

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, November 29, 2017, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Buck, Carlson, G. Chen, J. Chen, Chitwood, Chmaissem, Chomentowski, Chung, Conderman (for Johnston-Rodriguez), Creed, Duffin, Fredericks, Gebo, Glatz, Haji-Sheikh, Hanna, Hathaway, Horn, Jaekel, Johnson, Lampi, Li (for Surjardi), Liu, Maddali, May, McHone-Chase, Millhorn, Moraga, Nejd, Newman, Novak, Plum, Powell, Rheineck, Riley, Rodgers, Ryu, Saborío, Schatteman, Schraufnagel, Shi, Shibata, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Staikidis, Than, Thu, Whedbee, Zheng

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abul, Baker, Briscoe, Bujarski, Demir, Grund, Hunt, Johnston-Rodriguez, Konen, Krmenc, Millis, Mogren, Montana, Mooney, Naples, Patro, Penrod, Scherer, Song, Stephen, Surjardi, Wilson

OTHERS PRESENT: Andree, Bryan, Doederlein, Groza, Klaper, Quider (by videoconference), Torres

OTHERS ABSENT: Click, Falkoff, Gelman, Kortegast

I. CALL TO ORDER

L. Saborío: There are cookies out in the foyer, that is an end-of-semester treat. And also we have to mention Paul Stoddard is retiring so we brought in special cookies just for Paul, although I don't know where he went. Is he still here? He's probably out there eating cookies.

Faculty Senate President **L. Saborío** called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

L. Saborío: So first up, we need a motion for the adoption of the agenda. Can I get a motion?

J. Novak: So moved.

L. Saborío: Thank you, Novak. And a second?

T. Arado: Second.

L. Saborío: Second, T. Arado, okay. Any discussion? None? All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Opposed? Okay, motion passes.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 1, 2017 FS MEETING

L. Saborío: And approval of the minutes, can I get a motion for the approval of the minutes from the November 1 Faculty Senate meeting.

L. Beamer: So moved.

L. Saborío: So moved, Laura Beamer. Okay a second?

G. Slotsve: Second.

L. Saborío: Okay, George. Any comments or corrections? Anything at all? Okay, all in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Opposed? Abstain? Motion passes. Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

L. Saborío: For the president's announcements, very quickly, I just want to let you know that next semester I will be serving as the alternate for Paul Stoddard on the FAC to the IBHE. But we will be accepting nominations in the spring for a permanent representative to start fall semester. So if you are interested in serving on the FAC to IBHE, please consider it and submit a letter of nomination in the spring when we have that call, thank you.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. H.R.1, Tax Cuts and Jobs Act
Anna Quider, Director, Government Relations

L. Saborío: So up on the items for Faculty Senate Consideration, I'm moving quickly because I know that Anna Quider is waiting to connect with me. Let me go ahead and click on here. Hello.

A. Quider: Hello.

L. Saborío: Can you see me and hear me okay?

A. Quider: Yes.

L. Saborío: Okay

A. Quider: The same?

L. Saborío: Yes. So we have Dr. Anna Quider. She's director of federal relations based in Washington, D.C. For those of you who don't know her, she serves as the university's official

liaison with the federal government, and she's here today to talk with us about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. You can imagine this must be a very challenging time for you to be in Washington, D.C., Anna. Thank you for joining us today. Due to time constraints, I think we're just going to focus specifically on potential impacts of the bill for higher education. Is that correct – that's what we talked about, right?

A. Quider: Yes, we said approximately ten minutes, but I have as much time as you guys have.

L. Saborío: Okay, fantastic. We still don't have you up on the screen yet, but let's go ahead. Can everybody hear her? Okay. So why don't you begin with an overview.

A. Quider: Actually, there's some feedback or something in the microphone. Every now and then, it kind of makes a garbled noise.

L. Saborío: Oh, is it better?

A. Quider: That's working right now.

L. Saborío: It's working now, okay.

A. Quider: Yes.

L. Saborío: I'll stay this distance from the microphone. It's probably me. So why don't we begin with a brief overview of the key components as they relate to higher education.

A. Quider: Sure. Certainly. Thank you all for the opportunity to be here today. I really appreciate it, and I hope I have the opportunity to speak with you on numerous issues as they come up. In terms of tax reform, there are actually two different bills that are currently in the discussion. It's confusing, because they actually have the exact same name. So one is the House version of the bill, and the other version is the Senate version of the bill.

