest set of layoffs were tied to Holmes Student Center and were more driven by the transitions that are underway in the Holmes Student Center than by budget per se.

To the best of my understanding at this point – let me say that very carefully. To the best of my understanding at this point, we do not anticipate another cycle at this point of budget actions. And we, therefore, do not anticipate another cycle of layoffs as a potential part of it. The situation remains fluid. I cannot make an absolute promise that nothing further will happen for FY19. At this point, we are not looking for anything more.

L. Saborío: Any other questions for Acting Provost McCord? Please go ahead.

R. Grund: I understood the specific cuts made on a local level, etc. Just a quick question. Going back, Program Prioritization, is that still a roadmap, for example, division units being given certain percentages for making cuts across the university.

C. McCord: The specifics down at the most granular level are becoming – the signal, if you will, is becoming a bit attenuated over time. At the macro level, Program Prioritization certainly informed the decisions made as we made, for example, division-level assignment of budget responsibilities, looking at which divisions would be asked to contribute more, which would be asked to contribute less. As that filtered down from the division level down to the unit level, Program Prioritization certainly was a factor, but given the length of time that has occurred and the number of changes that have occurred since those reports were issued, it wasn't as strong a driver as it was say two years ago. Certainly – and let me draw a distinction between kind of, if you will, the specific recommendations about specific programs versus sort of, if you will, the criteria, the thought process. The criteria are still, I think, very much in our minds informing our thought process. The specific recommendations are, as I said, not gone, but a little more attenuated than they were a few years ago.

L. Saborío: Interesting. Okay, please go right ahead.

J. Song: I have two questions. First is the online initiative programs. And I was told there is a \$1 million allocated to the online program development. I would like to know how much of this portion of \$1 million is used to the development of the courses online. How much is used for the management, administrative positions? How much is for the marketing? Can you give an approximate proportion?

C. McCord: There is basically, none of it going, if you will, to overhead. None of it is being – let me say carefully what I mean by that. We’re working within the existing management structure. We have not created new administrative roles. We are reconfiguring existing administrative roles to have people manage this with more intention, but we’re not adding administrators in order to manage this. We’ve invested a significant amount in advertising. I’d say probably a third to a half of that available budget is going to advertising, because the sense was we have had a pretty soft visibility of our online programs in the market. We’ve not been very present. And so we’ve put a significant investment into advertising our existing programs. The next largest amount of funding is going towards program development, both developing new programs to bring online and refurbishing existing programs and existing courses that had been on the books, but have perhaps not been as solidly presented as they might be. So that’s been the next largest investment has been in course development and course delivery. And we are exploring one piece that we feel we can probably do best by contracting out rather than doing it ourselves, is the lead generation, lead development. When somebody sees a piece of advertisement and wants to respond, that piece of the cycle is critically important. Timeliness in that piece of the cycle is critically important. I was in a meeting this morning where I was told the industry standard for response time is three minutes from the time that somebody clicks a button on a web form to say, “I want more information,” until the time that somebody reaches back to them, three minutes. We are not, as an institution, well-positioned to do that. So we’re looking at contracting that piece out. We believe that that piece, there are companies out there that do this, that do it well. And we believe that we will be far better use of our resources to hire that out than to try to staff it up internally. So those are the big buckets that our funding is going towards.

J. Song: And related with that, I feel we have spent a lot of money in consultant outside and those who are like marketing. I don’t know how it’s a cost effect, how effective is that to spend that money on the marketing or on the consultant outside, because we losing the faculties so the real people who develop in the courses, the number is dropping. So when you have recruited some people here, but they may be disappointed at number of courses we can offer because of lack of faculty member. And I feel the biggest problem here is that administrative bloating in the salary we have just finished the survey of the Faculty Salary [Study], but that’s only the internal comparison, you know, different races or female versus male. We haven’t looked at the cross, you know, compare with the other universities. What is the salary compare with other universities in terms of the faculty, in term of the administrative salaries. And I have recognized from the IBHE the salary database for the last seven to ten years, the administrative position has increased, and also the salary and the compensation are very generous compared with the salary of the faculty member and also the number of faculty, which keep dropping. So if they are not proportionate in the number and you may say we are trying to reduce some higher position administrative salaries or the positions, but if number of faculty that is dropping is much, much faster than the number of administrative positions reduction. And if you look at compared with the student number, enrollment reduction, the [inaudible] is like destructive cycle I feel when we hike the student tuition there be less student that

