

TRANSCRIPT

FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, September 5, 2018, 3 p.m.

Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Beamer, Boughton, Buck, Burns, Burton, G. Chen, J. Chen, Chitwood, Chmaissem, Chomentowski, Chung, Collins, Creed, Duffin, Fredericks, Grund, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hanna, Horn (for Baker), Jaekel, Johnson, Kim, Konen, Koss, Lampi, Liu, Macdonald, Mayer, Millhorn, Millis, Montana, Moraga, Myers (for Littauer), Naples, Nejd, Nelson, Newman, Njue (for Surjadi), Novak, Penrod (for Johnston-Rodriguez, Powell, Riley, Rodgers, Ryu, Saborío, Schatteman, Schraufnagel, Shi, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Sprong, Staikidis, Subramony, Tatara, Than, Thu, Whedbee, Wilson, Zheng

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Baker, Bateni, Briscoe, Bujarski, Chakraborty, Demir, Irwin, Johnston-Rodriguez, Mogren, Schwerer, Shibata, Sirotkin, Song, Stephen

OTHERS PRESENT: Barsema, Bryan, Coleman, Doederlein, Duis, Groza, Klaper, Marshon, McHone-Chase, Royce

OTHERS ABSENT: Gelman, Marsh

I. CALL TO ORDER

T. Arado: Welcome to the first Faculty Senate meeting of the 2018-19 academic year. For those of you who don't know me, I'm Therese Arado. For those of you who do know me, I am still Therese Arado. And welcome to the first meeting of the academic year.

Faculty Senate President T. Arado called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

T. Arado: May I have a motion to adopt the agenda. I'm going to keep looking at Pat for my process here. Laura Beamer. Second? George Slotsve is seconding it. Any discussion on the agenda? Seeing no discussion, those who approve say aye.

Members: Aye.

T. Arado: Any opposed, say nay. Any abstentions? All right, we have an agenda. I have accomplished my first feat.

III. APPROVAL OF THE [APRIL 25, 2018](#) MINUTES

T. Arado: Second thing we need to do is approve the minutes from the April 25 meeting, which should be in the materials that Pat sent out to you. May I have a motion to approve those minutes? Michael Haji-Sheikh, thank you. And a second? George Slotsve second, all right. Any discussion on the April 25 minutes? All those in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

T. Arado: Opposed, nay. Any abstentions? Great, we have now approved our minutes. Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

T. Arado: So I just have a couple of announcements today. Basically, I'm going to work through our agenda and get us moving here. And I have nothing huge to announce today. But a couple of things I want us all to keep in mind: One is what I'm doing right now, as you all told me you couldn't hear me, is when you are going to speak to the group – and you will hear us say this every meeting – please make sure you have a microphone. And then please tell us who you are so that for the transcript purposes, we have correct information. But tell us who you are and then speak into the microphone. And wait to make sure that people can hear you like I had to do, because I didn't know you couldn't hear me.

The second thing is just something that I want to remind us all is that we have the opportunity to be here on a monthly basis, and we get to hear all of the things that are going on around campus through the various reports of committees and groups. And so that we can work on communication across campus, we have to remember that we get to go back to our colleges, our departments, our schools and share that information so that we can, hopefully, work on this information being disseminated better across campus rather than we come here, hear it, and it doesn't go anywhere. So I just want to remind you all that that is one of our privileges of being on this body to do.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approve the [2018-19 Faculty Senate Standing Committees](#) membership rosters per Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 3 – Page 5
- B. Approve the [faculty members of the 2018-19 UC-Steering Committee](#) per NIU Bylaws Article 2.1.1 – Page 6
- C. Approve Department of Communication Professor Ferald Bryan to serve as the 2018-19 Faculty Senate parliamentarian per Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 2.2
- D. Approve College of Education UC representative, So-Yeun Kim, to serve on the [University Council Personnel Committee](#) for a two-year term, replacing COE representative, Jane Rheineck, who resigned from NIU prior to beginning her term.
- E. Approve the [2018-19 University Advisory Committee to the BOT membership roster](#), confirming Sarah Marsh for a three-year term (2018-2021) per NIU Bylaws, Article 17.4.1.1 – Page 7

T. Arado: So the next item we have on here is our consent agenda. On this we have five items. We are approving the Faculty Senate standing committees, the faculty members on the UC Steering Committee, approving Department of Communication Professor Bryan to serve as our parliamentarian, and approving College of Education UC representative, Professor Kim. And the last item on there is confirming Sarah Marsh on the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees membership.

May I have a motion to approve the consent agenda? John Novak. May I have a second. Second, Michael Haji-Sheikh, thank you. All those in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

T. Arado: Opposed, nay. Any abstentions? Great.

VI. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Linda Saborío – report

T. Arado: We are now on to part VI, the reports from advisory committees. Our first report is from Linda Saborío for the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE.

L. Saborío: Okay so for our last meeting of the 2017-18 academic year, the FAC to IBHE attended the IBHE June 5 board meeting at the University Center of Lake County. And the chair of each caucus – the private institutions, the public institutions and the community colleges – each chair was invited to share with the IBHE the principal topics, or in other words the vexing issues, the challenges, that each of our caucuses found to be of particular concern. So I just want to give you a brief summary of the topics that were presented to the board.

One from our chair of the FAC, we have the lack of voting faculty representation on the IBHE. Despite the fact that faculty representation is statutorily imbedded in the board's membership by careful design, we still do not have legally mandated representation on the board. This was as of June 5. This is a problem.

Second, from the public caucus, our caucus chair discussed the importance of a liberal arts education and the many strengths and breadth of skills and knowledge that a liberal arts education can provide. Also within the state of Illinois, we seem to be competing when, instead, we need to working collaboratively. For example, dual credit was once something that four-year institutions left to the community colleges so as not to compete with them. But now they're talking about this issue with the bordering states offering our students dual credit. And so we think the time has come to discuss offering dual credit in four-year institutions, somehow without creating a sense of competition with other community colleges. I'm not sure exactly how that would look. And she was talking about beginning from K-12 to community colleges up through the four-year institutions, that we need some better collaboration.