The House version of the bill actually passed on November 16 by a party line vote, so the House is currently not actively working on the legislation, because they have passed their bill.

The Senate, however, has not passed their bill, and the Senate is going through a procedure – there are numerous procedural moves that they have to do to get the bill ready for a full vote on the floor. And that full vote on the floor should be happening as soon as Friday.

So those are the two bills at play. They have a number of things that are in common, but for higher education, they have some pretty stark differences. So let me run you through some of the differences between the House and the Senate bill.

The House bill – which again has already passed so we do not have the opportunity at the moment to influence the House bill – but the House bill is where many of the most harmful provisions that you've probably heard about in the news that affect tuition and graduate students – those are only in the House bill. So some of those would be: eliminating the tax exempt status of tuition reductions or

waivers that are granted to graduate students or graduate assistants, either teaching or research assistants; tax exempt status of certain tuition waivers or benefits for NIU employees or their dependents; eliminating certain higher education tax credits; eliminating the student loan interest deduction; and then also eliminating the ability of employers to give a tax exempt grant of \$5,250 to their employees for education expenses. All of those things are in the House bill, but not in the Senate bill. So again, the House bill has already passed. It was the strict party line vote.

Now turning to the Senate bill, there are some challenges in the Senate bill that are not in the House bill that affect the university. The ones in the Senate bill, they're a little more on the operations side of the university. So one of those would be the way that royalties and licensing income is taxed would change in the Senate bill. So whenever put the NIU logo on things and receive licensing fees for that, that would be taxed in a different way. Also the way that we are taxed for our activities that we do as an institution that are not directly related to our non-profit mission, so that would be things like our conference centers and those types of work, the way that they are taxed would also be changed.

Something that is common between both bills is that currently in athletics, there is a special rule that allows for 80 percent of the cost of the right to rent a season ticket for a seat in the stadium, 80 percent of that fee can actually be counted as a charitable deduction to the university. That would be eliminated in both bills.

And so you see, quickly it gets into this archaic, all these very specific little provisions. So those are the main ones that are very specific to higher education or would have particularly a large impact on higher ed.

Another thing that we're looking at, though, is the reduced incentive for charitable giving. And so that comes about by both bills would double the standard deduction. So they would move the standard deduction for an individual to \$12,000 and to married couples \$24,000. In fact, the Senate bill actually is \$12,200 and the \$24,400. But when you double the standard deduction, it will significantly reduce the number of people who are incentivized to give a charitable donation to a non-profit because they won't have that tax incentive to do so. And there have been estimates circulating out there that that could result in an up to 39 percent decrease in the amount of money that is claimed as a charitable deduction in people's taxes if this passes. And so, of course, you can say, well does that mean that people won't donate because they don't get to write it off on their taxes. I'm sure there are folks in the audience who would be better able to speak to the psychology of that than I could. But that's a question: How much charitable donation decrease would we see with this lack of an incentive.

So there are a number of issues that are specific to higher ed like these tuition issues. But also some issues that are facing some of the broader, non-profit community like the charitable giving issue.

L. Saborío: Okay, thank you.

A. Quider: So those are the main pieces.

L. Saborío: Okay. So now this bill is sitting in the Senate you said, correct?

A. Quider: Yes, the Senate is working on their version.

L. Saborío: Working on their version. So then what happens if they pass their version?

A. Quider: So what happens is, if the Senate passes their version, which is still an “if.” I’m sure if any of you are even remotely political junkies, you are probably watching the ins-and-outs of: What is Senator Collins from Maine going to do? And what is Senator McCain from Arizona going to do? And really what it comes to is that the Senate is using very special rules. So how this whole thing is going down is the Senate is using a special procedural move called budget reconciliation. And using that special procedural move, it means that they only need a simple majority to pass the bill. And so that means they just need 51 yes votes to pass tax reform. So really what that means is they only need 50 senators, because Vice President Mike Pence could cast the tie-breaking vote. They only have 52 senators, though, in the Senate, that are Republicans. So they can lose two, so how do they do the calculus to get to 50 yes votes. And so that’s where you see certain senators are starting to – they have provisions that they feel very strongly about that should be included in the bill, some of them less related to tax reform than others. For example, Senator Murkowski from Alaska, she has felt strongly that there should be a provision about drilling in the Artic Wildlife Preserve, and so that is likely to be included in the bill in order to secure her vote. And a couple other of these types of things. So it’s not 100 percent locked in yet that the bill is going to pass.