can afford NIU and that the people who have the money, they prefer to go outside state, outside Illinois to get higher education. So when we have less students, the cost per student will increase. So right now in Illinois, we all have this similar problem. So the state funding per student has increased 70 percent more than the surrounding neighbor states, because loss of state funding is used to offset the high administrative salaries and their high compensations. So the only way to reduce or to stop this destructive cycle, is to try and cut the operational spending and also reduce the number of administrative positions, reduce the number of people who try to manage people or manage the programs. Consolidate some programs. As each department is losing the faculty, the rest of the people have to take more responsibilities. But our salary is not increasing for many years, so we are at the very bottom. That's why, compared with the nationwide university, so we are losing the faculty because they are not satisfied with the low pay here. And once they left, for example, Anthropology has only five faculty left here. And in our department also losing the faculty, because they get higher pay in other universities. They feel that they are not appreciated at NIU. And that position must [inaudible] we have the faculty left that position either lot of cases we don't get any replacement. The best chance is we hire just an instructor at the pity of the administration saying, "we give you an instructor" to replace this. So the instructor cannot maintain the higher teaching mission our university has. You know, we have a goal, right, student centered, teaching and [inaudible] research. But if we hire more and more instructors, we are losing the more tenured faculties, I don't know how long we can keep our original goal of our university mission.

L. Saborío: So that's a lot to unpack there, isn't it. Maybe if you could address the faculty attrition and morale and what plans administration has to address faculty morale and attrition, that would be a good place to start.

C. McCord: So I think we have to recognize that we have to break the declining enrollment cycle above all else. We have to break the declining enrollment cycle. Very, very few things will fix themselves if we don't. Many things will be able to be fixed if we do. The university, like many universities, has in fact, not increased tuition in the last several years as enrollments have declined. We have not tried to make up for fewer students by charging them more. We've held tuition largely flat for a number of years now. We have to. Our students cannot afford to see significant tuition increases. We know that, and so we know that, if we don't increase the number of students, we are not going to break the cycle here.

So we also recognize that there are some interesting opportunities for doing that. I was part of a team testifying before the higher education working group in the Illinois legislature earlier this year, and my apologies if I've already told this story and you've already heard it. We knew that one of the things we were going to be asked was: Who are we losing students to? So we looked up who did we lose students to? Student who are admitted to NIU, don't come to NIU, where do they go? It turns out we don't lose students to out of state. There are virtually no students who apply to NIU, are admitted to NIU and go out of state. That happens to other schools; it just basically doesn't happen to us. What we did find was that the schools you would name are sort of the obvious ones. Our leading schools we lose other students to are ISU, UIC, UIUC. But the single biggest place we lose students to is nowhere. Highly qualified students who are admitted to NIU who do not go to any other four-year institution, do not go to a two-year institution, they go nowhere. That's where we lose the most, the greatest number of our students to. That's a great opportunity. Now that we've identified that opportunity, we have to chase harder after it and identify well, what are the barriers

to recruiting those students? But I think this is an overly simplistic way of saying a complex thing, but I'll say it again. We have to break the cycle of declining enrollments. If we can do that, that begins to generate revenue. With revenue generation, we can do many things. We have to recognize as we look at that, that our students are not, necessarily, where they used to be. So one of the reasons, for example, we're making an investment in online courses right now is we recognize that many of our student opportunities lie with online students who don't want to come to NIU. We're also actively exploring opportunities for taking programs to, for example, community college campuses, offering degree completion programs there, connecting with students where they want to be, giving more focus on where students want to be than on where we wish they were.

