

TRANSCRIPT

FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, November 28, 2018, 3 p.m.

Holmes Student Center Sky Room

Northern Illinois University

DeKalb, Illinois

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Baker, Beamer, Boughton, Buck, Burns, Burton, J. Chen, Chitwood, Chmaissem, Chomentowski, Chunk, Clark (for Schraufnagel), Creed, Demir, Duffin, Fredericks, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hanna, Jaekel, Johnson, Koss, Lampi, Macdonald, Mayer, Millhorn, Millis, Montana, Naples, Nejd, Nelson, Newman, Novak, Powell, Riley, Rodgers, Ryu, Saborío, Schatteman, Shi, Shibata, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Staikidis, Surjadi, Tatara, Than, Thu, Whedbee, Wilson, Zheng

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bateni, Briscoe, Bujarski, Chakraborty, G. Chen, Collins, Grund, Irwin, Johnston-Rodriguez, Kim, Konen, Liu, Mogren, Moraga, Myers (for Littauer), Penrod, Scherer, Schraufnagel, Sirotkin, Song, Sprong, Stephen, Subramony

OTHERS PRESENT: Barnhart, Bryan, Falkoff, Frazier, Hellyer-Heinz, Klaper, Marshon, McCord, McHone-Chase

OTHERS ABSENT: Doederlein, Ferguson, Gelman, Groza, Kortegast, Marsh, Pietrowski

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 3 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

G. Slotsve moved to adopt the agenda, seconded by K. Thu. Motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 31, 2018 MINUTES

G. Slotsve moved to approve the minutes, seconded by V. Naples. Motion passed.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. Committee for the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
[Award Nomination Process](#)
Professor Cynthia Hellyer-Heinz

B. Acting Executive Vice President and Provost Chris McCord

T. Arado: Okay, as I mentioned at our last meeting in October, Acting Executive Vice President and Provost Chris McCord was going to come and answer any questions people may have. We had one question that was submitted ahead of time that I gave to him earlier this week, but otherwise the floor is open for questions. I don't know, Provost McCord, if you have a statement or anything you want to say first.

C. McCord: Just welcome, I'm glad to see you all, so many of you here as we come up on the home stretch of the end of the semester. It's a little disconcerting to come back from Thanksgiving and realize there are two weeks of classes instead of one. Hope you and your students are all processing that okay.

I did not bring the text. I can certainly give the spirit of the one question you sent in advance, but I didn't bring the text.

T. Arado: That's okay, the spirit is fine.

C. McCord: So the question I received in advance had to do with student health insurance. And in particular, you may be aware that there was a change in the student health insurance offerings this year, which meant that dependent care was no longer included as part of student health insurance. And I was asked to speak to that, explain what that situation was and where that comes from, what do we know about that.

So I'd like to walk through that situation and start with a little bit of context and background about student health insurance. You may have heard that NIU just completed an agreement with Northwestern Medicine to take over the operation of our student health services – that's different. Student health services are the on-campus facilities available to students. Student health insurance is a requirement that, if students do not have evidence that they already bring their own health insurance, they're required to purchase health insurance, and NIU negotiates a package that they can purchase if they don't have access to any other. So I'm prepared to talk about student health insurance as distinct from the agreement with Northwestern [Medicine] about student health services.

So for student health insurance, again, it's sort of seen as a public health issue that it is in the interest of the entire campus community for all members of the campus community to have health insurance. So that's why, going back decades, NIU has expected all students to have some form of health insurance. For the student health insurance that is currently in question, we're a pass-through agent. That is, NIU negotiates a package with a vendor, in this case Aetna is our current vendor. We negotiate a package. We negotiate a price. We negotiate a package of coverage. We make that available to students as, if you will, the default. Absent any other insurance, students are expected to purchase this insurance. We collect the money. We transfer 100 percent of the money to Aetna. NIU does not take any share of that insurance money. We have a modest amount of processing cost that we incur that we simply, for managing this, that modest processing cost is covered out of the student health insurance fee, not – sorry, which is different yet again from the premium the students pay to purchase health insurance. So we're a pass-through agent. We negotiate the best deal we can

with vendors. We're frequently looking at comparing vendors. Part of what's been explained to me is, providing health insurance to universities is a niche market. There are not a lot of vendors. And so there's Blue Cross, there's Aetna. There aren't a whole bunch of other big players out there for us to negotiate with.