But let’s say that it does pass. Well what happens at that point is that you now have two bills that are on the same topic that don’t have the same language. They don’t have the same provisions. So they have to go to something called a conference. And in that conference is where the final negotiation happens for what’s the one bill they’re going to send to President Trump. And so that’s a conversation, President Trump was just on the hill yesterday talking to Republican senators about what are his priorities for having in this final bill, those types of things.

So one very positive thing – or I could call it very positive in this environment – you like seize on the positive when you find it – is that all of those harmful tuition provisions that are in the House bill, are not in the Senate bill. And the chair of the House committee that’s writing the tax bill called the Ways and Means Committee, he has indicated that he would like to have a positive outcome, is how I think he put it, on those tuition provisions. So we’re kind of interpreting that as him being interested in not including them in the final bill package. But he hasn’t said, “I won’t include them.” But we are saying this is a positive move. And in fact, Congressman Rodney Davis from Illinois have been one of the most vocal proponents of that in the House.

So that’s what happens, they negotiate some compromise bill, and that gets sent to the president.

L. Saborío: Okay, thank you. So we have a few minutes here if anybody has any questions for Dr. Quider. Your microphones are working, and she should be able to hear you if you want to use your microphone.

J. Novak: John Novak, School of Music.

L. Saborío: Can you hear John?

A. Quider: Yes, hi John.

J. Novak: You said what would happen if both House and then Senate passed their bills, but I don't think I understand what will happen if the Senate does not pass their bill.

A. Quider: So if the Senate does not pass their bill, it will be like healthcare. You may recall that earlier in this year we had the healthcare reform legislation moving through, and Senator McCain did the very dramatic – at the final vote, he walked in and did a thumbs down. And if that happens, then that's it. We don't have that bill. There is no legislation then to send to the president, because what actually has to happen is the House and the Senate have to both pass the same piece of legislation. So that's why, even if the Senate passes their bill and the House has passed their bill, if they can't come up with a compromise bill that they both can agree to, then it also falls apart.

J. Novak: Okay, thank you very much.

A. Quider: You're welcome.

L. Saborío: Thank you. Anyone else have a question? Comment? Question?

J. Hanna: This is a question about the situation with tuition waivers. Is there a sense that there might be some sort of institutional work around like distributing funds in terms of scholarships rather than tuition waivers? Or are scholarships going to lose the tax exempt status as well? I don't know if there are creative ways to get around that even if the bill does pass.

A. Quider: I think that I would defer to other folks at the university who work on those types of things like Brad Bond or our Student Financial Aid folks, because I don't know all of the various mechanisms that would be available to us as an institution. I have heard colloquially, not in any sort of formal sense, not in any sort of even written publically, that I'm aware of, sense, that some institutions are looking at: What could we do to convert graduate research assistantships into a scholarship, something like that. But I'm not versed in those institutional mechanics.

L. Saborío: We're just waiting to see if anybody else has a question or comment for Anna. Okay. And on another topic, really quickly, the DACA legislation. Anything happening there?

A. Quider: Yes, so this is a – man, it's a busy time here in D.C.

L. Saborío: A challenging time to be there, right?

A. Quider: So with the DACA situation, a number of Democrats are calling for including – the way that we've been saying in the community and that's been picked up by these members is that we would like to codify DACA, so do something that, at minimum, at least gives us the program, DACA, as it existed under the Obama administration. It would be wonderful to have things that go further like the Dream Act, for example, that provides a pathway to citizenship, and it would be a better solution and would cover more people actually.

But anyway, there have been Democrats who are calling for codifying DACA as part of the requirements to get their vote to pass funding for FY2018. And so right now, the federal government, we started Fiscal Year 2018 on October 1. And actually, that's my two-year old daughter's birthday, so when she was born, I said to the doctor, "Oh my god, she's a federal fiscal year baby." And they were like, only in D.C. would you celebrate the beginning of the federal fiscal year. I love it. It makes her birthday, you know the federal fiscal year beginning is always a stressful time. It's like, is the government going to be funded or not. And my husband is actually a federal patent examiner, so we're always like: Is he going to be paid? [laughter]. So at least we have a positive thing to celebrate at the beginning of the fiscal year. Anyway, personal aside.