And finally we need to address the stressful rhetoric in the state of Illinois, because it is extremely harmful to our enrollment. That was from the public caucuses.

From the private institutions, the caucus chair highlighted the impact that the lack of resources for our institutions has had on students, faculty and staff. He argued that education is an investment and not a cost, and he urged the board to find ways to educate the legislature and the general public on the importance of investing in higher education. Very important as well.

And then finally from the community colleges, regarding the conversation of two-year colleges offering baccalaureate degrees. The caucus wanted to go on record to say that they are not in favor of community colleges offering four-year degrees. Yay, right, I know, thank you for doing that. He said that offering four-year degrees would impede upon their ability to fulfill their mission, which is to provide a quality two-year degree. Many community colleges do not have faculty, and they do not have the facilities to offer four-year degrees. Simply put, it would be too costly for them to do so. And he remarked that Illinois would be better served making more two-plus-two agreements and clearer articulation agreements between the community colleges and the four-year institutions.

So there's a full audio recording of the June 5 board meeting available on their website if you're interested in listening to the entire discussion.

The first meeting of this academic year for the FAC to IBHE will take place on September [21] at Judson University. And I believe this concludes my report. Are there any questions? I was going quickly there, because I know we've got board members sitting in the back waiting to address the faculty. I have a question, actually. Were we able to identify an alternate faculty rep to serve this year in case I cannot attend a meeting.

T. Arado: We are doing that, I think, during the elections portion of our agenda.

L. Saborío: Excellent. So if anybody has any questions regarding the meetings. The locations haven't exactly been set. But after the September 21 meeting, we'll know better the locations of the next year. Any other questions, please let me know. Thank you.

T. Arado: Great. Thanks, Linda.

- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
Holly Nicholson, Cathy Doederlein, Therese Arado,
Alex Gelman, Sarah Marsh, Kendall Thu

T. Arado: The next item on here is the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. The committee members attended Board of Trustee meetings a couple of weeks ago, and just a couple of highlights sharing information across campus: Jenna Mitchell is our new Illinois legislative liaison, and she works out of Springfield. And she came up and reported on various things going on with Illinois legislature that affect higher ed and universities. So you can look to the committee minutes to see more of her full report.

And at the same meeting, we also got a report in person from Anna Quider, who is our federal liaison based in D.C. So both of those, they were just very interesting reports that you can take a minute to look at the committee minutes to see what they were talking about.

And the other piece of information that just came out at the meeting, and that the university is looking into, is the Discovery Partners Initiatives. That is the University of Illinois program that was announced over the summer, creating different hubs around the state to participate in this initiative. And NIU looking at, and working toward, being one of those hubs. So just things affecting us and affecting campus that you can take a look at the committee meeting minutes for more information on that.

Any questions on that? Or anyone who was there? Okay.

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs Committee – Sarah Johnston-Rodriguez, Chair – no report
- C. Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession – Alicia Schatteman, Chair – no report
- D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Clanitra Stewart Nejd, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

T. Arado: Then we're going to move on to our reports from the standing committees. First meeting of the year, so at the moment, we do not have reports from Faculty Rights, Academic Affairs or the Committee on Economic Status. So A, B and C, we have just accomplished.

We do have a number of elections to take care of. So, Clanitra Nejd is going to handle those for us.

C. Nejd: I am Clanitra Nejd from the College of Law. I am the liaison/spokesperson for the committee. So we have several elections. Before I begin, please remember that, even though the ballots have been placed at every seat, you should only vote if you are a voting member of the Faculty Senate.

1. Election of University Council alternates – ballots will be distributed at the FS meeting.

C. Nejd: The first election is the election of University Council alternates from among the faculty senators. As an alternate, you might be called upon during the year to serve on University Council, should a University Council member from your college be unable to attend the meeting. These ballots are color-coded, and we will distribute them per college. Faculty senators, as well as faculty members of University Council who are present today are all eligible to vote for these alternates. When you receive your college ballot, please vote for the number of people noted at the top of your ballot. Once you've voted, leave your ballot at your place and it will be collected at the end of the

meeting. When I call your college, please raise your hand so we can get the appropriate ballot to you.

First is College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. And you will be voting for six individuals. Is everybody from College of Liberal Arts have their ballots? Okay.

Next is College of Business. You'll be voting for three individuals. Please raise your hand if you are from College of Business.

All right and next is College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. Please raise your hand if you are from one of those colleges. You leave them at your place, please.

Okay, everybody from those colleges have your ballots and you've voted? Okay. Again, please leave those at your seat.

2. Election of Hearing Panel – ballots will be distributed at the FS meeting.

C. Nejd: Next we have the election of the hearing panel. The hearing panel is used for appeals based on Bylaws Article 7.3 regarding due process for faculty dismissal issues. The ballot is printed on white paper, and it's already at your seat. It contains the names of 34 tenured faculty members selected randomly. Please vote for 20 of those by placing a checkmark next to those 20 names that you wish to vote for. When you finish, please leave the ballot at your place, and it will be collected at the meeting. While this list was created from current records, it's possible that one or more people on the list are no longer here. If you see that to be the case, please don't vote for that person. And also let us know so that others don't vote for them either. Are there any extra? Yes, Pat has some. All right, does anybody need more time on the hearing panel ballot? Okay.

3. By-lot election of faculty to serve on 2018-19 Grievance Panel

C. Nejd: Next is the by lot election of faculty to serve on the Grievance Panel. Per NIU Bylaws 11.5.3.1(b), the Faculty Senate is asked to forward the names of 15 members of its faculty constituency to serve as a panel from which the grievance committee can be chosen should one be needed to review an Article 11, Step III faculty grievance, or a student grievance during the academic year. These 15 panel members will be selected by lot from the University Council and Faculty Senate members who are tenured, but not currently serving in an administrative role. So we will draw those 15 names at this time.

My name is Clanitra Nejd; I am very sensitive to pronunciation issues, so please forgive me if I do this wrong.