So for context, FY18, the premium was \$1039 per semester. And that did include dependent care. About this time last year, the university began to negotiate with Aetna for FY19. And for FY19, for essentially the same coverage, Aetna would have increased the premium from \$1,039 a semester to \$1,487 a semester. That was what Aetna came back with as the price of keeping the same coverage, roughly a 30 percent increase in premium for the same coverage.

NIU began to look at how do we manage this. That's a pretty steep increase. What are our options? Our options are: well we could look at another vendor. We actually went to Aetna because they were lower priced than the other vendors. Nobody else had a better deal on offer. Is that steep of a premium increase acceptable in order to keep coverage? Or do we need to look at changing the coverage in order to bring the premium down?

We have over 4,000 students who purchase health insurance through this process. About 100 of them have dependent care. About 100 of them take advantage of the dependent care option. To drop the dependent care option – and admittedly make a few other changes, but dropping dependent care was, by far, the biggest change – took the premium down from \$1,487 a semester to \$1,179 a semester. So just over \$300 a semester reduction for over 4,000 students, admittedly at the cost of 100 students who, going by last year's estimate, 100 students who would have had dependent care are not going to be able to have dependent care through this plan.

Those are the hard choices. Those are the hard trade-offs you have to make as you're evaluating this. And that was the evaluation made. That evaluation was made by a group – this is all managed by Andrew Digate, who is the manager of Health Services in Student Affairs. So Andrew every year pulls together an ad hoc group of staff and students to get input on this. That group weighed the options and came to the recommendation that the best course forward was to drop the dependent care, keep the premium – still \$100 increase in premium, it wasn't trivial – but basically for somebody for the year, it's a \$600 difference in price for everybody, because Aetna did not offer an option where you could pick or choose whether you wanted dependent care or not. Either everybody got dependent care through this plan, or nobody did. We asked, was there any option to keep sort of a variable, an option, and the answer was no. Either it was all or nothing. So that was the option chosen. This advisory group recommended to Andrew that the best course was probably to drop the dependent care and keep the premium increase to a more manageable level.

I recognize that as the kind of difficult decision that you have to make. Where we broke down was in messaging about that decision. The recommendation on the fee was brought forward in due course by Andrew through the administrative chain, all the way up to the Board of Trustees. But the messaging about, "oh, by the way, there's going to be a change coming, and dependent care is no longer going to be available," it was out there, but it wasn't proactively – you know, you could have found it, but it wasn't aggressively pushed out. We didn't go out of our way to make sure that everybody who might need to know, knew. And so that's where I think there was an improvement needed. And we've got a number of plans in place recognizing how we will need to better message

and how we need to better message what the options are for somebody who needs dependent care, because this is not an insurance plan that any student is obligated to purchase. It's the plan of last resort, should they not purchase anything else.

So part of what Health Services does is make students aware of what other options are. What else is out there on the market that could be available to them. Again, we weren't proactive enough last year about making sure students knew what the market was, what their options were, how we could help them find other options. That's what we're trying to strengthen this year.

I'm happy to answer other questions, but I think that's a quick overview of the situation as it now stands.

K. Thu: Thanks, Chris, that's very helpful. Do we know anything about – so there's 4,000 undergraduate students that have the Aetna insurance policy and 100 that previously taken advantage of the dependent care. Of the 3,900, do we have any information on those that have dependents in that group, where they're getting their dependent care insurance.

C. McCord: A good question. And we asked that question, and the answer was that we don't track that. If somebody doesn't bring forward saying, "I have dependents that I want covered on this insurance," we have no way of knowing that they have dependents they're choosing to insure otherwise. So yes, great question; we don't know the answer to that.

T. Arado: Any other questions not related to the insurance for Provost McCord at this point? They could still be related to the insurance, but you were all silent. Virginia.