So it began on October 1. What the Congress did is, rather than pass its appropriations bills to fund the government for FY2018, they passed something called the continuing resolution. And what that does is it says: Keep the funding and the policies, keep everything the same as it was in FY2017, and just extend that for some limited amount of time. And so the limited amount of time that they agreed to back in September was to extend the funding for the government through December 8. And so that means that by December 8, the Congress has to come up with some way to continue funding the government.

And so they could do it as another continuing resolution. They could do it, more preferably, as actually passing their 12 appropriations bills so that our federal agencies have a clear plan and can actually do their strategic planning and funding for the entire fiscal year. And I'm sure many of our federal grant recipients in the audience have felt the effects of continuing resolutions where federal agencies are much more cautious in how they spend funds or even approve you for new funding.

So some Democrats are pushing that, to get their vote for this year-end spending package, they would have to include a fix for DACA. And a number of Democrats have said that they're willing to go to the mat and force a government shut-down over this. And so actually, I think it was yesterday, President Trump was supposed to be meeting with the majority and the minority leaders of the House and the Senate at the White House, but ultimately, the minority leaders, both Senator Schumer and Speaker Pelosi, they actually opted to not go to the meeting. So that was the picture of the president and the empty chairs. And so who knows how these negotiations are going to play out, but there is building political momentum among Democrats to insist on a DACA fix as part of year-end spending.

And Congress has until March 5, 2018 to come up with a solution. At that point, the DACA provisions expire, and I think the estimate I saw is that 1,000 DACA recipients per day after March 5, will lose their status. And so it will be quite a cascade at that point.

L. Saborío: Question?

M. Haji-Sheikh: One other thing that I've been paying attention to that does affect our students is the CHIP program – Children's Health Insurance Program – is that still?

A. Quider: The Children's Health Insurance Program is another one of the things that Congress has to reauthorize. And so that is also being talked about as part of this big year-end package. It would include. It would also include reauthorization of some flood insurance provisions. And also the big

thing, which is funding of the federal government, also DACA. So they have a very full plate for the end of this calendar year. So that's still in discussion. And I'll be honest, I haven't been following it as closely as some of these other issues, but I can look more into that if you'd like.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yes, because if we have grad students that have children or generally on the financial end of the lever, I mean the financial end of things, CHIP is a big deal for them, because they get insurance for their kids. If you're not working full-time with getting insurance from someone, that's the only source of insurance you have sometimes, especially if you're from a low-income.

A. Quider: I will look into that, and I'll circle back with you. Thank you.

L. Saborío: Okay, great, thank you. Any other questions?

A. Quider: So one thing that I'd like to let you guys know about is that there have been – it's come out in the media today and I had actually heard about it yesterday from the APLU – that the Higher Education Act is being reauthorized or is starting to make noise about reauthorizing it from the House side of things. And so the Higher Education Act, that's the piece of legislation that governs student financial aid. It governs Title IV programs like our Trio programs and those types of things, student success-related programs. It's also Title VI, which is funding for international education programs. So that bill is currently being discussed in the House in the Education and Workforce Committee, and I've heard that the chairwoman of that committee plans to actually introduce a bill on Friday of this week, so in two days. And then she plans to bring it to the committee and have the committee go through the editing process called markup next week. So again it's an example of one of these incredibly important policy vehicles being moved very quickly through the process. So I just want to let you know, you're probably going to be hearing about the Higher Education Act reauthorization. It's only the House that's currently acting on it. The Senate has said that they won't be taking any action on this until 2018. But they have called it their top education priority for 2018.

L. Saborío: We look forward to that, right?

A. Quider: Me too.

L. Saborío: Keep you busy. Any other questions before we say good-bye? No need to be smiling, right? We're all like, Ohhh. All right, well, Anna, thank you very much for your time. I appreciate it. A wealth of information and something that we'll have to keep in touch with you so we can be on top of what's happening with legislation. I will look forward to an email from you regarding the question that Michael raised on CHIP. Is that how you want to handle that?