Jozef Burjarski, [Biological Sciences]
Jim Millhorn, University Libraries
Virginia Naples, Biological Sciences
Reed Scherer, Geology and Environmental Geosciences
Kryssi Staikidis, Art and Design
So-Yeun Kim, Kinesiology and Physical Education

Veysel Demir, Electrical Engineering
Rich Grund, Theatre and Dance
Tomoyuki Shibata, Health Studies
Gleb Sirotkin, Mathematical Sciences
Mahesh Subramony, Management
Jamie Mayer, Allied Health and Communicative Disorders
Gary Chen, Industrial and Systems Engineering
Tharaphi Than, World Language and Cultures
Kirk Duffin, Computer Science

4. Election of a Faculty Senate vice president per NIU Bylaws Article 2.2

Next is the election of the Faculty Senate vice president. I'll open the floor for nominations at this time.

K. Jaekel: I nominate George Slotsve.

C. Nejd: Can I have a second on the nomination for George Slotsve? Kendall Thu has seconded. Are there any other nominations for Faculty Senate vice president?

K. Thu: I move that nominations close.

C. Nejd: All right, so nominations are closed. So George Slotsve has been nominated. All those in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

C. Nejd: All opposed say no. Any abstentions?

G. Slotsve: Abstain.

C. Nejd: Thank you.

5. Selection of one Faculty Senate member to serve as the Faculty Senate President's designee on the 2019 BOT Professorship Award Selection Committee. Self-nominations will be taken from the FS floor, and election will take place during the meeting.

Committee members review approximately 10 applications online, and the committee meets two-three times between November and February. The person selected to serve on this committee cannot be a candidate for the award, nor have submitted a nomination for the award. (Ross Powell served last year.)

C. Nejd: Next is the selection of one faculty volunteer to serve on the BOT Professorship Award Selection Committee. The assignment includes reviewing approximately ten applications online,

and the committee meets two or three times between November and February. Could we have a volunteer or self-nomination to serve on the selection committee for this year?

K. Thu: I nominate Ross Powell.

C. Nejd: Okay. Kendall Thu has nominated Ross Powell. Can I get a second?

G. Slotsve: I'll second.

C. Nejd: All right, George Slotsve. Any other nominations or volunteers? All right, we have received the nomination of Ross Powell. All those in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

C. Nejd: All those opposed? Any abstentions? Thank you.

6. Motion to approve Linda Saborío to serve as NIU's representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE, completing Paul Stoddard's term (2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21)

C. Nejd: Okay next we have the selection of one faculty member to complete Paul Stoddard's term as the NIU representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE. During the spring 2018 semester, Linda Saborío served in this role, and she has indicated a willingness to continue. I move to approve Linda Saborío to serve as the NIU representative to the FAC to the IBHE, completing Paul Stoddard's term through spring 2021. I need a second for my motion. Laura Beamer, okay. Any other discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

C. Nejd: All opposed say no. Any abstentions? Thank you.

7. Selection of NIU's alternate representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE, completing Rebecca Hunt's term (2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21) – Self nominations will be taken from the FS floor, and election will take place during the meeting.

C. Nejd: All right, next is the selection of one faculty member to serve as Linda Saborío's alternate. So the FAC to IBHE meets monthly on Fridays at various college and university locations throughout the state. This alternate would travel to attend meetings only when Linda is not able to do so. And the travel expenses are reimbursed by the Faculty Senate office. The floor is open for volunteers or self-nominations. Anybody want to volunteer or self-nominate? You get to see the state. All right, if you want to think about it, please consider it and then contact Therese Arado or Pat Erickson if you're interested.

8. Motion to approve Jodi Lampi to serve as the Faculty Senate representative to the NIU 125th Birthday Committee.

2020 marks NIU's 125th birthday. To celebrate this university milestone, a planning committee will convene to coordinate events commemorating NIU's history. It is anticipated that this committee will meet monthly beginning in Fall 2018 and continue through 2019.

C. Nejd: And finally the motion to approve Jodi Lampi to serve as the Faculty Senate representative to the NIU 125th Birthday Committee. I move to approve Jodi Lampi as the Faculty Senate representative, and I need a second. Second by Katy Jaekel. All those in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

C. Nejd: All opposed, say no. Any abstentions. Thank you. And that's all from the Rules Committee.

T. Arado: Thank you. That was quite the list of elections.

- E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Kirk Duffin, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

T. Arado: Our last committee that we have no report from is Resources, Space and Budget. They will be meeting later this month.

VIII. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. [Presidential Search Update](#) – Pages 8-9
Board of Trustees Chair Wheeler Coleman
Board of Trustees Vice Chair Dennis Barsema

T. Arado: The next item on our agenda under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration is, hopefully, earlier, well I guess last month, you all received the email about Trustees Coleman and Barsema coming to receive feedback from various groups, but for us, from the Faculty Senate, on the modified presidential search that has started. And the questions that they sent to us will be on the screen, that you were to seek feedback from your constituents. They are here to listen to our feedback and, hopefully, listen to the feedback you brought from other people. When you are speaking with them, remember to grab a microphone, one so that everyone in the room can hear, but also so that it is picked up on the transcript. Introduce yourselves again. I like to say I know everyone in this room, but I don't. So it helps me too, and it will also help Trustees Coleman and Barsema. So I am actually going to turn the floor over to them.

W. Coleman: Good afternoon everybody. There's, thank you for the great introduction and explaining why we're here today. I also want to thank this group for allowing us to come in front of you and get your input. Trustee Barsema and I are on a listening tour. Actually several other trustees have also participated in the listening tour. Every session that we've had – and this is our tenth

session – for the most part, all we’re doing is seeking input on the three questions that were raised in our introduction letter. And so today we’re seeking input from you. And our intent is not to go through each question and go around the room, but to have all three questions on the table so you can provide us your input on the modified presidential search process.