So that is not a direct answer to what we're doing to address faculty morale, but, ultimately, I think it comes back to, if we don't address those issues, no other issue will be easily addressed. And I'm sorry, I know you touched on many points, and I realize I've only skimmed a few of them.

J. Song: But I know a lot of student who is not coming to NIU. They are going to outside, like Iowa or maybe like

C. McCord: Again, our data suggests that there are vanishingly few, we can actually track the students who we admit, we can actually track where they end up.

J. Song: A lot of high school student, they know they don't want to come to NIU, because of the higher tuition here compared with the other states, their tuition is much lower, much lower than ours. And we are kind of double our tuition over the last ten years almost.

C. McCord: But again, at the moment, for the last four or five years, we've held tuition flat.

J. Song: But we already raised it higher than the other states.

C. McCord: Understand, and so many states are, frankly, aggressively – I mean there are many states surrounding us whose enrollment plan hinges on recruiting students away from Illinois. Cost is a factor. Reputation is a factor. Convenience is a factor. I'll touch on another piece of what you mentioned. I understand the concern about: Are we spending money on advertising budgets? I believe I have this fact correct. ISU currently spends seven or eight times what we spend on advertising. We have not been aggressive for too many years. We counted on, oh, these are students in our back yard. They know us. We don't need to. When I arrived here, that was very clearly the affect across the university was, our potential students, our student pool knows us. Our community college partners know us. We've learned the hard way we cannot take any of those relationships for granted. I hear President Freeman say over and over again, relationships are resources. We're rebuilding our relationships with high schools. We're rebuilding our relationships with community colleges. And yes, we're going to have to spend money on things like advertising to get that message out and make a difference.

L. Saborío: Michael, do you have a question?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yes I have one.

L. Saborío: Okay, and then Hamid, okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I have a quick, I mean at RSB I asked this question about the possibility of using excess dorm capacity as a marketing tool, a direct marketing tool. In other words, a lot of people can get money for tuition and scholarships, but a lot of that doesn't translate to room and board. We have, how many rooms, I asked you if you knew how many rooms we had, I thought it was somewhere around 1,000 empty spaces? But you can figure out a minimum number of dollars it would take to maintain a student in that space and then go direct at them. For example, just throw out a number, SIUE is about \$18,000 to \$19,000. That's where my kid went so I know, so.

K. Wesener Michael: So I do not know off the top of my head, I'm not quite certain I can speak with all that certainty about the occupancy numbers off the top of my head. But I do want to talk a little bit about opportunities to use housing as a way to attract students to our institution. We do have implemented a program in working with Financial Aid and the Scholarship Office where we are taking select situations where we're able to provide housing scholarships to students to supplement their aid packages that makes NIU more attractive. So we have been doing that and have been collecting data on that so we can make some strategic and wise decisions about that. It's a little bit of a slippery slope, because the residence halls are auxiliary units on the campus. They're bond revenue units. They're responsible for debt service, so it's that balance of really utilizing your residence halls to be able to attract students, but by the same time, understanding that that work or those numbers have implications in the overall budget and revenue generation for the institution as a whole.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well I understand that that's where you talk about board more than room, because the food, obviously, pay labor for that and deal with profit margins and everything else.

K. Wesener Michael: Yep, we continue to look at programs that are innovative across all of those areas, housing, dining, any of the services that we have available and how we can enhance them to really make our institution attractive to students who might need those particular services or ways that we can supplement financial aid as well.

L. Saborío: Our students do like to eat, don't they?

M. Haji-Sheikh: I want one more pass and then I'll yield. What I was more talking about is not just for financial aid purposes. I was talking about an aggressive marketing campaign that says, "we have the lowest cost in the state schools," which we used to have. We used to be the highest quality, lowest cost university in the state. Okay, that's what I mean.