A. Quider: Sure, that's fine with me.

L. Saborío: And I can share that information then with Faculty Senate in January, whatever you're able to find out.

A. Quider: Thank you guys so much. I'm always happy to come back and talk about any federal issues that are on your mind or that you'd like an update on.

L. Saborío: Absolutely. Thank you very much. Have a great day.

A. Quider: Thank you so much. You too.

L. Saborío: Okay, that was a wealth of information, very interesting.

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 NejdI, 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 – no report
- E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Sarah McHone-Chase, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

L. Saborío: So we're going to move ahead with our agenda unless anybody has any questions. Reports from Standing Committees. We just have a report today from the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, and I think Sarah McHone-Chase is going to be giving that report. So let's move on ahead with the agenda.

S. McHone-Chase: At our last meeting, which was back on the 3rd [of November], we had a quick report from George on the University Fee Review Committee. He didn't give us much; there wasn't that much for him to give us. We talked about a few things, but nothing specific. And then Hamid gave us a report from the Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee that he's on. Talked about parking and the speed bump placement, panhandling, and a little bit of a discussion on the presence of the supremacy groups that people have talked about on campus. Most people have heard about that already. So that's a security concern, obviously.

And then we talked with Larry Pinkelton about the budget reduction that was announced, I think that was back in late October. That's a \$10.9 million reduction, and we talked about where that's coming from. And he broke it down into four components for us.

And then we also talked about the quarterly budget – that's an issue, people don't like doing the budget quarterly. And he told us that unit heads, chairs and office managers could talk to Accounts Payable [Services] and the Controller's Office, and they would be there to help us with that.

John Heckmann gave us a facilities update about the Holmes renovation design and Stevens Hall. He also said that the theatre would be the one part of Stevens that would not be renovated and would need its own funds.

And then we also talked about the preparations being made to approach the state for Fiscal Year '19 concerning building maintenance.

Our next meeting is coming up this Friday, and we'll have Acting President Freeman and Acting Provost McCord there. And we also encourage you, if you have any questions for Resource, Space and Budget, to contact any of the members of that committee with your questions, and we will take them to the committee at large. Thank you.

L. Saborío: Okay, questions? Go ahead, George.

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to comment, it's not that I didn't have much to say. I had a lot I wanted to say. It's just there was a lot I couldn't say because I can't reveal what happened at the meeting until it goes through the Board of Trustees.

S. McHone-Chase: I'm sorry, George. I didn't mean to imply that you didn't have anything to say.

G. Slotsve: Just wanted to clarify.

S. McHone-Chase: You're right, I'm sorry. I apologize to George. He was being judicious.

L. Saborío: Anybody else. Questions? Go ahead Michael.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I have a concern with the way they're running the facilities still? I found out we have another piece of equipment that's part of our building, and they're wanting to not work on it in Heckmann's group unless we fork over more money to them. There's a compressor that runs compressed air all over the building for all the different labs that need it. And that particular compressor has a dryer. And the dryer keeps water from being in the compressed air so it doesn't get into all our equipment and freeze out and rust out the equipment. And I found out we can't get it fixed because somehow we have to come up with – the same problem I had with my vacuum pump from the building vacuum. They now want money to fix the compressor. So what they're doing – and I think it's a shame – is that they're trying to use student fee and research money and reroute it to facilities maintenance by saying: Hey that's special to your building, and nobody else has it. So even though the state spends \$20 million on engineering building, the university doesn't guarantee they'll keep the building running, okay?

S. McHone-Chase: Which building is this?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Engineering.

S. McHone-Chase: Okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: So if you read the budget principles that was published under Baker and authored by Acting President Freeman and I believe Acting CFO Sutenfield, that's essentially what that document says, that they insist on rerouting money that has less mobility essentially, okay? It's more ear-marked. So for the vacuum pump, I had to guarantee, I had to basically tell what classes were affected, which is a general facility equipment. I had to figure out what classes were affected and how much research was affected, and how much can be pulled out of student fees to fix it vs. how much could be pulled out research money to fix it. And I think other colleges are having problem. I know chemistry has had problems with this system. And this is kind of disingenuous to take student fee money that was for general supplies for these classes and reroute them to building maintenance. I don't know of anybody – and I've never been in an organization that does that. So I'm a little bit, even in another university. So I think that's a fair question to ask VP Heckmann. We're going to start getting outside vendors to fix this stuff if we have to fix it. We're not even going to use the university people. I've already talked to the dean. I said, we're going to go get quotes, because last time we did it, they charged me \$2400 for the vacuum pump. And they want to charge me \$4,000 to install it.