So many of you are aware that Dr. Freeman had an open forum last week. I think I saw quite a few of you in the forum. We have been seeking great input and feedback. There’s an open survey that’s also available. Let me explain briefly how we got here and then we’ll open the floor for your feedback. As board chair, part of my duties is to seek individual feedback from other trustees about Dr. Freeman’s performance review. And so I had one-on-one sessions with each trustee. And simply to get feedback on the performance. And from one session to the next, from one meeting to the next, the sentiment was that, not only is Dr. Freeman doing a great job, but boy it would be nice to have her as a permanent.

We also received feedback from the Presidential Search Preparation Committee that laid out the profile of what we would like to see in our next president. And comparing Dr. Freeman to the profile, to the fact that we felt that she did more than just stabilize the university, but she also engaged in activities to help move the university forward, that we needed to take a hard look and maybe reconsider whether we conduct a national search.

And so that’s essentially how we got here. We believe there’s a lot of advantages having Dr. Freeman as a candidate, and even having her as a permanent president. However, let me explain a couple of things, and then I’ll open up the floor. One of our responsibilities as board members is to have the fiduciary responsibility of the university, to oversee the university and make decisions that we think is best for the university. One of the key decisions that we make is the removal of a president or the hiring of a president. And we don’t take that decision lightly.

One thing that we also know is that this university operates with a shared governance that we don’t want to take for granted. And so instead of the board just taking unilateral action, we decided to modify the search process and actually seek input, input greater than if we would have just simply made a decision or if we would conduct a national search. And so throughout the past month, we’ve probably heard from 5, 6, maybe 700 people in terms of their feedback on Dr. Freeman as the potential permanent president.

From this point forward, after today, next week the board will engage in a closed door session where we will review all our notes from our listening tour. We will review the results of the survey. And then we will debate. But the objective is to come out of the meeting on the 13th [of September] with one of two decisions: Either Dr. Freeman will be our next president or we will engage in a national search. And our objective is to have that decision made on the 13th, at the end of the day of our board meeting.

So that’s how we got to this point. That’s where we are today. This is our last listening tour. I would say that we saved the best for last. With that, I’d like to open up the floor, or if there’s anything that you’d like to add to set the stage. If not.

D. Barsema: I would just add my thank you for allowing us to be here today. The only other comment that I would make to Chair Coleman's statements is that, we're putting a lot of weight into the presidential profile that was created by the Presidential Search Preparation Committee, of which there are a number of you in this room that were parts of that committee.

If you recall, just about a year ago, Chair Coleman and I were here to solicit feedback from you on the presidential profile and the characteristics of our next president. So we actually started the process a year ago, took that information that you gave to us, as well as other constituency groups gave to us, fed it to the Presidential Search Preparation Committee. They used that, along with outside data, that they gathered to come up with the profile that we've used to say that, as Chair Coleman said, that the person who's in that seat today, Dr. Freeman, fits that profile beautifully. So I just wanted to remind you in your role in the creation of that profile. It actually began about a year ago here, almost to the day I would think.

But again, thank you for your time, and we'll open it up to you.

W. Coleman: One other thing that I'd like to mention is that we are, Dennis and I will both take notes, but our official note taker is Chelsea, who is sitting to our [left]. One thing that we do not do, and we will not do, is attribute any of our notes to a single person. What you say is more important than who you are in terms of us taking notes. You are important, but I'm just saying we won't attribute any comments to one person. And our objective, once again, is to go back and share the sentiments of this message that we get today, or the sentiment of the messages that we get today with our colleagues.

At this point, the three questions, they're up on the board, and if anyone would like to open up the floor with a comment or a statement as it relates to the three questions that are here, please raise your hand and I'll try to recognize you.

J. Millhorn: My name is Jim Millhorn. I represent the University Libraries. I have a question about the timeline. My understanding is the last meeting of the Presidential Search Planning Committee was May 15. Was there an understanding amongst members of that committee at that time that this would be their last meeting? Your announcement came on July 11, and what I don't understand is why the Presidential Search Planning Committee was not consulted before that document was released on July 11.

D. Barsema: Well let's back up just a second in terms of the Presidential Search Preparation Committee. That was not the search committee. If a national search would have been convened, that was not the search committee. A new committee would have been named if we did a national search.

The purpose of that committee was really threefold: One was to benchmark presidential contracts. Two was to benchmark presidential or best in practice search processes. And then three was the presidential profile and the characteristics of our next president, as well as the marketing collateral. So those were the three basic initiatives of that group. We first convened that group in January of this year. We met – I don't have the specific days in front of me – but we met on a monthly basis in person under the Open Meetings Act so everybody was invited to attend or could have attended

those meetings. They were posted on the presidential website. Our last meeting was in preparation for the presentation to the Board of Trustees that the Preparation Search Committee made in June. So it was in the June Board of Trustee meeting. And I don't recall exactly when the last meeting was, but it would have been in May, if not in early June, to prepare for that. Each of the working groups made their presentation to the board on those three areas that I defined. And that was the last time they had met. Their job was basically done. And so, once we got the report from them in the June Board of Trustees meeting, that was when the board began the discussion of the presidential profile.

J. Millhorn: I would like to hear from a member of the Presidential Search Planning Committee whether you considered that your job was done after May 15.

K. Thu: I was on the Presidential Search Planning Committee. Yes, we were done in June. Once our report to the Board of Trustees was finished, yes. And the presidential profile was finished then and handed over to the board.

L. Saborío: And it was our understanding at that time that we would then charge the Presidential Search Committee in the fall with any follow-up with the presidential profile if, indeed, there were to be a search.

J. Novak: Yesterday at the School of Music monthly meeting, I put these questions up, and I told them a week in advance that we would talk about this subject. It was unanimous that the School of Music wants a national search. There were a lot of reasons. One was that nothing was lost to us having a national search. It would cost some money and some time, but it's worth it to get this information. Secondly, that we feel like this is kind of unprecedentedly handled this way and that, for the Board of Trustees to make this decision, will be a bad precedent for the future about doing things how they feel good, warm and fuzzy. Also it's not a computer dating service, so if one card matched up, going back 40 or 50 years with our dots, with the one candidate that we have, we still haven't seen the rest of the people, if their dots match up even better. The only person that I talked to was somebody outside of my college teaching in another college who said we should just not have a search, because the school has such a bad reputation, we will not get good candidates. That's really, really negative, and that's a bad reason to go that direction, I think. Thank you.

