

# TRANSCRIPT

## FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, October 3, 2018, 3 p.m.  
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Arado, Baker, beamer, Buck, Burns, Burton, J. Chen, Chitwood, Chmaissem, Chomentowski, Chung, Collins, Creed, Demir, Duffin, Fredericks, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hanna, Jaekel, Johnson, Johnston-Rodriguez, Koss, Lampi, Liu, Macdonald, Mayer, Millhorn, Millis, Montana, Myers, Naples, Nejd, Nelson, Newman, Njue, Novak, Powell, Riley, Ryu, Saborío, Shi, Shibata, Siegesmund, Sirotkin, Sprong, Staikidis, Subramony, Tatara, Than, Thu, Whedbee, Wilson, Zheng

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bateni, Boughton, Briscoe, Bujarski, Chakraborty, G. Chen, Grund, Irwin, Kim, Konen, Mogren, Moraga, Penrod, Rodgers, Schatteman, Scherer, Schraufnagel, Slotsve, Song, Stephen,

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan, Doederlein, Falkoff, Johnson, Klaper, Marsh, Royce

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Ferguson, Gelman, Groza, Kortegast, Pietrowski

### I. CALL TO ORDER

**T. Arado:** Let's respect the gavel. Actually, I have a reason for wanting to get started, because we do have Wendell Johnson here to give an update, and he has a class to get to. So I want to make sure that we give him ample time.

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

### II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

**T. Arado:** So I would like to start with an adoption of the agenda. May I have a motion to adopt the agenda? John Novak. Do I have a second? Richard is our second. Do we have any discussion on the agenda at this point. All right, all those in favor of adopting the agenda, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**T. Arado:** Any opposed? Abstentions? Excellent, we have an agenda.

### III. APPROVAL OF THE [SEPTEMBER 5, 2018](#) MINUTES

**T. Arado:** Our second item is the approval of the September 5 minutes, which you should have been able to link to in the packet that was sent out. May I have a motion to approve the September 5

minutes? Thank you [Todd Buck]. May I have a second? Laura seconded, okay. Richard also raised his hand. Any discussion on the September 5 minutes? Okay, all those in favor, say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**T. Arado:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, our minutes have been approved.

#### **IV. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

##### **A. United Faculty Alliance update – Wendell Johnson**

**T. Arado:** And that brings me to number IV, which is why I had to wave the gavel. Under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration, we have Wendell Johnson from the United Faculty Alliance to give us an update on things. And as I said, he has class at 3:30, so I want to make sure that he has enough time.

**W. Johnson:** Thank you. I'm Wendell Johnson from the University Libraries. I'm president of the United Professors of Illinois, NIU chapter, and I'd like to give you an update on how we're proceeding with negotiations. What I'd like to do is perhaps summarize two of the articles under discussion to kind of give you context for what we're discussing and give you a little bit of a timeframe if you wonder why it's taking so long. These are very involved and very complicated. We're making great progress. I'm pleased to report both our bargaining team and, I think, there's a very good partner from the director of labor relations – pardon my title there – his name is Kevin Reynolds. He knows what he's doing, and we're making very good progress.

I'd like to talk about two articles. One is our salary proposal, and the second one is an administration proposal on something called corrective action, just to show you the level of detail and the amount of time it takes to sort these out.

First an update on the salary. We are thrilled to report that we have presented our salary proposal to the NIU administration. The salary proposal is a product of many months of meetings, discussion with faculty members, two faculty surveys. And from these discussions, the bargaining team – and I see several of you are here – determined that the faculty have three priorities when it comes to salary. The first is a severe problem of salary compression. Second is some type of increase to make up for lost purchasing power. This has to do with a decade of fixed income. And third, you'd like to preserve a component for merit.

In response to this, our salary proposal addresses these priorities in the following ways:

First, we propose an across-the-board increase for all faculty of 2.25 percent for each of four years, starting in this fiscal year. Second, to alleviate salary compression, which the administration, itself, has identified as an issue, we propose an additional raise of from 1 to 2.2 percent based on years of employment at NIU for each of the four years. Third, also to address salary compression and perhaps the issue of inversion, we propose minimum salaries for professors at each rank. This will affect only those professors whose salaries are still below these minimum standards. So, for example, we have many full professors who are making less than \$70,000 a year. We don't see how

this enhances our reputation nationally. So we are proposing minimum add rate. And then finally, we propose an additional “x” percent; that is one percent merit pay to be distributed among the departments for each of these four years.