V. Naples: This is not related to the student health insurance, but I was present at the Board of Trustees when they were talking about ratifying the contract with Northwestern Medicine. And one of the things that seemed to me to be very disturbing was that they were talking about the student health clinic being reduced from 31 staff to 11, and that they were no longer going to be providing any kind of specialty physicians for people to come and see directly. One of the statistics was that they said at least 20 percent of the appointments that people bring to the student health clinic were gynecological in nature, and it seemed to me to be odd that that kind of service wasn't going to be continued for students, because it occurred to me that, of all of the women who were present at the Board of Trustees meeting, as I suspect is the case also here, that even if we have family practitioners and general practitioners, we also have a gynecologist we essentially consider to be a primary care physician. I don't quite understand why all of those kinds of services will be eliminated from the student health clinic, where it seems that's a very large percentage of the reason that women students go to the health clinic.

C. McCord: I was not at the board meeting. I'm certainly aware there was extensive discussion on the topic. As somebody who was not present for that discussion, I'm reluctant to offer too much beyond the extensive discussion that was offered there, I'm reluctant to weigh in with a less than informed take on this. I can assure that both NIU and Northwestern Medicine are well aware of the issues raised and are by no means ignoring them. But the details of how those needs are being met and how they'll be monitored so that adjustments can be made if what we're doing now doesn't work, I'm not clear on and don't want to misstep on. I will note from talking to Jay Anderson that

they're very committed to making this work. And if they need to make adjustments to make it work, they will do so.

K. Thu: So in anticipation of questions or comments about Northwestern [Medicine], I printed out the agreement between NIU and Northwestern [Medicine]. There is not yet a contract available for us to look at. But the agreement that was approved by the board, an essential element of it, it says, I'm going to read this: "Under the terms of the agreement, all services currently provided will continue to be offered and enhanced services in support of mental health as well as walk-in services for students will be available." So you can take that for what it is on paper. It says in the agreement that all services currently being provided will continue to be offered, but we will see.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Along the lines of what Kendall is talking about, you mentioned, Kendall, that there was not a copy of the contract available?

K. Thu: Yes, I asked Vice President McGill for a copy of the contract, and she said that they're still working on it. And once they get the details finalized, it's my understanding that she'll provide a copy.

M. Haji-Sheikh: So the board approved a contract that wasn't complete yet? Is that what I'm hearing.

K. Thu: I don't understand how these things normally work. Maybe Provost McCord can answer. But I think what the board is approving is sort of the shell to move ahead with the contract.

M. Haji-Sheikh: To move ahead with the contract. Because the way it sounded like you have, they will have to publish that contract before they, in the documents supporting report of, otherwise it would be a violation of OMA.

K. Thu: I would expect so. So the agreement the board passed is only four pages long. You can imagine the contract is going to much longer than that.

T. Arado: Linda.

L. Saborío: I didn't hear a question in there either, so I'm going to go ahead with a new question. Can you provide us with an update on any discussions or next steps in addressing the recommendations brought forth by the Faculty Salary Study?

C. McCord: Yes, thank you for asking. The Faculty Salary Study is now basically moving into the environment of the collective bargaining agreement between the university and the UFA [United Faculty Alliance]. The president and I were very eager to engage on this and had it very forcefully explained to us that any unilateral action at this point would constitute an unfair labor practice. And I understand that. I had to have it explained to me, but I understand it, that any unilateral action by the university, whether it is favorable or unfavorable, doesn't engage the union and doesn't respect their rights as the sole bargaining agent. So this is now something that is going to come through the process of collective bargaining. And because it's coming through the collective bargaining process, I unfortunately can't discuss it in another venue. I'm sorry, I have to leave it at that.