W. Coleman: Thank you for your comments.

M. Haji-Sheikh: A couple things. I agree with my colleague in the School of Music, Engineering, almost every professor I talked to as soon as the announcement, almost every professor was alarmed to some extent that the search would be abrogated. The other question I have is, I'm a little confused about your procedures that you're planning going after this, because you said you're going to take it into a closed session to discuss this information from all these different conversations. But if I remember the Open Meetings Act, you can only be a personnel, can only be specifically about personnel issues with a specific person, and not necessarily a general conversation or debate, okay? Debate is supposed to be in public. And a vote will be in public also. So I mean that procedural part, you know, it's concerning to us as faculty, because we won't know, we kind of like to have a feeling that we have an actual input in this system. And when we find out we don't, we get a little cranky.

W. Coleman: Well, let me speak to the procedural matter. And oh, by the way, for every comment that's made, we're here really to listen and to take notes. We're not going to get into back-and-forth debate about every comment that's made. But what I'd like to do is clear the air about a procedural matter. You know, the Open Meetings Act allows us to go into closed session to discuss personnel matters. This is input into a personnel matter, whether or not we're going to extend a job offer to an employee or not. And we will come out in open door and Open Meetings Act, and we will conduct the vote. And that vote will either be yeah or nay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: So you are, this meeting is going to be the deciding meeting, in other words, is what you're saying, and not necessarily a meeting that is necessarily an extension. It's not deciding on the procedure of completing this. It's deciding on whether or not you'll be hiring Dr. Freeman, is that correct?

W. Coleman: Yes, there will be, and I believe the agenda has been posted, but if not, the agenda will be posted 48 hours in advance. And there will be an agenda item that the trustees will vote on, either to extend an offer to Dr. Freeman and solidify her as a permanent president or conduct a national search.

We've got a question in the back.

K. Jaekel: It's not a question as much as a comment. I served on the Presidential [Search] Planning Committee over the spring and summer terms. And just a quick follow-up to John's point, it's not unprecedented. So part of my committee's job was to do some benchmarking in regard to contracts. And so these things do happen at other institutions. It's maybe just not as common as what we've come to know.

W. Coleman: To further add to that comment, I'd like to also mention that it's not unprecedented here at this university as well. The president that sat in that seat, I think 12 or 14 years, Dr. La Tourette, was appointed by the governing board at the time. There wasn't any shared governance. There wasn't any polling, surveys or consulting with others for that appointment. And I want to emphasize that we believe precedent was set, and the board could have taken that action. However, we value the shared governance process, and we value the input of the university. And so that's why we modified the process to get input. And this is input that we're seeking to help us make our final decision.

G. Chen: First of all, I would like to say that I'm glad that Dr. Freeman fits well with the presidential profile. But my question to the two of you – I thank you for coming to the meeting today. My question is: What's the strong rationale for not going for a national search? What are the advantages to NIU not going forward to a national search?

W. Coleman: That's a fair question. Other than us having a candidate that we feel really good about, there's a lot of advantages to not doing a national search at this point in time. Personally, I believe that we spend nine months – a typical presidential search takes about nine months. If we spend nine months conducting a national search and selecting a president that will start at the beginning of the fiscal year, in July of '19, it's going to take that new president at least another year,

or maybe two years, to get their people in place, get processes in place, learn about this institution, learn what we have to address, what we don't have to address. It's possible that this university would go into what we would call somewhat of a pause mode for the next two to three years. And we are at a critical state within our university, in itself. We don't have the luxury of a two- or three-year pause. Now granted, not everything will pause in a two- or three-year timeframe, but we don't believe that a new president can come and help turn this ship around. And one of our most critical areas that we've got to address is enrollment and our financials. So we believe that having somebody with institutional knowledge can help us move faster to address those two critical items specifically.

V. Collins: Just a follow-up. So you shared advantages. Would you share with us disadvantages in going this direction?

W. Coleman: And, Vicki, there are disadvantages. There's no question about it. I will tell you, furthermore, the advantages, we have a known entity. We have a candidate that we've seen in action for a year. A disadvantage of doing a national search, we may come out with a candidate that interviews well, that fits the profile, but doesn't fit in once they get on campus. Conducting a national search doesn't guarantee that we're going to get somebody better or somebody that will fit in, somebody that will help address the problems that we have in front of us, and that will fit socially or fit within the university, itself.

So a disadvantage of not conducting a national search – there will be pockets of people who feel that we didn't go through the right process to make it happen, to bring in a candidate. I don't know, Dennis, do you want to add something to that.

D. Barsema: It's clear the one disadvantage to not doing a national search is that you're not getting a broad pool of candidates that you can see. So that's the obvious disadvantage. And to me that might be the only disadvantage, because I think that, when you do a national search – and many of you in this room have found – all of you in this room have been a part of a national search committee for your department, for your college, for the university – and you know that you get, your time with the candidate is measured in hours. You may get six hours, eight hours, ten hours with that candidate over the interview process. How well do you really know that candidate? We are just going through – there's a reason that Dr. Baker is no longer the president of NIU, and how many hours were spent in that search with him?

So I think when you look at the fact that we've had a year to observe Dr. Freeman in her role as the acting president of NIU. Prior to that, we had seven years to observe her in other roles in the university, I think we have a good feel for who she is. And we have a good feel for her character, her transparency, her integrity, her ability to lead, her ability to address tough issues. She came in in a very tumultuous time a year ago, or a little bit more than a year ago when Dr. Baker resigned. And she did a brilliant job in stabilizing the university, addressing the fiscal issues of the university, addressing the academic issues of the university, bringing the university forward, not just being a babysitter, but she continued to move the university forward. So it was the issue of you've got somebody that you know very well and you've seen now for a year in this role, versus on a national search you've got hours to spend with somebody.