L. Saborío: Okay, thank you. So that's a question that Sarah will take to the next meeting, yes, to the RSB? Anybody else? Go ahead.

T. Buck: I had a quick question. You said that for the renovation of Stevens, it does not include renovation of the stage?

S. McHone-Chase: Yes, that's what he told us. It's not going to include the theatre.

T. Buck: Okay. So I was just, I don't know if Theatre and Dance is planning to use that space, and if that affects their classes.

S. McHone-Chase: That's a good question. I don't know either, because I haven't talked to anyone from Theatre and Dance yet.

T. Buck: They might be kind of surprised.

S. McHone-Chase: [inaudible] everything except for the stages, the theatre itself, but the rest of the building. I'm only assuming that they know that.

L. Saborío: Someone back there has their hand up. Go ahead.

J. Chitwood: The renovation of O'Connell Theatre was never part of the capital project for the building. Unfortunately, the theatre is in horrible state with the ceilings falling in, so the dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts is looking for funding and donations to get the theatre space. But it will not be serviceable when the building opens. Just the new Black Box, right.

J. Novak: If the theatre has not been used all these years, if it's not been operative, why [inaudible] in the theatre the last three years? They just closed off that area and did nothing to it?

J. Chitwood: Right. The whole building was renovated, but the theatre, itself, was untouched during this whole renovation. So the seats are full of dust, the ceiling has fallen in, and everything is kind of where it was left when the building was closed for renovation for Stevens. But it was not part of the original plan to redo that when this was put up like 25 years ago when the building was there.

L. Saborío: Was that due to lack of funding.

J. Chitwood: I don't know the history behind that, but the capital project for this, when it was initially projected, the O'Connell Theatre was never part of that capital project.

K. Thu: I've been through the theatre many times over the last several weeks, and it is abysmal, as you say. And you're going to have all this brand new space, and in the middle of it, you're going to have this decrepit theatre that is really the centerpiece. Now they are getting a new Black Box Theatre, renovating the other theatre, but still, you're right, this was never in the capital development plan, and it's going to be shameful if they can't find a private donor to redo that theatre.

L. Saborío: I agree. Are you still projected to move in next semester?

K. Thu: The official completion date is still the end of March, and that timeline has not changed. And I'll be in there again on Thursday afternoon if anybody wants to know what's going on.

L. Saborío: Okay, thank you. Any other questions for Resources, Space and Budget? A lot of good questions.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Presidential Search Planning Committee
Select three faculty representatives to serve

L. Saborío: All right, we're going to move on then to New Business, Item A. Presidential Search Planning Committee. The Presidential Search Planning Committee is charged with benchmarking current practices and trends related to presidential searches and contracts. Additionally, this committee is going to prepare a draft of the job description and Points of Pride document. And the committee will provide input regarding the structure of the Presidential Search Committee, itself, beyond those positions mandated by the constitution, of course.

And what we're looking for today is we want to elect three Faculty Senate members to serve on the committee. Again this is a planning committee, it's not the search committee. However, serving on this planning committee does not preclude any members serving on the search committee, which will be a different process than this.

The timeline – they're looking to meet periodically from January through May. And then the

committee will report on the benchmarking research and present a draft job description document at the June 2018 BOT meeting.

So what I'm looking for is actually self-nominations from the floor, because if you nominate someone who is not here and that person then later decides that they don't want to serve on the committee, that could lead to some potential problems there. Okay, I see hands going up.

G. Slotsve: I'd like to nominate Kendall Thu. He's here, so.

L. Saborío: So what we're going to do. Pat's going to start listing names, and then we will talk about how we're going to vote if we have more than three. Go ahead, Clanitra.

C. Nejdil: Hi, I'd like to nominate Katy Jaekal.

L. Saborío: Katy Jaekel. We have two. If we have more than three, we'll vote, so it's okay. We have a representative now from CLAS and Education, right? Keep that in mind too. Go ahead, Kendall.