L. Saborío: Thank you.

T. Arado: Virginia.

V. Naples: Yes, I would like to add an additional comment that that was the item that I wished to discuss with the Board of Trustees at the last meeting. And the salary inequity, not only is existing, it has existed probably for as long as NIU first hired a minority protected category individual or a woman. It certainly was in place when I was hired now 35 and a half years ago. It also cross cuts all levels of employees, not exclusively faculty. It is equally or perhaps even more of a problem for staff and all other categories of employees. And my 20-year study shows that, at least for the faculty. And the most important thing to keep in mind with this is that it is actually outside of some of the things that the union has been looking for, because it is a violation of state and federal. Salary discrimination is illegal and has been for decades. And the only protection the university was able to claim was that they did not believe it existed, because they could not see it. And after having had five faculty salary equity task force studies, plus mine, and it having been presented here at Faculty Senate and at other places on the record, the university can no longer use that excuse. It does cross cut the issues of all employees, not just union employees, whether they're faculty or staff. And it is in that way also outside of it. It is also something that is, as I have said and I mentioned this several times at the Board of Trustees, it is illegal. And it's just like everybody says, "Oh, well it's illegal to cheat on your taxes, but everybody does it, wink wink, nod nod, look in the opposite direction." This is an outright violation of all the state ethics and other kinds of laws and illegality. So whether it is included or not in any kind of negotiations with any of the faculty and/or staff unions, it is something that must be addressed.

C. McCord: Oh, and I don't want my remarks in any way to suggest anything to the contrary. The mechanism that we are now rapidly approaching for addressing it for those faculty covered by the UFA negotiations, will be the UFA negotiations. Those, of course, who are outside UFA, obviously, will have to be addressed through different channels.

T. Arado: Any other questions? No? Thank you. It looks like you will be on time for your 4 o'clock meeting.

C. McCord: Thank you all. I appreciate it.

C. [Open Access Policy Review](#) – Dean Fred Barnhart, University Libraries
[Presentation during meeting](#)

T. Arado: All right, our third presenter/speaker today is Dean Fred Barnhart from the University Libraries. And he is going to be speaking about the Open Access Policy review.

F. Barnhart: And then there was one, thank you. Thanks for having me this afternoon. This report was actually supposed to happen last year, but because I was new and they were very gracious in giving me some time to get acclimated for bringing it here.

The NIU Open Access Policy was approved by this group and then passed by University Council in 2014, December of 2014. It was prompted by the Illinois Open Access to Research Articles Act, which for those of you who remember from 2013, Sen. Daniel Biss was the one who spearheaded that and brought that to the General Assembly and got it passed into law. Essentially what it does is it grant non-exclusive license to the university, to NIU, to make articles available online through open access. It encourages faculty to retain their copyrights, which is always a good idea. I know that it's often very easy when you're that close to publishing to just sign what's in front of you, but retaining copyright is good for a number of reasons, not just for open access.

And then it asks that the post-print be deposited in the Huskie Commons. And for those of you who are not familiar with the Huskie Commons, that's our institutional repository here at NIU. Many, many institutions have similar institutional repositories. It also allows for, or encourages, deposit of articles in other open access repositories. So many disciplines also have open access repositories. Physics, for instance, has archives. Public Library of Science, I believe, is primarily biological sciences. So there's other areas, too, where it could be deposited.

Doesn't dictate at all where faculty should publish. So there's no requirement for faculty to publish in an open access journal or to publish in a specific journal of any kind.

And then it also allows faculty waive or delay the application of the license. So there's many instances where the faculty member may want to have an embargo on an article being available open access. Or maybe even the publisher that you're working with would like you to have it embargoed for six months or a year or some period of time. Or even to waive it. So the Open Access Policy does not require that it be instantly online or that it be made available if there's other reasons.

So just to kind of look at where we are, and I want to benchmark this. I think our goal from this is to report on what we've been able to do and see if we can do better in the future. But just to benchmark, currently approximately 606 faculty articles are in the Huskie Commons. And that's by far [College of] Law has the most there at the bottom. I could speculate on why that is, but that's not unusual. Most institutional repositories, where there's a law school at that institution, have a heavy representation from the College of Law because of the type of journals. But then followed by Biological Sciences, Geography, Physics, on up the line. And these are just the units that have ten articles or more in the Huskie Commons. There's a really long list of units that have maybe one or two articles from their faculty in the Huskie Commons.

And so I did a little searching. Basically what I wanted to see if, of the eligible articles that could be in the Huskie Commons, you know what percentage are actually in there. So looking at Web of Science, which was by no means comprehensive, it is primarily science; but it does include social sciences and some humanities, as well, there's approximately 2300 publications, papers, articles, that would be eligible conceivably to be in our Huskie Commons. As I said, it's not comprehensive, so it's probably a lot more than that. So only 18 percent of the non-law articles are actually in the Huskie Commons. So it's a small percentage. It's not unusual. It's often very difficult to get that kind of critical mass of articles to be in the institutional repository. But again, I think we could do better, and I'd like to see us increase that number going forward.