Plus we had the advantages of seeing several national searches of other universities in our state that have occurred over the past year. Chicago State and Northeastern, being two of them. And so we kind of saw the pools that they drew. Now we are a research university, they are not. There are many advantages to NIU that they don't have, but still I think we felt that the person who was in that seat relative to meeting the presidential profile that we identified, knowing her as well as we do, you just get to a point where it's like, I don't think we're going to find somebody better out there. And if you do a national search, now you've got that timeframe as Chair Coleman said, where it's going to take you nine months so you're going to have a new president July 1. He or she is going to take a year or so to get their own agenda in place. So you've lost a lot of momentum. And we have a lot of good things going on here at the university. We tend to focus on the things that are not so good, and that's good, because that's the only way we fix them. But we have a lot of really positive momentum here at the university that we, as the Board of Trustees – and I hope you as faculty – are anxious to continue to move forward. And so for all those reasons, that's why we have chosen the path that we did.

W. Coleman: I saw a couple of hands in the back. Go ahead.

K. Thu: Again, I was on the Presidential Search Preparation Committee, and I want to clarify a process thing, and then I want to get back to the issue of the three questions and Lisa. I'm glad you're here to answer questions.

When I was on the Presidential Search Preparation Committee, I was contacted by faculty members who wanted us to reconsider – or to consider – the possibility of Lisa changing her mind. So part of what you're hearing from the board is not just a unilateral process that they developed. It's actually in response to feedback that they'd gotten before they made the decision. So I polled my college, which is the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Specifically, I polled our chairs. There are 18 departments in the college, and some other number of interdisciplinary units. Excuse me, Michael, I'm talking. Thank you. And I asked them three questions: Do you want Lisa to continue? Do you want to do a national search? And then the third one was just sort of a miscellaneous. I didn't get one chair voting against Lisa. The only person that said that he didn't want her, it was a process question. And I understand a lot of the process issues that people are raising here.

That then led to other conversations between members of the committee and board members. So I want to clarify that part of what's happening here is the board listening to the feedback they're hearing from the faculty as well as the operating staff and SPS.

Back to Lisa, if you look at the numbers nationally – I was part of the team that looked at presidential searches among our peer institutions nationally – [the number of candidates for president has dwindled dramatically](#). So the number of provosts that are seeking presidential positions, that would go after our position would be less than in the past. And I've shared those numbers with board members and others.

The second thing is that, as Trustee Barsema said, do you want to take a chance, roll the dice with that dwindled candidate pool, when we know someone who I think we have a pretty good idea about. I don't agree with everything that Lisa has done. I've disagreed with her, and I've confronted

her with disagreements. And I don't measure someone by the fact that they don't agree with me. I measure them by the fact that they are able to work things out and how they respond.

And plus, it's just a pragmatic choice, really. I mean searches are six-figure costs. And can we afford that at this time in the juncture? I don't think Lisa is perfect, but I think she is a decent fit for where we are now. And, by the way, I think that she is all those things that you mentioned. She's transparent. She's responsive. She has integrity. And at least to the people that I talked to, they have a very, very different view of her than they did with President Baker.

W. Coleman: Thank you, Kendall.

M. Haji-Sheikh: My concern is, when you're – and no offense to Kendall – but when you're surveying the chairs, you're not surveying the worker bees, okay? They are administrations in our department, in our college, it's an administrative job. Those of us who are regular worker bees, I haven't heard too much in support of not going for a search.

But I'm going to also make a point that Dr. Freeman was hand-picked by Dr. Baker to be his provost. Hand-picked over Ray Alden and didn't really make any waves when some of us were raising up red flags. And so there were red flags going off in 2014. And you guys, I've come to you, and you know my opinion so I don't have to go over it. But those red flags were going on and on and on and on. And Lisa could have said something. She should have said something. I mean that is part of the state ethics law. If you see something is even questionable, it's not your job to investigate it; it's your job to report it. So that is a problem I see in the long run, not that I think she did anything horrible, okay? I just think it was a blind eye. And that is where I have significant, so you asked me whether the qualifications, you go through this list, the first qualification is yeah. And I think she can get there. I think if the board and the acting president open up all the investigations that you basically not provided to the public that were done by the state ethics and by local ethics including; in fact, I was talking about the core campus and the road problems, those should be in the open. I mean Dr. Baker alluded to them in his letter just before he went away, okay? I mean those are little things. They're big things because they're ethical, but they're little things when that will gnaw at the system and gnaw at the system over time. And sometimes a good truth in reconciliation commission works pretty well, okay? Where people get to see what's in the open and understand what's going on. So, yes, the president of NIU should have all those characteristics, and I think they did a good job, the faculty did, putting it together. But I think there is a stage where some healing has to be done internally too.

W. Coleman: Thank you for your comment. I'm going to reserve [inaudible].

G. Chen: First of all, thank you for the trustees Coleman and Barsema for your sharing with all of us regarding the pros and the cons about whether we do want to have national search or not to have a national search. Right here I just, based on what I have listened from your sharing, that I see that the major risk of not going for a national search is about time and cost. Do we have a gut feeling to just risk it to see what the opportunities are going to take us. It may be taking us to the next higher level we have never been knowing. And I have a great respect to the credentials of Mr. Coleman and Barsema. I know you are coming from industry, coming from business world. You are willing to take the risk and being successful. So I'm not against Dr. Freeman, and I will come Dr. Freeman

to be part of the candidates in a pool. But I not only speak for myself as a Faculty Senate and UC [University Council] member, but I also spoke to my colleagues in College of Engineering, that we believe for NIU internally, from the moral point of view, that a national search is very much needed.

W. Coleman: Thank you.

S. Schraufnagel: We discussed this at our last faculty meeting, and the consensus was that we – well not only consensus, it was unanimous that – we should try to retain Dr. Freeman and forego a national search.

