

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT**  
**Wednesday, February 25, 2015, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Baker, Bateni, Bond, Brubaker, Campbell, Carlson (for Plonczynski), Chakraborty, Chen, Chmaissem, Coronado, Dawson, Deng, Doederlein, Domke, Donovan, Ferrell, Feurer, Frascello, Fredericks, A. Freeman, L. Freeman, Haliczzer, Hathaway, Henning, Henry (for Block), Holly, Jaffee, Kamholz, Liu, Long, Macdonald, Mason, McCord, Mogren, Mohabbat, Monteiro, Moremen, Naples, Pitney, Riley, Sagarin, Shannon, Sorensen, Summers, Tahernezehadi (for Vohra)

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Abdel-Motaleb, Arriola, Block, Giese, Hedin, Khoury, Lee, Lenzewski, Neal, Perea, Plonczynski, Schoenbachler, Schwartz-Bechet, Starofsky, Ueckert, Vohra

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan, Kaplan, Klaper, Mann, Stafstrom, Weldy

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Armstrong, Coryell, Falkoff, Phillips, Stoddard

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

D. Baker: Good afternoon on this snowy day. Shall we get going?

Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m.

**II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**D. Baker:** So I'll call it to order and ask for an adoption of the agenda. Bill we had a modification?

**W. Pitney:** Yes, I'd like to just add one item under New Business and that would be some small edits to Article IX, so I'd like to modify the agenda accordingly.

**D. Baker:** Any other suggested edits to the agenda? Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion for approval with that edit.

**Unidentified:** So moved.

**S. Farrell:** Second.

**D. Baker:** Thank you. Any discussion? All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**D. Baker:** Opposed? We have an agenda.

### III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 28, 2015 MEETING

**D. Baker:** Approval of the minutes for January 28. Do we have a motion for approval?

**Unidentified:** So moved.

**Unidentified:** Second.

**D. Baker:** We have a move and a second and any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**D. Baker:** All opposed? Thank you.

### IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Budget Presentation – Doug Baker

**D. Baker:** All right, here we go, President's Announcements. You may have heard the governor's budget proposal. Pretty dramatic, wasn't it? Kind of took the wind out of everybody's lungs. Well I warned you in recent months that this is how the play is going to unfold. That the governor was going to want to have a significant reduction in the state budget to balance the budget and was unlikely to suggest revenue enhancements, a.k.a. tax increases or changes in the tax code. So he submitted his budget and now the legislature will take it on. Two Democratic houses will take it on.

What I want to do today is give you an overview from the macro down to the university. So from the state budget on down to our university's budget about what it is because there have been a lot of things written in papers and other places that say it's a certain percent cut or another percent cut. And I thought I'd kind of give you here's the budget from macro to micro so you can talk with your colleagues about this and kind of get people all oriented the same ways so we're talking about the same things.

When we talk about the budget let's start with the state budget. How big is the operating budget for the whole state? The answer is in the top left corner, \$31.4 billion. A pretty big number. What do they spend all that money on? Well let's break it down. The big piece, the purple piece, the biggest piece of the budget is on education. And I'll come back to that, and we'll look at the slide to the right, but let's go around the wheel here first. The biggest chunk is education. The second biggest chunk is health and human services. And that includes Medicaid and that's an area that's eaten state budgets alive for the last 20 years around the United States is health care has not been reformed. Medicaid has gone up by dramatic amounts and it had to come from somewhere else in the pie. In many states, including ours, it's come from operating budgets for higher education.

These slides, by the way, will be available for you and they'll be on the University Council website. So if you want to download them and look at them or share them, you can do that. The next one is government services, \$3.8 billion, so Department of Natural Resources and all those departments. The next is public safety, five percent, and then finally the other category of \$167 million.

Now let's look at education. We're kind of interested in education. What do they spend most of the money in education on? Seventy-five percent of it is K-12. Out of the governor's budget proposal, he suggested an increase of over \$300 million to the budget and a \$389 million reduction in higher education. So he's taking from the bottom sliver our \$1.2 billion and taking a similar amount and putting it up in K-12. The orange bar is SURS, the retirement, \$1.3 billion. Community colleges, a much smaller amount, 345, about one percent. And then the ISAC and MAP and other grants and another one percent sliver. Any questions on that slide? It will give you a sense of proportion about where we fit in the state budget. We're not a very big player are we?

So when we go down and stomp our feet and say higher education is the future of the economy, which it is, they're looking at a pie chart like this going: Well I've got some other needs I've got to deal with here to deal with a budget that has a structural deficit, depending on who you talk to, \$6 billion or so they need to cover. So if you wiped out all the funding for public education you'd be a sixth of the way to their solution. That's the magnitude of what they have to deal with at the state level at this point. Got it? That's where higher ed fits in a big state budget and that's the state operating budget. Let's go to the next one.

We'll take that little sliver, that little green sliver of \$1.229 billion. Here's the \$1.229 billion. Here's what it's spent on. The first column is fiscal year appropriations by university. So Chicago State, \$37 million; Eastern Illinois, \$43; on down to us at \$93 million. That's our appropriation this year. And you might ask: Why is there a blue line under Western Illinois? The answer is, if you add up all the operating budgets from Western Illinois up to Chicago State, that's about how much money the governor is cutting out of higher education. Okay got a feel for the magnitude now? That's what 31 percent looks like. What the governor is proposing to cut out of higher education. What he's proposed to the legislature. Now the legislature will take it under debate. So the governor's proposed budget is to reduce us by \$387 million dollars. That's at the bottom of the third column and then parenthetically above that is the amount of cut for each university and then the actual dollars in the column in between the first and the third, the second column. So the higher education budget would shrink to \$842 million from \$1.2 billion. Okay and you can see in there our cut from the \$93 million would be \$29 million. There may be additional reductions based on what they're doing with shifting the cost of insurance. So there may be \$3, \$4, \$5 billion shifted to our budget from that. We don't know yet. We haven't heard the details. That's 31.5 percent.