L. Saborío: Okay, one more. Go ahead, Hamid.

H. Bateni: [inaudible]

C. McCord: So first of all, within my 11 years here, we have not lowered admission standards. But the students that we detected, discovered, unearthed – I'm not quite sure what verb to use there – had high GPA, high ACT scores. So they were academically qualified. That was not the issue. So we have hypotheses, but they're hypotheses at this point. We hypothesize that these are first-

generation college students for whom the pathway to college is not simple or straightforward. And even though they're well qualified, they're admitted, do they get their FAFSA filled out in a timely fashion? Do they understand how to navigate the sometimes complex world of financial aid? Do they have families that really believe? We hear very compelling stories of some of our students who come to us basically saying, "I came here in spite of my friends and family who said it's a waste of time. Don't do it." And they've gone on to great success, and they're tremendously proud of themselves. But for that student who took that leap of faith and came, how many students are there who get talked out of it. We don't know. We've only just unearthed this phenomenon. It absolutely merits deeper dive to understand with more precision who are these students. Again, we know they're not going anywhere else, that's the whole point. But what's deterring them. Obviously, we hypothesize that finances have a lot to do with it as well.

L. Saborío: Okay.

J. Song: In addition to finances, I also feel the reputation of our university. If they know we are cutting our programs, laying off faculties, they may have the negative, you know.

C. McCord: But we're not laying off faculty. We're not cutting programs.

J. Song: But the faculty who is leaving, they are not being replaced.

C. McCord: Understand. But if I may say so, I think that's highly visible to us and very much of concern to us. I don't see evidence that the 17-, the 18-year old sees those issues at all. We see them.

J. Song: Maybe their parents see this.

C. McCord: I will suggest that those are not the issues that drive this, the students' choices. I think those are issues that are of very legitimate concern to us and that we need to do our best to address. But I don't believe those are the issues that attract or deter students from coming to us.

J. Song: Regarding the tuition, I want to see, let me compare with the other states like Iowa or Indiana. How can they keep their tuition much lower, like 50 percent of our level and still operating smoothly.

C. McCord: Well the most obvious hypothesis is that they have more reliable state funding than Illinois. But I don't think that easy of an excuse to simply say that that's all there is to it. I think that Illinois has been – again, many of these schools are able to operate, if you will, on volume, because once you have enough students, you can make things work differently. Certainly that's true in housing, right? One of the things I've learned having Student Affairs report to me this year is that there's a certain fraction of your students in the dorms that pay for the dorms. And everything after that is essentially profit. So you can, at certain points, the more students you can bring in, you can afford to bring them in at a lower per-student cost and still benefit.

J. Song: We used to have a lot of students here. Most of that tuition is paying for administrative cost.

C. McCord: No that's not true.

J. Song: Because the state funding divided by the student number enrolled is the highest here.

C. McCord: When we look at our ratio of instructional cost to administrative cost, we are below norm. That is, administrative cost as a fraction of instructional cost, we are below norms. Our administrative overhead is not higher than normal.

L. Saborío: Okay, I'm going to interrupt here, if you don't mind, and kind of bring this back to the discussion here. I know you have a lot of questions. Questions are great.

J. Song: Yeah, [inaudible] like a survey, you know, to compare nationwide.

L. Saborío: So we're going to move on, and we're going to ask Kelly to please go ahead and give us an update on Student Affairs. And then if there's time at the end, we would definitely be open to more questions. How does that sound?

C. Student Affairs update
Kelly Wesener Michael, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs

L. Saborío: Okay, so let's move along with the agenda, please.

K. Wesener Michael: So thank you for giving me a little bit of time this afternoon to talk a little bit about Student Affairs and some of the things that are going on in our campus community with our students and how we've been listening to them and working with them and trying to create some positive change.

Over the past academic year, we've certainly heard some themes – some of that coming loudly from students in terms of some concerns that they're sharing; also some of our observations of students' behaviors; and some things that we've just learned throughout the year as we've been talking with our students about the things that we can do to make their student experience better.

Some of those themes that we've unearthed over time is that we've really discovered there's a public health concern on our campus regarding the culture of troubling alcohol use. This is not necessarily a new theme on college campuses and certainly the landscape that we've seen, in particular in fraternity and sorority life, Greek life, nationally, in all of the incidents that we've seen over the past year, we know that this is something in higher education that we really need to deal with, and it certainly is a theme on our campus as well.