When we presented this proposal, the first thing that Kevin Reynolds said was, how much is it going to cost? The answer is, we are asking the administration for \$2.5 million a year for four years. Please invest in the faculty to the tune of \$10 million [~~a year~~] over four years. We wanted to make an honest, serious proposal, and one that could be taken seriously. I’m sure many people feel they’re underpaid \$20,000-\$30,000 a year. If we asked for this much, while you’re owed that much, you’re due that much, I don’t think we’d be taken seriously. So we made something that’s very serious, we think the university can afford. And we’re asking them to invest in the faculty.

Also merit is enshrined in various Board of Trustees and university regulations. And we’re asking for one percent of the total compensation package to be added to this. We believe it will run about \$12 million [~~a year~~] over the course of the contract.

Let me explain a little bit why this takes so long. In order to get this figure, Reva Freedman from Computer Science took a spreadsheet, put all of your names in there, all of your salaries, all of your length at rank, and all of your service in terms of years to the university. So any time we plugged a number into there, into the spreadsheet, we could figure how much it cost. The university has money set aside for salaries, and we’re asking to distribute it this way. So it’s very time-consuming to go through 600 salary packets and arrange a spreadsheet.

Also in addition, every syllable that we passed over the table in our workload document and in our salary proposal was written by your colleagues. I’m on the bargaining team. Fred Markowitz is the spokesperson. I think it’s very important that we stand by every syllable that we presented, which brings me to the second article I’d like to discuss, and why this is taking a little bit of time.

The administration has given us a proposal. It’s called the Administration Proposal on Corrective Discipline. I’ve been asked several times by several people to please address the issue of tenure. If you think back in the June meeting of the Board of Trustees, I believe, one of the trustees raised the issue of tenure. And in response, the president, the provost and Murali Krishnamurthi raised a very vigorous defense of tenure as it’s now executed. That’s very good. It’s my opinion listening to the tape or the transcript that it was just a request for information on a member of the Board of Trustees.

Then after this defense, the administration proposed the following, and let me just summarize this to let you know why this is taking some time. The employer subscribes to the tenants of progressive and corrective discipline and shall only discipline or dismiss bargaining through an employees for just cause. Let me summarize discipline and dismissal: verbal reprimand, written reprimand, suspension without pay, and dismissal – all well and good. However, reprimands are not subject to grievance procedure, cannot be appealed; and apparently, the chair and director have the to initiate dismissal proceedings against faculty members according to our interpretation of this proposal.

So let me go ahead and tell you what is just cause. So for example, a violation of the state ethics act. The last person to violate the state ethics act was given a six-figure payout and was not given a

suspension of pay. You, however, if you're a member of the bargaining unit, you do that. Or for example, any violation of law – violation, not felony, not misdemeanor, not conviction. Any violation of law or university policies. Have any of you gotten a speeding ticket? It's called a moving violation. It says any violation. Now I mention this, because every syllable has to be negotiated. This has set us back a month. We have to devote bargaining time to straightening this out. Do I believe they intend to fire me for a speeding ticket? Well, no. Well then why did you hand me this? So this is going to take some time.

The real question we're going to ask the administration is, since you gave such a vigorous defense of tenure and the way that we conduct our tenure policies here at Northern [Illinois] University presently, is that your position? Or are you trying to undermine tenure back door through the proposal of your labor relations director?

So there's two proposals. These are very time consuming. We're getting very, very close. We cannot finish the negotiations, I don't believe, until we have all of the economic proposals before the administration, and this actually stands to reason. We still have a little bit of work left to do on leaves. My mother died over the course of the year, and I missed several sessions, because I was at two funerals. And so I don't know if we've put in all of the benefits proposals yet. But two proposals. These are very time consuming, but we're making great progress.

I would normally take questions. I'm in the library, please come and find me. If there's anything that's not clear, I guess I can address it in a minute, but I do have a class in the library. Oh, Kendall.