Some of the possible issues with getting articles in our repository – and this is true across the board at other institutions, as well – there could be a lack of knowledge about the policy. And I think that’s probably very true. There’s not a lot of promotion of the policy. I think it could be a little bit confusing, even when you look at the Web page to review the policy. And again, it may not be the first thing on people’s minds when they’re trying to get published. We want to get it out there, but it may not be out there.

Difficulty navigating the process. We’ve tried to streamline it and make it as easy as possible for faculty to get their articles into the Huskie Commons, but again, it does require a certain amount of activism on the part of the faculty to get the electronic copy to the library, also to navigate that whole process with the publisher as well.

Many times scholarly works, as I said, are published in other repositories, so that’s perfectly fine, we just want it to be out there. But one of the things we try to do is keep track if it’s in archive or in Public Library of Science or in another discipline’s archive. We’d like to make sure that we know about it so that we can also link to that.

And there’s also no real repercussions to non-compliance. There’s no way of tracking if people are not putting their article in the repository. We don’t know, frankly, how many articles are published annually. Web of Science is a pretty crude tool to use to do that. It gets us close to the number, but we don’t know exactly how many articles are published every year by our faculty. So to actually track them down would take a lot more work. And there’s no real repercussions to that, not that we want them. But there’s no carrot or stick.

And there could be people who disagree with the policy altogether. I know that there are some professional organizations, physics is one, chemistry is another, where they actually publish some of their leading journals – the professional organizations publish them – for a fee. Those fees are very expensive. They go up usually by five percent or more a year. But that is how those organizations support themselves. So people who are active in those organizations may feel strongly about open access taking away that revenue stream.

And then also I think people just forget to do it, which is very – that’s easy enough to understand. It’s probably not the first thing on people’s minds when they’re going through this process.

Just to review, and I’m sure many of you are aware of this, the benefits to faculty of publishing open access, I think the largest one is increased citations. This is kind of a no-brainer, but the fact is, if you get your article out there more, it’s going to be read more, it’s going to be cited more. So there is a study that was done at the Public Library of Science in 2010. As far as I know, it hasn’t been updated since then, but I see no reason to believe why it would have changed, that demonstrated that open access articles were cited more heavily and more long-lived citations than non-open access articles.

Again that wide exposure comes partially from some of the databases that are out there right now that are indexing open access. So there are a number of databases that are solely interested in indexing open access articles. This is because, as I said, the price of journals keeps going up. Our

budget does not go up every year by five percent, or even more, so it's hard to maintain this. So there's a lot of interest in open access journals being made available.

Maintaining better control of your work by retaining your copyright, as I said, that's just a good idea. It's not always possible, but as much as possible, for faculty retaining their copyright.

And then preserving the scholarly output in a format that's going to be accessible, say ten or 20 years from now. Formats change, and I think one of our goals with the institutional repository is to make sure that our formatting is always going to be current, it's always going to be available, it's always going to be something that people can access and read.

And now I think it goes without saying, many research grants come with an open access mandate. So NIH, NSF, there are these mandates out there. And putting it into the institutional repository or the Huskie Commons does comply with that.

Are there any questions? I'm moving through this fairly quickly. Okay. This is the article I was referring to, the study. The green line is the open access journals or articles. The blue line is non-open access. Very clearly, there is a benefit to getting it out in open access.

Some of the other benefits to NIU, it does raise our prestige. The more we have out there, the more people realize what kind of work we're doing, the scholarship we have. It increases our influence in academia and, thereby, also increases our retention and recruitment. So I think these are all good things for NIU.

Some of the others – and this is more close to my heart, I think, as a librarian. The fact that open access does allow people who may not have access to expensive journals to access your scholarship. So there's a lot of laypeople, lay researchers, out there, who just don't have access to expensive publications. Those are doctors, teachers, parents, people from other countries where they just don't have the resources that we do. So I think this is just an ethical thing as well. It makes a lot of sense.