We also need to figure out what is the true balance of policies that insure safety but also work with students in terms of privacy and their space. And what does that mean for us? And how do we strike that balance in a way that we can make sure that we're working toward the safety of our students, but also honoring privacy.

We've also heard about fairness and transparency, particularly with the student conduct process,

and are going to be working toward some of those pieces that I'll talk about in a moment. And also there seems to be a theme of distrust and suspicion of college administrations, and that's a national theme. In my conversations with colleagues who have positions like me in the nation, there is this ongoing theme of student distrust of administration as a whole. Specifically on our campus, we've heard a lot about the student conduct process and how we can make sure that that's a transparent process and build some trust back in to that.

As we've unearthed these themes and heard them, I want to talk a little bit about some of the action steps that we've taken to address these. A lot of these are in process that we've begun, and most of them will continue on into the fall.

Some of those things that you might have been hearing about specifically: We had Alpha Sigma Alpha Sorority as well as Phi Kappa Theta Fraternity who were going through the conduct process and were facing three-year suspensions. We know that that's a real detriment to some of those Greek organizations, and so we've been trying to work creatively and look at ways that we can work with those organizations to have them do some self-reflection, get back to their values and become a healthy, contributing organization in the Greek community. We've been using an alternative sanction process to really try and take a look at that. We're well on our way with the sorority in that, and we're working to finalize out the fraternity, but we feel like there are ways that we can help those organizations re-shape the way that they approach the membership, the activities in the organizations and how they can contribute and really be leaders in the Greek community. It's innovative, and it's different from what we've done in the past, but as we see the national landscape, we feel a call to try to do some things that are going to really help build Greek communities in different ways as we see nationally, there continues to be struggle.

With that, our Interfraternity Council has also chosen to do some different level of self-regulation. They've taken a time-out and really want to step back and look at what IFC is on our campus and Interfraternity Council are the traditional fraternity, the student organization that governs traditional fraternities on campus. They're in the process of a culture renewal plan where they can also take some opportunities to do a different level of accountability toward one another and really take a look at what a healthy culture is within the fraternity life specifically.

We've been working hard with some of the reactions and information that we've had with the Maxient system on campus, which is our student conduct database. We have a task force, or a small working group, that is taking a look at what is the best way to move forward, to have transparent procedures and policies within that system to make sure that we're letting students know about the policies and procedures that we have with that database. The groups that are represented in that particular working group are Athletics, Undergraduate Studies, Student Conduct and Academic Diversity, Equity & Inclusion. And we'll be working with Student Association to also get some input into that. And we're hoping to have that project completed by fall so that, as students return, we can be very clear about the use of that database and so that we can continue the conversation in a constructive way moving forward and be clear about that.

One of the other pieces that we are doing is we are beginning to do a review of the student conduct process, in particularly in regard to student organizations. We've heard that as a theme again, and we're looking to do that. Student Conduct actually has an advisory board that is embedded in the

governance process, so it has representation across all the different governing bodies, as well as lots of student representation. We're charging that group to take a look at some specific things with student organizations, policies and procedures, and looking to make recommendations. Also going to allow them to bring in some expert guidance from outside so that we have an opportunity to make sure that we're being recognized in standard practice and what's happening in our nation in terms of the world of conduct and making sure that we're adhering to what is best practice in the evolving area of conduct on college campuses.

We're excited about that work. We are about to kick off that group; and, hopefully, by the end of coming fall semester we'll have recommendations moving forward about how to make positive change. We're happy that that's embedded in the governance process, and there's really an opportunity to have all voices at the table with that particular project.