**K. Thu:** I want to make sure the numbers were clear, because I think you said \$12 million a year over four years.

**W. Johnson:** \$12 million over the course of the four years. It is \$2.5 million a year. Yeah, we don't think we'd be taken seriously. We do understand this. \$2.5 million a year over four years, and an additional one percent merit, which will be allocated according to current departmental policies. When we presented the proposal, we made that mistake. We confused five percent with \$5 million, and so I apologize. I also have floaters, I can't always see what I wrote, so I apologize. But it is \$2.5 million a year, four years, plus merit. And we feel like we are reflecting all of our priorities, and priorities expressed by the administration. So I apologize if I missed that.

**L. Saborío:** Do you know where we are with the faculty salary study, what happened with that study?

**W. Johnson:** I have a copy, yes. I think our negotiations or bargaining are being conducted in a very friendly, professional manner. And so I don't want to get too strident. I believe Kevin Reynolds has the best interest of all of us, of the university, at heart, although he is representing the employer. And we are all trying to reach a negotiation, or a settlement, so I really don't know. We do feel that we are addressing, but not fixing, some of the issues raised by the salary structure [study]. We cannot fix salary compression that's been brought on by 20 years of neglect of faculty compensation. That is not realistic. But if we ignore it, it will just get worse. So we are trying to address. We're not going to repair it in the course of six bargaining sessions, but this is one avenue forward.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** One of the things that you brought up was – and I talked to you a little bit about that recording – is actually even listen to the recording too, not just

**W. Johnson:** Well, yeah, I did listen.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Some of that was because I was in that packet.

**W. Johnson:** Yes.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** There was a direct, and I was talking to somebody involved in the discussion. It was an implied complaint that, because of my strong, vigorous stance against the administration at the time, that somehow I was an out, a huge outlier in the system. And so they're trying to build traps into the system to prevent faculty from speaking up. And I think you have to be careful about that.

**W. Johnson:** Well, and to show you how sincere I am, I just submitted my packet for full professor, so we'll see what happens. I don't believe I'm. I do not believe anything will happen because of that, but yes, I did hear your name mentioned in conjunction with the proceedings of the Board of Trustees, but not from the administration, however.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** I had some time with one of the members of the administration who happens to be a friend of mine, and that was what came across.

**W. Johnson:** Well, I'll just close by saying, one other item from corrective action action, since you mentioned the Board of Trustees meeting is that they are asking for discipline or dismissal for something called incompetence. This is after you go through six or 12 years of probationary period. And in the same meeting, if you'll remember, there was, or before that, there was a Open Meetings Act violation, and I guess the University Council [General Counsel] said, no, this is not Open Meetings Act violation, and it ended up costing the university tens of thousands of dollars a year. Now I'm not going to say this is incompetence, but they're not in the bargaining unit, so they're not subject to just cause. It applies only to us. We are going to protest this, and say it has to be related somehow to our duties as a faculty member. And then, you know, if you stand by what you said at the Board of Trustees in defense of tenure, then we really need an explanation on this. I promised several faculty members that I would raise this now, because if followed to its logical conclusion, the chair and director can – it says dismiss – tenured faculty members. We do view this as an affront to tenure as currently practiced Northern Illinois University. I'll take one. Yes, John – I'm sorry I'll get back to you on your email.

**J. Novak:** Oh yes, my questions is then, was there a meeting on Friday bargaining and, if so, what happened on Friday?

**W. Johnson:** If someone from the bargaining team would speak with John Novak. I am not available Fridays. I was on the bargaining team, we met on Tuesdays. I'm the only guy that can't meet Friday, and so they are meeting on Fridays. So until Thanksgiving, I can't meet, and I'm on my way to Berlin to meet my daughter. I have information personally after Thanksgiving until I saw

Mr. Tatara is here and I'm sorry I can't tell you, I just don't know. Robert, are you here? Could you update him later?

**R. Tatara:** I will.

**W. Johnson:** Robert, yes, okay. Well thank you. I'm in the library if you have any issues or questions, please come and find me. And I apologize, I have to run off.