W. Coleman: Thank you for your feedback.

V. Naples: As you may well know, I spoke to the Board of Trustees, and I'm very interested in the process by which this altered search was reached. And one of the things I'd like to ask as a question is something no one else has brought up here. Dr. Freeman may be extremely well qualified and meet the criteria that were generated. I have no problem with that. But did the group looking at that issue, the Board of Trustees in particular, consider additional other either local or internal candidates as you were saying that historic knowledge of this institution is of paramount importance. It seems to me that we have a good selection potentially of home-grown qualified people who might fit, in addition to Dr. Freeman, and if you will recall my comments from the Board of Trustees meeting, that I am very concerned that our next president, whoever he or she may be, would be considered the strongest possible candidate and the best fit. If we only have a single candidate, I fear questions may still remain that was there as thorough a search as appropriate provided.

W. Coleman: So thank you for your questions. I'd like to briefly answer that by saying Dr. Freeman's institutional knowledge of the university isn't the only reason why we think she should be put up as the primary candidate, right? So she also performed that role now for over 14 months or so, taking us from a point where we were in major crisis, to helping stabilize us. We were also under a crisis of a lack of a budget. I didn't talk about the state scenario and whether or not we'll have a budget next year. And you never know what we're going to get from Springfield. It's just too volatile at this point in time, and she helped us navigate those waves. And our thought is that we should strongly consider her as our primary candidate. So that was the process that we went through.

J. Novak: I just want to make a short comment. To be a candidate would be meaning there are other people possible. If we do a national search, the comments both of you have made seem to think that it won't go her way. You're saying two years, whatever, lag it won't be waiting. But if she's really the best, she will win at the national candidacy level. And then there can't be any bad blood. Right? If we just acclaim her, people are always going to be saying, what if, what if, what if, for as long as she's the president.

W. Coleman: And that's – some people will and some people won't. We realize that we're not going to get 100 percent consensus on, not only the process, but even if she's selected as president. This is not a popularity contest, right? And the decision should not be based on who's popular and

who's not. But at this point in time, we think the decision needs to be based on what we feel is best for the university going forward. So we hear you loud and clear, and we've taken note. I appreciate it.

Other comments?

K. Chung: I just, I think that, okay, we had a faculty meeting just for the audiology department and then, when we heard about just like the alternative for candidates, just appoint Dr. Freeman as the president, and then we were all really shocked, because this has been a national search. You know that is, that we feel it is sort of like just shocked, in general, I think. And then, because if the position was appointed some time ago and then now we have adopted this democratic and national search practice, and it just seems going back, going backwards. So I think and then we have nothing against Dr. Freeman, but it just seems to be, you know it would be more transparent for the university, and then you would be moving forward toward democratic procedure instead of just appointing.

W. Coleman: Thank you.

J. Hanna: I am generally supportive of Dr. Freeman. My department has not expressed a strong view one way or the other. One concern I would have about doing a national search would be that we just went through this Program Prioritization process, and though I was not nearly as involved in that as some others were, I tend to think we probably just shouldn't do that again, immediately start doing a different round of Program Prioritization launched by a new president or develop a completely new strategic plan, completely divorced from that. And the concern would be that we don't want to get ourselves into a position where every four years, we're asking everybody to invest a bunch of time in this plan that we retain for three years and then switch to something new. And I think that one advantage of President Freeman is that she was here for that, and she's familiar with the process. We can debate what we want to do with that, but I think knowing what the process was and what resulted from it is important unless we want to just scrap the whole thing.

W. Coleman: Thank you.

C. Nejd: I as the Faculty Senate representative for the College of Law, and Sharon Nelson as the UC [University Council] representative, both solicited comments on the three questions from the College of Law faculty. We did not get much response, but the response that we did get was in favor of retaining President Freeman based on her performance thus far.

W. Coleman: Thank you.

L. Saborío: I just wanted to mention briefly that at the state level, Dr. Freeman is a huge advocate for higher education, in particular for NIU and for the faculty of NIU.

W. Coleman: Thank you.

V. Collins: This is just a final comment that I just want to encourage the Board of Trustees to consider possible positive and negative consequences of either approach before making your final

decision. So when I asked about possible negatives, it was in that light that there are possible intended outcomes of either approach and possible negative ones. And so if you could weigh both of those, and in the spirit of transparency, maybe share of those when you come out of your meeting so we're clear on how you've reached your decision.

W. Coleman: Thank you. Are there any other comments? Seeing no more hands, I want to thank you for your time today. We know you have a busy schedule and you do great work for the university. On behalf of the Board of Trustee members, I just want to say that, without you, this institution can't go. So you play a vital role in the success of this institution. And we're at a critical junction. And we believe we need everybody pulling in the same direction. We definitely need the members in this room on the same page. We need your support. This is about the long-term survival of the institution. This is not about personal agendas. This is about the long-term support of this institution. And we've taken a beating the last few years. This is not just locally, but nationally. No one could have predicted what happened last May or last June, no one. I can tell you we weren't happy. And our objective was to try to move beyond that as quick as possible. And we need your help. We need your help. We've got to turn around enrollment. That means we need you to help recruit and help retain. We've got to turn around our financials. We need you to help and make sure that we're spending our money wisely. We need to turn around the morale of the university. We need you, as leaders of this institution, to help turn around the morale of the university. And that's how we can move in the right direction. So thank you for all that you do. Thank you for your support. We're going to attempt to make the best possible decision for the institution going forward. We are not perfect as a board. Procedurally, we're getting Legal's support to make sure that we don't do anything that we shouldn't be doing. We're doing it because we want to do it right, and we want to do what's best for the university. So thank you, everybody.

D. Barsema: Let me just also make a quick comment for your ears is that as some of you know in this room, I taught here for ten years. And I had to leave the classroom when I became a trustee, unfortunately, because I love teaching and love being in the classroom. I'm mentoring – I don't know – some number of students right now, and I just met with two of my mentees before coming here. And one's a sophomore. The other is a new freshman. And both of them, just with big smiles on their faces, said, I love the faculty here at NIU. I love my professors. I love my teachers. And so, as Chair Coleman said, we have a lot of pointers going in the right direction, but we have a lot of work left to do here on this campus. But we can do it if we work together. But getting the recruitment of students, the retainment of students, is all of our job. But hearing comments like the ones I heard today from the students go a long ways, because they go back and tell their friends about the faculty at NIU, and it just gains steam. So thank you for being great. Thank you for doing the job that you do, because I sat with you for ten years seeing how hard you work. And I appreciate it very, very much. So I just want to say thank you.