K. Thu: I'd like to nominate George Slotsve. [laughter]

L. Saborío: Reciprocal nominations are good. Katy, are you going to do the same back there? [laughter] Other nominations? From VPA? Like to have representation from different colleges, right? No? Going once, going twice? Nobody else interested in serving on the committee? Self-nominations – we take self-nominations too. You're not interested? I'm looking at Sarah, maybe she's thinking about it. I know you're so busy. I know, we're all very busy. I'm already on there. Do you want me to nominate you to be on the committee? No? All right, anybody else. If not, we don't need to vote. We have three and the committee just needs three. Nobody from Business?

Unidentified: We will still have to vote on this.

L. Saborío: Why would we vote if we only have three nominations? We need three representatives on the committee.

B. Ferald: You probably should get a motion to accept these nominees.

L. Saborío: Okay. Wait. You want to do the motion to approve? So we have a motion [C. Plum moved to accept the nominees.]

J. Novak: I second the motion.

L. Saborío: And second with John. Okay, all in favor of approving Kendall Thu, Katy and George Slotsve as the representation for faculty on the Presidential Search Planning Committee, say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Any opposed? And abstain? That was very easy. I didn't know what to expect. Any questions regarding this. We'll be in contact with you then. I'll let Matt Streb know. He's going to be coordinating the show, and he'll get in touch with the three of you. Okay, excellent.

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

L. Saborío: Let's move on then. Reports from Advisory Committees, we have Paul Stoddard here. Paul, it's your last meeting with Faculty Senate, right?

P. Stoddard: That is correct. I never counted how many I've actually been to, but I know this is number last. So the FAC met November 17 down at Illinois Valley Community College. One of the more interesting things we did is, given the state of news recently, which seems to continue even to the hour, we discussed sexual harassment on campus. People brought up several concerns they had, observations they've made and so forth. One of the concerns raised was discussing potentially edgy subjects and certain classes that demand that we discuss certain edgy subjects, and how best to proceed doing that without risking being called in front of the appropriate committee on charges of some sort or another.

And the suggestion was that, before addressing any touchy issues, that you let people know what's going to be happening, let them know that you're going to be discussing a certain area, and allow them to deal with that as they see fit, whether they choose to leave or not is a matter of class policy, I guess, and individual conscience. But the thought was to be aware that certain issues can be sensitive to people and try to make allowances for them.

The other issue around sensitivity, and I think that's one we probably are seeing nationally across all fields, is to be aware that what might be joking to you, might not be joking to somebody else. And that we do have to treat a little bit more on egg shells these days and just not take it for granted that everybody knows you're just kidding around, and that some people may not feel that way.

So those were, I think, the main take-aways from that discussion. It was impromptu. It was just brought up at the last minute in response to a lot of what had been going on.

Other things that we addressed, there is still a lot of discussion going on about this dual credit business where schools offer credit that we end up having to accept due to the IAI and other issues. And some of these institutions offering dual credit are actually out of state. And so there's talk with the IBHE on how we want to address those types of issues. So that's an ongoing discussion. I would suggest that whoever starts attending the meetings in my stead – that would be you – pay attention to that, because that has been going on.

And I think the four-year publics are still looking into gen ed programs across the state with an eye toward whether or not the programs, which are really – I mean the IAI, the Illinois Articulation Initiative for those of you who don't know, is a compact among the schools in Illinois that says that if you've satisfied your general education requirements at any institution, all the institutions accept them. And this has made it very easy for students to transfer from community colleges to four-years

and so forth. And it's been a plus in many ways, but it also sort of dictates what general education programs can look like. It's kind of the average of everybody's. And this has been in place for probably 25 years by now. And the thought is we need to take a look at it and see if what the IAI thinks of as a strong general education program is something we agree with, is something the four-year publics agree with. And so we've been doing, as a group, research into what each of the four-years are doing and then what the IAI actually requires. So that's been an ongoing discussion as well.

And those were the main things. The next meeting is going to be December 15 down in Springfield with the Board of Trustees [Board of Higher Education], so those are always interesting meetings. You get to see what the board is up to these days.

L. Saborío: Great. Okay, any questions for Paul? And, Paul, congratulations – 29 years of service to NIU – is retiring on December 15. [applause] And Paul, what are your plans for retirement?

P. Stoddard: I'll be applying for a job in the government sector. [laughter]

K. Thu: I'd just like to make a motion recognizing the 29 long years of service that Paul has provided to NIU. Anybody want to second the motion?