So some of our next steps – and again I would like to hear from you, actually, before we undertake any next steps. But I think I want to survey the faculty to see where are the barriers. Why aren't articles being deposited? And I listed a couple of reasons that I think are probably there, but I'd really like to hear firsthand what people see as barriers to using our repository. I'd like to use those responses to improve the procedure, so make it as simple as possible. Our goal is just to make it a no-brainer to do this. You shouldn't have to think too hard about this.

And then also draft revisions to the policy for consideration by Faculty Senate and University Council. So one thing about the policy, the law does not mandate that all articles be put in an open access repository. What it simply said was that there needed to be research done, and that there should be an effort to do this. This is a “should,” not a “must.” The way that the policy was written was as a “must.” And so I think that's one thing to take into consideration, or just to clarify that language to make it clear. There are some journals that simply do not allow to share the copyright, that do not allow for open access, and that's understandable. It's increasing. More and more publishers are evolving where they understand that this does not defeat their bottom line. But I think it's something that we need to take into consideration if we do revise the policy.

And then I think it's the library's role to promote the value of doing this. We have to get out there more. And we do have a staff person who can work on this with your faculty. We just need to get out there more and do this. And I think we've been doing a good job, but I think awareness is always kind of an uphill battle.

So, are there are questions or comments? I'd appreciate both. Yes.

K. Chung: I just want to know, what do you need to do in order to put the article into the depository? Does it have to be open access already? And then to put it in there?

F. Barnhart: No, actually, we provide a form that you can share. It's an addendum or a rider that you can share with your publisher that actually outlines what rights you're retaining to your article. And then it would be the post-print. So we can work with you on that. It depends on what the publisher is. There's a database called SHERPA/RoMEO that you can actually input the journal. You can see what the rights are that your publisher wants to retain. And we can work with you to make that available. We're looking at the post-print. We're not looking at the final print that would be going in the journal. We're looking at the post-peer review print. And so it won't look exactly like the journal. It won't be formatted in that way. But it would be cleaned up.

K. Chung: So if we have an article that is already published or accepted, then we should contact the library?

F. Barnhart: Yes, you can contact me or [Jaime Schumacher](#) is our staff person who works on that. And actually I should probably send this to this group.

K. Chung: How about the published already, like for many years?

F. Barnhart: That's fine. This Open Access Policy that was approved by the University Council was only meant to apply to articles from January 2015 forward. But if you want to put retro in there, we would love it. That's totally fine.

K. Chung: Okay and then does the library have any funding for faculty to publish their papers as an open access.

F. Barnhart: We do. So you're talking about open access where the publisher passes the fee along to the author. And the library does have a small fund that we're able to use. So if you have an opportunity to publish open access, we ask that it not be a hybrid journal. So in other words, that it be pure open access. We don't want it to be one where some people will have to pay for the article and other people don't have to pay for the article. So it's on our Website, but I can answer that more clearly if we talk about the publisher that you're referring to. But we're totally happy to help, because this is one of those things, every article is different, every publisher is different.

M. Haji-Sheikh: One of the issues is one of the largest engineering societies is IEEE, as you know. And they're one of the biggest publishers. They're very expensive. They're one of the biggest journal publishers in the world. They have journals in native languages, every major country. And

one of the problems with this is that it's mandatory to release your copyright when you're working with IEEE.

F. Barnhart: Yes, there's a variety of publishers that are out there. Some are very much more evolved about it, and others are much more sticklers for hanging onto that. Like I said, we do have a rider that you can send to the publisher. And surprisingly, even some publishers that state on their Website, "We do not allow copyright to be held by the author," they will be flexible if you contact them directly. They want exceptions; they don't want to make the rule broader.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Elsevier is the same way.

F. Barnhart: Yes.

K. Thu: Thank you. So this excludes books, I take it.

F. Barnhart: Yes.

K. Thu: Is there a mechanism, because that's going to impact history, and it's going to impact my department, which is a blend of journal articles and books. I'm thinking about the incentives for faculty to participate. And the additional citations is a big one for us. But it's also a fair amount of work for individuals. Besides getting your work out and broader exposure, can you think of any other incentives for faculty to spend some time doing this and giving me a little bit of ammunition so that I can go back to them and say, "This benefits." I mean, one of the things that I thought of is if you had all these, a fairly robust, deposit of anthropology journal articles, we could use that as a graduate student recruit tool.