There are two particular initiatives with the city [of DeKalb] that I think are really important for our campus community. Specific to the Greeks, and we've talked a lot about that particular community in this, there is a state ordinance that requires that Greek structures that house Greek organizations have to have sprinklers in them, and they have to have the sprinklers installed by January of 2019. This particular law has been in place for a very long time, but we have had landlords who have been reluctant to respond to that. So the city is working with landlords to make sure that they're well aware of these ordinances and working to help them financially support those infrastructure upgrades. And we're working with our students to make sure that they're in conversation with their property owners to know what the status of that is so they can be proactive and make some good decisions about the housing situation. And we also have some support for them moving forward if by chance there are some problems or issues with landlords, we do have, the students have Students Legal on campus and some lawyers to help them navigate leases and things like that. So we're working with the city to make sure that we're doing a holistic approach to really educating students and landlords and making sure that students have opportunities to make good choices about where they're living, especially coming into the fall.

We also have the Annie Glidden North project, which is really taking a look at the Annie Glidden north corridor. A lot of the are where Greek Row, or our Greek houses, are situated, and really taking a look at what are ways that we can renew those neighborhoods, bring a different level of vitality back. What are some business and support service development that we can do. And we're really supporting the city as they've brought in consultants to work with the community, including our students, because a lot of students live in that area, to really figure out what is the best path forward to revitalize that community as a whole. We know that that's critical for NIU being on the cusp of our campus, and we want our students, as well as that community as a whole, to be a great place to live, to contribute to our community and to really be a fantastic place right on the edge of our campus. And we're committed to, with the city, supporting them as they're working with consultants to figure out what is the best plan forward to revitalize that community.

So those are a number of the things that we've been working on over the past year that I think, not only have been highlighted in a lot of the different conversations across campus, but we also want to make sure that you know about these things as we're trying to really make the student experience outstanding here at NIU.

L. Saborío: Thank you very much. Okay, did you have a question for Kelly?

J. Novak: [inaudible]

K. Wesener Michael: That's a great question. Obviously, the mental health of our students and students across the nation is on the radar for everybody who sits in this seat like mine, but also all of us who work with students, because we know that this is a significant concern. And not only do we worry about the students, but the disruption to the community as a whole. As an institution, we are committed to increasing our resources in our counseling services. That was part of the Program Prioritization efforts, and we're continuing to try and increase those resources. It isn't as easy as one would think. You could have even institutions that have lots of resources and vacancies in their counseling centers, getting staffed to hiring staff and their availability can sometimes be a challenge. And psychiatric care specifically on college campuses and in our community as a whole is really restrictive. And so we struggle with trying to find the resources, not only in terms of having the money to hire staff, but also what are the staff available who are able and willing to come into our community and provide those services. We have a shortage in DeKalb County as a whole. There is a mental health board that meets regularly to try and address these issues, so we're not only as an institution trying to figure out what are the best mental health resources for our students, but also as a greater community as a whole. In terms of our ratios of the amount of counselors to our students, we are pretty average. We have some accreditations that we have in our counseling center that require some of those ratios so we're on board with that. Our wait list, because we have one, as probably most-to-all institutions do, our wait list times are actually shorter than the national averages. They're not what we would hope, because we wouldn't want them at all, but given the volume that most institutions are dealing with in terms of students who are struggling, our wait list is lower than the national average. We also have multiple mental health opportunities on campus as we have sites in the academic units as well as the counseling center. And we really try and refer students to spaces that are available on campus that might not be in the counseling center, but are also available. And also use referral into the city. It is nearly impossible for any institution of higher education to provide long-term mental health care to the students in need, because the needs keeps evolving. So to do long-term care is something that most institutions can't provide. So there is some level of a number of visits, and then they make referrals. And that's not an, "oh, you're done here, move on." It's a transition to you to resources within your community and that might be in the summer, let's figure out what's the best counselor that might be available in your hometown. It might be in the middle of the semester – where are you living? How can we find that? That's a pass-off to another resource, and we work with students to do that, because we simply can't, no institution can absorb that overall volume.

J. Novak: Thank you very much.

M. Haji-Sheikh: A simple, short question.

L. Saborío: Okay. I'm going to trust you on this, that it's simple and short, because we're losing people.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well, it's not that simple, but it's short. I would like to see as member also of University Council, see that the student conduct and Student Affairs rules be ratified at the

University Council level, because I think that needs to be something that is almost a bylaws-level rule, because it has such impact the students.