T. Arado: Thank you very much, Trustees Coleman and Barsema. And thank you, Chelsesa.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. PUBLIC COMMENT

T. Arado: Our next item on our agenda is Unfinished Business, of which we have none, and New Business, which we have none. And that brings us to Item XI, which is our Public Comments. And I would like to ask, do we have anyone who would like to make a public comment at this time?

J. Royce: I'm representing the Operating Staff Council. And I didn't mention it in front of the trustees, but when they came on their listening tour before our body, they got overwhelming support in favor of President Freeman. One of the main reasons, at least from an operational standpoint – obviously, our relationship with the administration is different than the faculty – but our morale has been low for a long time. And that's partially because there has been no promotion from within the campus. And I think starting at the top of being able to promote from within and maybe let that filter all the way down could promote a healing process on the campus, especially at the director and vice president level operationally. We do national searches. We bring these people in. They really have no long-term desire to help the university. They're just trying to stuff their CV on their way to their next high-paying job. And it tends to show. And it's a painful process. So obviously, it didn't come without some concerns, without reservations, but that was a primary reason Dr. Freeman got our endorsement.

T. Arado: Thank you. Do we have anyone else who would like to make a comment? Michael.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I'm not going to read my [statement](#), but I gave Therese my opinions to put into the record for this issue, and it's not a personal thing in the end. It's just we've had such a hard time with people following simple things like the Open Meetings Act. One of the reasons it's a lot of these searches have been as bad as they were is because the board had taken the searches into private and not into the Open Meetings Act. In fact, in 2001, in the Peters search, there was a lawsuit. Two editors of the Northern Star sued the university over the Open Meetings Act and won.

So one of the things that I want everybody to remember: ISU went through this. ISU went through this in the 1990s. They almost arrested the entire Board of Regents over the Open Meetings Act back in the 1990s. There's a lawsuit, the lawyers can tell you, called Reynard. It's a major law, a major case over what the Open Meetings Act covers in the state of Illinois. So I want to see this as open and transparent as possible. And even if we end up with the present provost or acting president as president, the process seems to me that we're being told that, you know. Rightfully so, they have all the choice in the world, they can pick anybody in the state of Illinois and make them the president, or in the U.S. and make them president. That is true. But part of the thing about shared governance is bringing the thing up in the front end and asking everybody their opinion before the decision has already been made.

T. Arado: Thank you, Michael. Anyone else? Virginia.

V. Naples: Just wanted to make the comment: I have been here for 35 years, and I got the plaque to prove it the other day. Of course, I started when I was six years old as an assistant professor. But I do want to bring to everybody's attention that I was here before we actually had a Faculty Senate and a University Council, and I've been on both of those bodies many times. And last year was the first year anybody from the Board of Trustees showed up at a Faculty Senate or a University

Council meeting. So it was good to hear them and their opinions and to show up here. And the other thing that I would really like to say is that I very much appreciate all of my colleagues who have expressed their opinions and who polled other faculty and staff and other people to find out what they thought about the process. My only concern is that there are an insufficient number of people willing to step up and be active and talk about the important issues that still remain. And I don't know what people in the body can do to encourage that to improve, but that really needs to be done, because it is the future of all of us – not just the institution, it's the future of all of us collectively as faculty, our students and the future of the university. So that's just a contribution from my institutional knowledge.

T. Arado: Thank you, Virginia. Anyone else?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

T. Arado: We have a whole list of the informational items, various minutes that are in the materials. There are just two at the very end that, when you have a chance, I want to draw your attention. One is there are a couple of at large committee vacancies, that's under BB. And the other is the NIU liaison to SURSMAC, which is State Universities Retirement System Members Advisory Committee, which is actually done through HR, but they are just asking us to announce it so that, if there is anyone interested in serving as that liaison, they could contact Celeste Latham or Liz Guess. It's on the materials.

- 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. [2017-18 Annual Report](#), Academic Planning Council
- R. [2017-18 Annual Report](#), Athletic Board
- S. [2017-18 Annual Report](#), Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor
- T. [2017-18 Annual Report](#), Graduate Council
- U. [2017-18 Annual Report](#), Office of the Ombudsperson
- V. [2017-18 Annual Report](#), University Assessment Panel
- W. [2017-18 Annual Report](#), University Benefits Committee
- X. [2017-18 Annual Report](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

- Y. [2017-18 Annual Report](#), University Council Personnel Committee
- Z. 2018-19 Faculty Senate meeting dates:
Sep 5, Oct 3, Oct 31, Nov 28, Jan 23, Feb 20, Mar 27, Apr 24
- AA. NIU liaison to [SURSMAC](#)
NIU HRS is recruiting one academic and one non-academic employee to serve as liaisons to the State Universities Retirement System Members Advisory Committee. To learn more, contact [Celeste Latham](#) or [Liz Guess](#).
- BB. At large committee vacancies
Several university committees currently have at large faculty vacancies, which can be filled by faculty from any college (as opposed to specific college representation). If you have interest in serving, or know someone who does, please contact [Pat Erickson](#).
- [Campus Parking Committee](#) – two vacancies, one-year terms each. Meets monthly on Thursdays at 1 p.m.
- [Parking Appeals Committee](#) – one vacancy, three-year term. Meets second and fourth Tuesday of the month, 1:30-3:30 p.m.
- [University Benefits Committee](#) – one vacancy, three-year term. Meets monthly on Thursday at 2 p.m.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

T. Arado: Getting through those two then, may I have a motion to adjourn.

Unidentified: Kendall moved to adjourn.

T. Arado: Kendall already moved to adjourn. Do I have a second. Michael seconded. Then we are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.