F. Barnhart: Sure.

K. Thu: And we could put it on our Website or put a link on to our Website and let our graduate students know, here's all the wonderful stuff in one-stop shopping that you could get out of our department. If we can think of incentives like that to get faculty to participate, I think we'd get a long ways.

F. Barnhart: Absolutely. And I would love some feedback on how to do that. It's kind of the Holy Grail if we could figure that out. I think one of the other benefits, potentially, not to veer into another topic altogether, but open educational resources would really benefit from using open access articles. And this is kind of a good building block.

T. Arado: Any other questions for Fred? No? Well, thank you very much, appreciate it.

F. Barnhart: Thanks.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

T. Arado: Moving on through our agenda, we have no consent agenda today.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

T. Arado: So on to the Reports From Advisory Committees, we have the FAC to the IBHE, Linda Saborío.

L. Saborío: So, Fred, I have to say before you leave, I'm a little disappointed, I must have mis-read the agenda, I thought we were talking about open alcohol policy. Anything like that in the works? [laughter]

F. Barnhart: I'll come back.

L. Saborío: For the November meeting, we met at Illinois Wesleyan University in Normal, Illinois. So I can happily report that I did not have a come-to-Jesus moment during this last trip down to Normal, Illinois. The provost of Wesleyan spoke with the group about their innovative program offering a signature experience to undergraduates. Select undergrads are enrolled in courses based on first-year experience themes that are then promoted campus-wide. Their Undergrad Research Advisory Committee develops the themes and events for the program each year. I thought it sounded kind of interesting. And the program is in its initial stages, and they're hoping to expand it further in the coming years.

The group also got to meet with Dr. Al Bowman. He shared with us that there is a sense of optimism in Springfield – no applause there, hah? We are still looking at the effects of the budget impasse, in particular with unpaid bills, as we all know. But state revenues look good this year.

The IBHE is looking to request a ten percent increase in university operations funding, and a \$100 million increase in MAP funding, which would still only cover about 40 percent of eligible students in the state.

We are looking at \$1.8 billion in appropriations for SURS next year – let that sink in.

Some ideas for generating additional revenues are dispensaries and sports betting will be right there too [laughter]. He put it as legalizing recreational marijuana, right? We're not talking about PEZ dispensaries, you all got that, right? Okay, good.

We also had the opportunity to meet with Rep. Dan Brady. It was more of a listen to Dan Brady. Some questions that we asked were: How do we recover our reputational damage from the budget impasse? How can we address the educator licensure shortage? How can we reverse the out-migration from Illinois. And he had mentioned the AIM HIGH merit scholarship, increasing MAP funding. And how to address the erosion in higher education's operations budget? He didn't have answers to all those questions, by the way, other than "we're working on it." They are working on it, though.

Late in the afternoon, we had an informal conversation with Dr. Jason Helfer via phone – he's the deputy superintendent for ISBE – about the university's primary role in teacher preparation. And

you have the document up there that Pat is showing you. He reported that they are considering three paths to educator licensure: 1) from a sub-license to full license; 2) for career changers such as para-professionals; and 3) from a two-year alternate to a one-year program. And what you're seeing up there is a response to the many concerns regarding the proposed actions for addressing the teacher shortage in Illinois. And it was signed by all the public university presidents, several (not all) community college presidents and numerous independent college and university presidents in Illinois.

And number 3, you can tell, has to do with the real cause is inadequate salary. We actually suggested that they move that bullet point up higher in the list.

Next month we will be meeting with our working groups in place of a full FAC meeting. And my group has decided to meet in downtown Chicago, because I told them that I miss restaurants. On December 14, we'll be meeting down there, and I'll report to you in January on that meeting. Any questions? And this is going to be available through the minutes so you can take a look at it.

T. Arado: 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: All right the next report from an advisory committee is the UAC to the Board of Trustees, and that is me. As you heard earlier, I guess it was before Thanksgiving, the 15th of November, the Board of Trustees committee meetings took place. And there were a number of things that I found of interest that took place there.