**T. Arado:** Thanks, Wendell, we appreciate it.

## **V. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**T. Arado:** All right, now we are on to Roman numeral V. on the agenda, President's Announcements. I don't have any earth-shaking announcements, but I do want to just say thank you for at the last meeting everyone who provided their thoughtful feedback regarding the presidential search process. But we are here at a new day. We now have a permanent president, and I hope that, going forward, we can focus on working together and moving the institution forward and doing what's best for our students and their academic experience, because that is why we are all here. So that's my goal going forward. Honestly, I never had the opportunity to speak personally because of this position, but I have to believe that President Freeman has the best interest of the university at heart until I see differently. So I look forward to working with her vision and what she wants to do for the university.

The other item is, in that process, now the board has authorized a search committee, and they're starting to convene a search, not committee, firm. And they're starting to convene the search committee for the provost following according with the bylaws. The committee, to the best of my knowledge, is not completely set yet. But it is going forward, and they have authorized the use of a search firm for that.

And Linda, I didn't want to bring it up, because it's not connected to Wendell, but you asked about the salary survey – or study, I keep saying survey – and I have been told directly by the administration that they are committed to acting on the study that was done. Completely aside from things that Wendell might be going on in that realm, I've been told that. What that means at this point, I can't say. But I have been given that from the administration.

## **VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

**T. Arado:** All right, moving on to our consent agenda, we have a number of approvals for committee positions that have subsequently been, people have stepped up to fill, that we're taking care of on this. May I have a motion to approve the consent agenda.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** So moved.

**T. Arado:** Michael Haji-Sheikh. And may I have a second? Richard raised his hand; Richard is seconding. All those in favor of the consent agenda, please say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**T. Arado:** Any opposed? Abstentions? Great, thank you.

- A. Approve Department of Communication Professor Betty La France to serve one year (2018-19) on the Campus Parking Committee, replacing Professor Eric Zeemering who resigned from NIU leaving one year remaining on his term.
- B. Approve Department of Accountancy Professor Linda Matuszewski to serve one year (2018-19) on the Student Conduct Board, replacing Professor Akshay Bhagwatwar who resigned from NIU leaving one year remaining on his term.
- C. Approve College of Law Professor Matt Timko to serve one year (2018-19) on the University Press Board, replacing Professor Amy Widman who is unable to complete her term.
- D. Approve Department of Engineering Technology Professor William Mills to serve a three-year term (2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21) on the Student Conduct Board.
- E. Approve School of Nursing Professor Laura Beamer to serve a three-year term (2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21) on the University Benefits Committee.

## **VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

- A. FAC to IBHE – Linda Saborío – report  
[IBHE Data Points – Transfer Success in Illinois](#)

**T. Arado:** Now we're moving on to our reports from advisory committees. Our first one is the FAC to the IBHE, Linda?

**L. Saborío:** Good afternoon. The FAC to IBHE met last September at Judson University. The president welcomed us to his campus and spoke about the university's mission, their RISE Program, which is the Road to Independent Living, Spiritual Formation and Employment, as well as their enrollment. The RISE Program is a newly formed program at Judson that allows students with intellectual disabilities to live on campus for two years. It includes connective internships that they try to place the students in positions related to their goals. Very interesting program.

Then we met with Sen. Cristina Castro, who is from the 22<sup>nd</sup> district in Elgin. And she's also a member of the Senate Higher Education Committee. She joined us for a discussion. Cristina has worked with higher education institutions and has four in her district: Elgin Community College, Harper College, Roosevelt University and Judson University. And many of the students, she said, feed into NIU. Much seems to pit two-year and four-year institutions against each other, such as nursing (sorry this is coming up again, Laura). What seems to reduce pressure is having a good partnership, such as with NIU. But places that don't have that relationship are more interested in two-years being able to offer full nursing programs. The focus should be on how we solve problems to better serve our students and how we can make achievements, such as Elgin Community

College's success in closing the achievement gap for Hispanic students, and translate those to other communities.

Several FAC members raised issues, such as requiring that dual credit courses be offered if a high school wants them. Concerns focused on the ability to control the quality of what happens in classrooms and trying to insure that students are prepared for subsequent coursework.

Sen. Castro pointed out that there is a lot of pressure for college readiness and frustration with high school graduates that have been placed in remedial courses, because they are not prepared to continue with the next course in the sequence.