K. Wesener Michael: Thank you, we'll take that into consideration.

L. Saborío: Something to think about, but I do see it as bringing it before University Council – sorry I'll be very brief – and introducing something that we may not exactly specialize in to a group that would be asked to vote on, you know.

M. Haji-Sheikh: [inaudible]

D. Legislative update
Matt Streb, Chief of Staff to the President and Liaison to the Board of Trustees

L. Saborío: So let's move on. Matt, are you back there? Matt's here to give us a legislative update. He has promised to be brief. And he's going to be even briefer.

M. Streb: I mean I could be like three sentences brief if you want me to be. Good afternoon. So two things Linda asked me to give you an update on. One, what is the status for the budget? And two, what is the status with Rose-Brady.

In regard to the budget, it's really important to note that, although the legislature has been in session since January and they will recess on May 31, they don't usually do much budget work until right about now. So there are still a lot of things that are still in flux, a lot of things that are in play. I do think we have some positive news, though, and that is people want a budget and I think more importantly, people believe that there's going to be a budget. And there are reasons to believe that there will be a budget. First of all, our legislators do not want to go back to what they went through last year. They do not want to go back to 700 days without a budget. They're concerned about the effects that it will have on the bond agency ratings and the accreditation of higher education, universities, that type of thing. It's an election year, and in an election year, you don't want to run for reelection if you don't have a budget. And also I think, if you look at the voting that went on last year with the budget, there were 15 Republicans in the House side and one Republican on the Senate side that voted for the budget and the tax increase. Ten Republicans on the House side, one Republican on the Senate side voted to override Governor Rauner's veto. Most of those people are not running for reelection, and most of those people that we've talked to said that their number one goal is to actually have a budget this year. And so they are likely to sit there. There may be some sort of a weird kind of agreement again, but I think those things are positive.

The negative, of course, is this is Illinois. I would have never expected that we would have gone 700-plus days without a budget. We are going to have potentially the most expensive statewide race, not just in Illinois, in the country in history. And you have two leaders, Governor Rauner and Speaker Madigan who, one, don't trust each other; two, don't like each other, and are not willing to give either one any sort of a victory. And so because you had that dynamic, that becomes a little nerve-wracking.

Very quickly, Governor Rauner, some positive news in a sense. Governor Rauner, when he proposed his budget, had NIU at \$81.9 million, which was what we were given in fiscal '18. That's about a \$10 million cut from where we were in fiscal '15 or fiscal '17, depending on what you want to talk about. The good news about that, though, is that in the past, we've been fighting with the governor. He's been saying we're coming out with 25-30 percent cut out of the gate, right? If we do get a budget, I would be surprised if we go below that \$81.9 million. We as an institution put a request in for \$91 million, which is our fiscal '15 amount. I will tell you that we're not going to get \$91 million. We thought it was important to fight for \$91 million. But if I think, if there is a budget, we probably won't go below \$81.9 million.

The other thing that Governor Rauner put forward that gives people a lot of angst is he wants to start seeing healthcare and pension costs shift to the universities. He proposed that over the next four years, essentially the universities would pick up 100 percent of the healthcare and the pension costs. For NIU, that would be \$180 million, which is double the amount of our entire state aid. That is not going anywhere right now. I can tell you that it's amazing – he's found bi-partisanship. Democrats and Republicans all are in opposition to the plan. There's been no legislation that is filed. It's not going to happen now. It may happen in the future, not necessarily what Governor Rauner's proposal is, but I think we have to be fully prepared that healthcare costs and pension costs are going to be shifted in some form, in some fashion, to the university at some time.

The last thing I'll say about the budget is that if we do get a budget, it's likely to be just like the budget we had before and kick the can down the road budget. It's not going to address the structural problems with the state of Illinois budget. That may be good for NIU. That probably isn't good for the state of Illinois. And so that's kind of where we are on the budget.