First, there was recognition of the faculty and staff who received the 2018 special excellence awards, and a few of the people who received awards were there and were able to get up and speak to the board.

The Northwestern Medicine transition was discussed, and the transition was approved. As you heard here, the contract part is still going on.

Academic year and fiscal year 2020 tuition and room and board rates were presented, and they were basically left flat.

There was a discussion of the NIU IP holdings and processes, because the board had asked for information on what type of IP holdings the university has based on different things going on. So there was a presentation on that.

The Education System Center presented on their mission and the work they're doing in outreach.

And then legislative updates were given. Illinois is currently in its veto session. And in the General Assembly, that will start on – will get sworn in in January, there will be three additional NIU alums

joining the Illinois General Assembly. All three of them are in the House. That will bring our total in the entire General Assembly to ten.

Before taking this position, I have to admit I did not go very often to Board of Trustee committee meetings or Board of Trustees meetings. They can be really interesting, though. So the agenda gets put out a couple of days ahead of time. So if you take a look at the agenda to see if there's something on there of interest, anybody is welcome to come to these meetings. And it can be a rather good learning experience. And to me, it was really informative. It was great to see faculty and staff get up and be able to talk about what they got an award for. That was a feel-good moment. So for more information on all of these, they put out the reports that come out with the agenda, and then ultimately, the minutes. The minutes from that meeting weren't yet posted at the BOT page on the Website. And then on December 6 is the next full Board of Trustees meeting, and it takes place in Room 315 in Altgeld. And I know everybody on a Thursday wants to go hang out for four, five, six hours. But really, you can come and go. There are interesting things that happen throughout.

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

T. Arado: All right, on to our Reports From Standing Committees, of which we have very few. They actually all indicate no report, but I would certainly, if somebody had a report that I'm unaware of. I know RSB, though, might have an announcement to make, not necessarily a report, about the next RSB meeting.

J. Wilson: We do have a meeting coming up. Lisa Freeman is supposed to be in attendance at that meeting as well. And all are invited to come for our open discussion period that we have there. And also that's December 7 at 10 a.m. And if you have any questions that you would like to ask the senior leadership, then please either send it to me or to Pat Erickson so we can put those on the agenda. That's it.

T. Arado: Thanks, Jim.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. PUBLIC COMMENT

T. Arado: All right, that's the end of our reports. We have no unfinished or new business, so that brings us to our public comment. Do we have anyone who wishes, Michael?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yes. Many of you know, this is my last meeting. And I appreciate working with all you all. It's been fun. Sometimes it's been frustrating. And one thing I want everybody to remember: Your working conditions are the students' learning conditions. And that's something you should always remember, okay? And that is why I worked and fought so hard over the last few years, to try to improve that. Like I said, thank you and pretty soon this will be the end and in January I'll be out of here, so thanks.

T. Arado: Thank you, Michael. I do appreciate your passion in everything you do. It's nice to see that. Virginia?

V. Naples: Yes, I'd just like to say that I, for one, will miss his commentary and his insights and his willingness to stand up for the appropriate things that need to be done, and to follow the rules and do things correctly. If it had not been for his diligence and his research capabilities, many of the improvements that we have seen in the way the university has been run over the last few years would not have taken place. And I'd like to ask everybody to join me in giving him a round of applause. [applause]

T. Arado: 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](#), Student Senate
- M. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- O. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- P. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- Q. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- R. 2018-19 Faculty Senate future meeting dates: Jan 23, Feb 20, Mar 27, Apr 24

- S. 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](#).

- T. 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.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

T. Arado: Okay, so some of you I will see next week at UC. Otherwise, the next meeting of this body is on January 23. I hope the semester is wrapping up nicely for you all, and let's remember our students are going into their really stressful time. And so even though it's the end of the year and we all do the whole recap, what I can do, improve myself, let's remember that every day we get a new chance to make a difference in the world. So let's just take it day by day, rather than going with the full and make a difference every day and be a better world when we get there. [applause]

And I need a motion to adjourn.

K. Thu: So moved.

M. Haji-Sheik: So moved.

T. Arado: Kendall moved, Virginia second. Oh, we'll give Michael the second for his last meeting.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Second.

T. Arado: All right.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.