Jaimee Ray, our IBHE rep, provided a report by phone. What to expect from the veto and lame duck session, and it depends on what happens in the governor's race. The governor vetoed 47 bills, and only a few might come up in those sessions, but others might be re-introduced during the next general assembly. Among those likely to resurface, perhaps with variations, are the religious exemptions bill – and here we go, Laura – bachelor of science nursing programs in community colleges – it's not going away.

There is discussion about releasing money for emergency capital projects, and there's also a focus on creating a base-funding formula with additional performance-based funding elements. But whether the performance-funding would be from new or existing money is unknown. The working group is researching other states' experiences with a deadline of mid-April.

From our chair, Marie was invited by Al Bowman to be the lone faculty voice on the 30-member performance-based funding group. She provided a handout of a presentation made in August by the group titled Transfer Success in Illinois. And maybe we could include this, Pat, with the next agenda. I could just read the first sentence to give you an idea. It says that Illinois now leads the nation in bachelors degree completion rates among community college students who transfer to four-year colleges. Yay for Illinois, right? We are at 53.8 percent, and the national average is 42.2 percent. So this is something good that we should be celebrating, right?

And then finally this year, the FAC members, we've decided to divide ourselves among five working groups with cross-caucus membership. By the end of the year, each group would produce at least one product, such as a position statement, research articles, conference presentations and more. Each of the groups are divided into, let's see we have Program Prioritization and Consolidation – I decided not to join that group, I had enough of that; P-20 Outreach; IAI; Dual Credit; Regional Dual Credit System; and "This We Believe." What we're hoping to achieve from these working groups is a greater presence at the last IBHE meeting of the year, which is actually going to be held here at NIU in June. And we're looking to include more concrete input from faculty regarding the many salient issues impacting our institutions across the state. I think this is a good idea for us to focus on specific issues.

Our October meeting will be held at Lincoln Trails in Robinson. And that concludes my report. Are there any questions?



**T. Arado:** Thank you, Linda. We appreciate that. No questions I guess means that was nice and thorough.

- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report  
Holly Nicholson, Cathy Doederlein, Therese Arado,  
Alex Gelman, Sarah Marsh, Kendall Thu

**T. Arado:** Our next one, we have no report from the UAC to the Board of Trustees, because we have not met. That doesn't meet again until early November.

## **VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report

**T. Arado:** Reports From Standing Committees. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, we have no report.

- B. Academic Affairs Committee – Sarah Johnston-Rodriguez, Chair – no report

**T. Arado:** Academic Affairs, and speak up if there's something that came up, we have no report at this moment.

- 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:** So our next one is Rules, Governance and Elections. Clanitra, we have a couple of items on there.

**C. Nejd:** Hi, how are you? We have two items of business today from the committee.

1. Motion to approve Laura Beamer to serve as NIU's alternate representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE, completing Rebecca Hunt's term (2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20).

**C. Nejd:** One is to select a faculty member to serve as NIU's alternate representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE, completing Rebecca Hunt's unexpired term. The wonderful Laura Beamer has indicated that she's willing to serve in this position. So I move to approve Laura Beamer to serve as NIU's alternative representative to the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE, completing Rebecca Hunt's term through spring 2021. And I do need a second. Katy Jaekel, okay. And then we can do a vote. All those in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**C. Nejd:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, great. Well, thank you, Laura, for that.

2. Selection of one Faculty Senate member to serve as a nonvoting member of the Baccalaureate Council.

The BC meets monthly on Thursdays, 12:30-3 p.m. in Altgeld Hall 125.  
Meeting dates are: Oct 11, Nov 8, Dec 6 (HSC 306), Dec 13 (only if needed),  
Feb 14, Mar 21, Apr 11, May 2. This is a one-year term (2018-19) only.

**C. Nejd:** And then also we need to select one Faculty Senate member to serve as a nonvoting member of the Baccalaureate Council. NIU Bylaws Article 15.5.1 (D) states that, if in any given year, no member of the Baccalaureate Council is also a voting member of the Faculty Senate, then the Faculty Senate shall elect one Senate member to serve on the Baccalaureate Council as a nonvoting member. This is a one-year term, from 2018 to 2019. The floor is now open for volunteers or self-nominations. Would anybody like to volunteer?