The other thing you wanted me to mention very quickly is Rose-Brady, right? And so in a nutshell, Rose-Brady in its current form is not going anywhere. It's stuck in committee. It's not likely to move anywhere. But, and this shows you how quickly things are going on in Springfield right now. Just yesterday I was talking about Rose-Brady, and we were talking about certain aspects of Rose-Brady that I said may actually be pulled out and could be considered on their own as stand-alone bills. And what we're hearing is that some of that will happen. Now it's probably the stuff that are the least controversial parts of Rose-Brady. So it would be things like establishing a common application. It would be things like going to multi-year MAP funding, right? The higher education working group that Chris mentioned earlier has 12 members or six Democrats, six Republicans. There are six members of the House, six members of the Senate. And what we're hearing is that all 12 of those members, the things that they're going to put forward, are things that all 12 of those members agreed upon. So, like I said, things like the common app.

The most controversial aspects of Rose-Brady are the centers of excellence, right? The going through and ranking the programs and, you know, funding the top eight, and all that type of thing. That has very little traction and doesn't seem to be going anywhere anytime soon. As I said yesterday, I give Senator Rose and Representative Brady credit for introducing the bill to get somebody talking about higher education. There are aspects of the bill that NIU is okay with. That part of the bill, we are not okay with, and that part of the bill does not appear to be going anywhere.

So that might even have been a little bit longer than you wanted, but I'm happy to answer any questions if anybody has one.

L. Saborío: That was perfect, thank you. Any questions for Matt? No?

M. Streb: Easiest audience I've had all day.

L. Saborío: Thank you.

E. [Faculty Salary Study](#) – Follow-up discussion

L. Saborío: Okay, one more item is the Faculty Salary Study, a follow-up discussion. I did talk extensively at the Faculty Senate Steering meeting with my colleagues about how to move forward with the Faculty Salary Study, and we decided that we would like to identify two faculty members to potentially take a look at the Faculty Salary Study and identify key problems to bring forward to Faculty Senate in the fall. And we identified Richard, you're still here. You were on the task force, and we thought we would ask you if you would be interested. And the other person was Laura Johnson. Is she, I don't see her here, did she leave already? There she is, okay. You were also on the task force, were you not? And you're serving in the fall? Okay. So we were wondering, just put the two of you, a really small group, if you would be willing to identify key problems from the Faculty Salary Study, such as promotion policies and criteria. You could even look at the CLAS policy on associate promotion, which they just started. Highlight some possible next steps and then bring it forward to Faculty Senate in the fall. And this doesn't have to be the first meeting in the fall. It could whenever you decide. Fall goes from August to December. If you're willing. And then at that point, Faculty Senate could decide how to move forward based on your recommendations and if you wanted to add more individuals to your team, etc. I would also suggest contacting someone in the union to see where they're moving forward with, what items they're going to move forward with in their next negotiations. Okay? I think they both agreed, they're both nodding. Thank you, Richard and Laura. Are there any questions about the Faculty Salary Study then that was proposed by Steering?

XII. PUBLIC COMMENT

L. Saborío: Public comment. Do we have anyone here who would like to make a public comment? No public comment today? Okay.

XIII. 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. 2018-19 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
Faculty Senate meets monthly on Wednesdays at 3 p.m. in the HSC Sky Room.
2018-19 dates: Sep 5, Oct 3, Oct 31, Nov 28, Jan 23, Feb 20, Mar 27, Apr 24.

L. Saborío: Information Items. Just note Item Q., which are the Faculty Senate meeting – it’s the Faculty Senate meeting schedule for next academic year, so you can mark those off in your calendar.

And, for public comment, I guess Virginia’s [Naples] not here. I was going to ask if there was a union update, but does anybody want to provide us with a union update? You’re all just ready to adjourn, aren’t you?

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

L. Saborío: Next item is an adjournment, right? Did she leave yet. If you have more questions, I’m sure that Acting Provost McCord would be willing to address some of them after the meeting today, even though I just dedicated him to staying a little later, if that would be okay?

L. Saborío: So can I get a motion to adjourn then?

K. Jaekel: So moved.

L. Saborío: Thank you, Katy. And a second? Okay, thank you very much. Meeting is adjourned. We’ll see you in the fall.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.