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

L. Saborío: All in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye [applause].

L. Saborío: I don't know, you must have started when you were 15?

P. Stoddard: No. [laughter]

L. Saborío: Make sure you get a cookie on the way out, Paul. Those are special just for you. Anybody else here have 29 years? This is your 30th year, wow!

K. Thu: Ross Powell, 37 years.

L. Saborío: Ross Powell, 37? [applause] How the institution must have changed over the years, a great deal, I'm sure.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
Barbara Andree, Cathy Doederlein, Alex Gelman,
Mark Riley, Linda Saborío, Kendall Thu

L. Saborío: Next we have University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. Kendall and I were there. They have decided to post the [president's goals](#) on her web page, so I think they are in the process of making that link available so that you can all view her goals online. They did announce the Excellence Awards for faculty and staff. There was a discussion regarding tuition, it's

been flat for the third year in a row. But I do think they tabled this discussion, because there were some concerns regarding an increase in fees. There was a decrease with some, an increase in other areas that led to a .5 percent I think and .9 and then, depending on undergrad, grad and college, the increase. And also the room and board, there was a two percent so one of the board members had a question about that. Considering many of the beds are not full, two percent may actually not be a good idea. And then we had a faculty scholarship presentation by Aaron Fogelman, he presented to the board. And then they discussed the deletion of two centers. And I think that was really the result of Program Prioritization and also just the faculty within the centers, themselves, decided they had run their course. Any questions for me or Kendall, who else was there? Just the two of us. Again, the minutes to the BOT and their agenda, they're all available online, as well as an audio transcript of the meeting.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

L. Saborío: Comments and Questions from the Floor. Virginia is not here. So we all had the MoU was approved by the Board of Trustees at their last meeting. And that's also available online if you want to review it. The raise should have gone into effect beginning November 16, I think that's what we all heard, on this paycheck, it should have shown up. I know you're all thinking: That was three percent? Yep, that was three percent. That's what I was thinking.

And I don't know, do you have any announcements for the union, United Faculty Alliance, Michael, no?

M. Haji-Sheikh: I'm not authorized to speak for the union.

L. Saborío: You're not authorized to speak, is that what you said?

M. Haji-Sheikh: For the union.

L. Saborío: For the union, no? Oh, okay. Go ahead, Paul.

P. Stoddard: As secretary of the union for another 16 days, we are having our annual membership meetings this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon at 5. They're open to everybody. I would encourage anybody who's interested in seeing what's up to show up at one or the other of those.

L. Saborío: Have you decided who's in and who's out, as far as members of the union?

P. Stoddard: That's part of the ongoing negotiation.

L. Saborío: Okay, not able to comment.

M. Haji-Sheikh: The one thing I do say, since I was involved with the initial part of it, we were negotiating. The membership of the union was initially negotiated at the filing of the union paperwork. Now the university's trying to back into backing out of some of that, but that is what's. The union has to be decided at filing by state law.

L. Saborío: Okay, that's what I thought. So it's in negotiation, okay. Any other questions, comments from the floor? Oh my gosh, aren't we good. It's not even 4 o'clock.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I've got one quick one. Engineering [inaudible] passed through almost all the gates to get to the, for our new Ph.D. program and our two new undergrad programs. We're now getting to the point of having external reviewers coming out so, hopefully, everything will flow through the spring, and we'll be able to try to expand the engineering college here as best we can.

L. Saborío: Absolutely. Sounds fantastic. Will you be able to hire more faculty?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Biomedical engineering, we'll be adding two new faculty. Hopefully, a member of faculty per year for the next five years. For the Ph.D. program, we're just going to basically work with the load we have and work doubly as hard in three, two new replacements and a chair over the spring too.

L. Saborío: Nice, great. Anybody else? Go ahead, Sarah.

S. McHone-Chase: The food drive at the library is running through December 16 still, so if you have non-perishable, unexpired food, you can still bring that in. And that means that, if you have fines at the library, you can still take money off your fines and fees.

L. Saborío: I need to get over there.

S. McHone-Chase: Either way, you should still bring food in.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

L. Saborío: So can I have a motion to adjourn this meeting? I think we are done.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I move.

L. Saborío: So moved. Second?

D. Boughton: Second.

L. Saborío: Thank you. All in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Aye. Have a great end of the semester, everyone.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.