**T. Arado:** Do we need to do Ferris Bueller?

**J. Novak:** Could you clarify a little bit of what they do and when they meet?

**C. Nejd:** I don't, but I bet Therese or Pat knows.

**T. Arado:** Do we have anyone in here who could tell us, who's served in that position?

**S. Marsh:** I've been on the Baccalaureate Council three years now. Baccalaureate Council reviews all curricular proposals, also performs the role of reviewing standards and procedures through curriculum. So that's the bulk of the duties.

**T. Arado:** Thank you, Sarah.

**C. Nejd:** So given that new information, is anybody interested in volunteering or self-nominating?

**T. Arado:** Richard, are you volunteering?

**R. Siegesmund:** No, I'm not volunteering. I'm just saying, as a former rep from the Faculty Senate on this committee, it is a nonvoting position, so you're only there for discussion purposes. It's not a heavy weightlifting position.

**T. Arado:** Thank you.

**C. Nejd:** Katy, are you volunteering? Katy Jaekel, ladies and gentlemen, is volunteering to serve in this role. So I make a motion to approve Katy Jaekel. Can I have a second?

**Unidentified:** Second.

**C. Nejd:** All those in favor, say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**C. Nejdil:** Any opposed, say nay. Abstentions? Thank you, Katy. And that's all.

**T. Arado:** Thank you very much, Clanitra.

- E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Kirk Duffin, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

**T. Arado:** Our last report is Resources, Space and Budget. Kirk?

**K. Duffin:** Yes, one of the important points from our latest meeting. We had the opportunity to meet with Sarah McGill who serves as the VP for administration and finance and also the chief financial officer for the university. She presented to us that, as we're now in a different budget environment, we've got some money coming in, that the university must still be mindful of its resources. And the administration is looking to get the RSB more involved in the planning process and helping to align mission and priorities with the future. There were some people on the committee who had long memories that were quite impressed with this, recognize that this is a vast change from what's been done in the past, its openness, although there are still steps that need to be done for the future. But this is very definitely a step in the right direction.

I also wanted to mention, for those who may not be aware, that the RSB has the opportunity to meet with the president and the provost twice during each semester, usually, if all goes well, just to answer questions that might exist concerning resources, space and budgeting. Therefore, if there is anybody in the Faculty Senate that has any particular questions in these areas, would they please get those questions to me or some member of the RSB. Or probably most effectively to Pat so we can get them on the agenda and get them to the president and have them answered at our next scheduled meeting with her on November 2. That's it.

**T. Arado:** Kendall has a question.

**K. Thu:** Thanks, Kirk, for the summary. I also wanted to just add to what – I'm on that committee as well – and I think what Sarah and Chris McCord conveyed to us at the last meeting was an actual possibility of making changes to the way the finances are handled at the university. And chief among them, for me at least, was trying to decentralize the way in which hiring, budgeting is handled. That was done during the crisis era to try to control, constrain our finances. We're no longer exactly in that context anymore, and so it's very frustrating for our college accountant and departments to have to do things like wait until the end of the year, or the end of the semester, to get money back from the Provost's Office for something we spent. So we ought to be able to get money directly from the Provost's Office in the college budget so that we can do our jobs better. I don't think it's more efficient for everything to be handled through the Provost's Office. I think at the department level, we do a much better job. So I'm sort of compiling a list of issues that I want to bring to that committee, and I think I've shared it with Jim Wilson. And if any of you would like to share your perspectives, I'll add it to the composite that I'm going to hand over to Chris and to

Sarah. But I think they're looking for action items, not just responding to questions. I think they genuinely are wanting to change the way things are done. I could be wrong.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** You mean not have so many check all your purchases?

**K. Thu:** Yeah, there you go.

**T. Arado:** Thank you Kendall. Anyone else have any questions or comments for Kirk? Virginia?

**V. Naples:** I just wanted to put into the record to remind everybody, not only of Faculty Senate or University Council membership, but all of us who are members of the university community and elsewhere, that according to the Open Meetings Act that the Resources, Space and Budget, and all of the other subcommittees of Faculty Senate and University Council have a requirement that they allow public attendance and also public comments. So if you do not have the opportunity or the time or choose to deliver your comments through someone else, you are able to go and show up in person and ask those questions yourself. Just wanted to remind people that that is not only an opportunity, but it is something that's really important for all of us to step up and do.

**T. Arado:** Thank you, Virginia. Anyone else? Okay, thank you, Kirk.

## **IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **A. Review of university-wide promotion policies**

**T. Arado:** Our item number IX – again I have to learn my Roman numerals again – Unfinished Business. At the end of term last year, a charge went out to a task force to discuss the possibility of a review of university-wide promotion policies and the following up on a couple years ago LA&S having done an overhaul of some of their things. That task force is looking at things. Richard, do you want to say anything about that at this point? I just wanted to bring it up that we have not forgotten that that went out there.

**R. Siegesmund:** It's something that we haven't forgotten it. Laura Johnson and I were charged as co-chairs to – in response to the Faculty Salary [Study], and we have been framing the response for that committee, and Therese, you had a conversation with President Freeman about it. And we met with Acting Provost McCord the other day as well. And I think we have dimensions as to how to frame a response and, hopefully, out of that, that we can have a report sooner than later, hopefully this semester.

**T. Arado:** Thank you, Richard. I just didn't want that to be out there floating and people saying, oh, this happened at the end. So there is action being taken.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** I just want to ask one quick question. You're aware that we're overhauling all of our bylaws in Engineering for promotion and tenure this year.

**R. Siegesmund:** I was not aware that you're doing that. I am aware that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences have overhauled it.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** That was sort of a sideways

**R. Siegesmund:** In terms of – I would appreciate – I mean it's in process. But even the issues that you want to consider. We are not going to present findings. We are going to present problems.

**Unidentified:** [inaudible]

**R. Siegesmund:** It's really the problem that came up in the salary study, which were centered around a part of what initial presentation from the union is, the endemic problems of compression, and what are some of the ways that departments are addressing that. And are they addressing that? And are they thinking about that? Part of what we also tried to figure out what that charge would include was: Was there an expectation that we would actually do an analysis like the union has done with it. So what kind of access would we have to the data and what would that cost? I think at this point, this committee is not charged with that analysis, but we would put forward for consideration that, if the Faculty Senate wanted to do its own analysis, to do it right, what would you have to expect? And how would that have to be budgeted? And what kind of resources would have to be put behind that kind of a thing? So defining that is much more make a report by the end of the semester than what was the mandate actually were we supposed to oversee a secondary analysis, full-scale blown secondary analysis.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** We're in the process of identifying any issues that we're going to be dealing with, so that's perfect timing actually. That was my point. If you will send me a note.

**R. Siegesmund:** I will do that, absolutely.

**T. Arado:** Thank you, both of you. And any other – poor Richard – any other comments or questions for him? Okay.

## **X. NEW BUSINESS**

**T. Arado:** Item X, New Business. I have nothing on here. Is there anything? Kendall?

**K. Thu:** It's not really new, but I wanted to loop back very briefly to the provost search. In the bylaws for NIU, this body shall have the opportunity to review the criteria for the provost before the advertisement goes out. So the last time we searched for a provost, there was very little faculty involvement as I remember. That was for the search for Ray Alden. So this body needs to be involved in reviewing the criteria that's going to be put in the ad. And then we need to be represented as part of the search process. So the bylaw specifies the contours of that search committee; it's very clear. And the Senate is included. I just encourage all of us to get involved as much as possible.

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** The last provost search was 2013 for the replacement for Alden.

**K. Thu:** That failed. You're right. That failed. And then Lisa stepped in.

**T. Arado:** Thank you, Kendall. Anyone else?

## **XI. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**T. Arado:** Okay, we have public comment in Number XI. Do we have any members of the public that would like to comment? Virginia, as a member of the public.

**V. Naples:** Speaking as a member of the public, yes. I am very heartened that there is an acknowledgement and a discussion about the faculty salary equity task force report, but I would like to iterate that this kind of report has been going on at NIU for at least 25 years. All of the previous reports were held in a clandestine manner. At most we received “executive summaries.” I was at the Presidential Commission of the Status of Women when Steve Cunningham – some of you may remember – was charged with presenting that, and he didn’t want to give anymore information that he absolutely had to. I strongly suspect had he not agreed to release an executive summary and to talk about some of those issues that the group would have skinned him alive before he left the room. All of those reports, regardless of what information was provided to the public, us, showed that sex and protected category minority discrimination has existed at NIU probably since the first woman or minority in a protected category was ever hired. And my history goes back 35 years. And it happened and had been continuing to happen before then. Even before I showed up, there had been a successful lawsuit by women faculty to get remedial raises. This was back in the late 1970s. And the university then pledged that it wasn’t going to do that again and promptly ignored that. My main point is I want all of this to be in the record so everybody is aware of it. It doesn’t get swept under the rug or forgotten as the previous five reports have been, plus my own individual studies that clearly demonstrated that. And it is illegal. It is now being treated the same way as, oh, nobody cheats on their taxes. Well just because everybody else is doing it does not mean that we should continue to do it. And it needs to be resolved. I just want everybody to think about that and to be aware of it, because it has had profound impact on faculty morale. It’s also a problem for staff. But I can speak personally as a faculty member that it has made a profound and perpetual problem in my life. I will never recover what has happened to me, and I’m sure my story is nowhere near as bad as those of many others. So we need to continue to push on this, to maintain it in our awareness and to hold the administration’s feet to the fire to make sure that they do adhere to resolving this problem. Thanks.

**T. Arado:** Thank you, Virginia. Was there somebody’s hand over here as well? Jim?

**J. Wilson:** I’d like to get a reading from this body about the recent news of students with dependents not being able to use insurance or have insurance for their dependents. If there’s much awareness of that. That was the talk in our department. They wanted me to bring it up.

**T. Arado:** Okay. You’re curious on if others have heard of that?

**J. Wilson:** Yes.

**T. Arado:** Is this an issue that people have heard of?

**K. Myers:** [inaudible]

**L. Saborío:** Did you hear that?

**J. Wilson:** No.

**L. Saborío:** Is this a new policy?

**J. Wilson:** Yeah, I think on July 31 and then all of a sudden, like a few days ago, there was an email going around about, you know, if we're trying to retain students or attract students, especially non-traditional students with dependents, this can be a real barrier.

**V. Naples:** If I may, I do have a comment about this. I'm on the Presidential Commission of the Status of Women and, at our most recent meeting, that was a question that was raised. And the response was that it was deemed to be too expensive for dependents to be able to be maintained on the insurance, because all of the insurance prices are going up, and the carriers are changing, and the policies of those are changing. But I think that's something that needs to be more completely investigated.

**T. Arado:** Okay, I have a note to look into if somebody can give a better explanation.

**L. Johnson:** I don't have any information on that policy, but some of you may be familiar with the survey of non-traditional students that just came out, and one in four students are parents. So that would make our case strong that this is really important to keep this sort of benefit.

**T. Arado:** Go ahead, Linda.

**L. Saborío:** I believe the provost is still committed to attending Faculty Senate once a semester, is that correct? So these are questions that we could bring up when Acting Provost McCord comes to our group.

**T. Arado:** And we are working on the date for that.

**L. Saborío:** Okay, the Faculty Salary Study, maybe an update on that, and then this policy regarding.

**T. Arado:** Thank you. Anyone else over here? All right, anything else?

## **XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- C. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee

- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

Q. 2018-19 Faculty Senate remaining meeting dates:  
Oct 3, Oct 31, Nov 28, Jan 23, Feb 20, Mar 27, Apr 24

- R. NIU liaison to [State Universities Retirement System Members Advisory Committee](#)  
SURSMAC [sample meeting agenda](#)  
SURSMAC [Constitution and Bylaws](#)

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](#).

- S. 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](#) – one vacancy, one-year term. 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.

- T. [Nominations](#) for Honorary Degrees – Page 4

### **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**M. Haji-Sheikh:** Move to adjourn.

**T. Arado:** Well I don't want you to get used to this being this early, because we do have things on the future agendas that will keep us here longer. But I will accept Michael's motion to adjourn. May I have a second? Second from Richard. We are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.