Now, just to really cheer you up, that's not our only source of revenue reduction. Our main driver for revenue at the university is tuition, fees, room and board. Let's go to the next page. You've seen this chart before. We used during the town hall meetings in the fall. This is our enrollment trend over the last 12 years. Our enrollment this semester is 19,000. That's a drop. A function of both recruitment and retention and we've been working on retention and I've thanked you and I'll thank you again for the five percent increase in retention this last fall. We're basically flat fall to spring in terms of retention, so we've got to see if all these important activities we're undertaking from first year on are going to have another positive impact on retention in this coming fall. That's going to be an important piece. It's an important piece for our mission. We want our students to come and succeed and to do that they have to stay. So critically important that we do that. And on the recruitment side we're not going to get a turnaround in our recruitment activities by waiting for the demography to shift. We've got a

decade of flat high school graduates. So we've got to think about how do we get more market share, so to speak, from our community colleges, from our high schools, from adult learners, from international students, from businesses, and other organizations. So we need to be thinking back to that triangle plan and the strategic plan. How do we hook up our students and our faculty with the outside folks, our stakeholders that we're serving and fulfilling our mission with? This will impact our enrollments as well, or our, well this is our enrollments. It will impact our revenue.

So let's look at revenue. Here's our budget with just three pie pieces. We can break it down in more detail, but I wanted to give you again a sense of scale and scope here. Our total budget, our total operating budget, is \$426 million this year. The green part, the big pie slice, is not fungible. This is money that has to be spent on what the money is allocated to. So they may be Pell grants that are passing through the institution. We can't take that and pay your salary. We have to do the Pell contract. There are grants and contracts in here. So if the National Science Foundation gives us money to go do arctic research or Antarctic research, guess what, we gotta go spend it on that. We can't pay salaries and electrical bills and that kind of stuff. Also there's the revenue bond money. So students who are living in residence halls pay a housing fee; the housing fee pays the bond. You can't take that money and not do it. We're obligated by the bond to do it. So the green pie piece is off the table for reduction. That's what we got to spend it on.

So that leaves us about \$233 million out of that \$426 million that's in the blue and the red. So the blue is the state appropriation and the red is our income fund a.k.a. tuition and fees. Okay? So when the governor says it's only a six percent cut for higher education, he's putting the numerator to be this whole pie chart and then he's putting the \$29 million over that. I guess this is the denominator. Did I say it backwards? This is the denominator and the numerator is \$29 million. So that's how he got the percentage he did when, in fact, that's not fungible, that's not money we can move around.

There has also been talk about foundations. Why can't the foundations just pay your bills? Well the corpus of the foundation is composed of donations. Donations almost always have an earmark. They are for scholarships for accounting students. They are for scholarships for music students or a particular program. They too are typically not fungible. And it's not that much money. So that's not going to solve our problem. They are difference makers, that's good. Or there may be people that have helped us build a facility and they have said we will pay the bond, we're going to sign a contract and we will give you X amount of money every year to work on paying off a particular facility. Again, not fungible dollars. Okay we're talking about \$233 million that we can work with here in our operating budget. Any questions on that one? Next page.

This is what the pie chart would look like if the governor's proposal went through and if we had a 500 student drop in enrollment. So you can see the green chart, here flip back to the previous one, see the green slice, bigger in the second one because of the shrinkage in both enrollments and state allocations. So just to give you a sense of what it would look like. So a 500 student drop and the drop in state support equates to, here's the top right corner, \$40 million. That's a big number. \$40 million out of \$233 million or now less than that, out of \$386 million. Okay? I'm framing for you here what we've got in front of us. Let's go to the next one.

It's a little bit busy and I have a chart with the numbers on it but I'll show you the figure and

then I'll show you the chart the figure came from that may be easier to read than this one. What do we spend our money on? If we've got \$433 million, what did we spend it on, or \$423 million, what did we spend it on? Well the blue part is academic affairs. The next biggest pie piece is that pink one, \$26 million. That's central money for utilities and things like that. That's kind of keeping the lights on and running the campus stuff. The next big one is the red one. It's a former category called operations and community relations. That was the stuff that was under Bill Nicklas before we reorganized his area. So it's facilities, it was human resources, community relations, police department, that kind of stuff. We've eliminated his position and dispersed those into other areas, but that will give you a feel for what facilities, etc. cost. The green one, student affairs and enrollment management. The next one is information technology, outreach and engagement, finance, marketing communications, athletics, university advancement, research and innovation partnerships, executive office and internal audit, internal affairs, and general counsel. Any questions on that one? The actual numbers are easier to read on the next slide.

This is the table from which that came. That pie chart is the first column on this table. That first column is our operating funds from state appropriations and income funds a.k.a. tuition and fees. So that's what I charted. Now there's other funds and those are the ones that go into that untouchable part, the revenue bonds and the other sources of grants and contracts, etc. So this is the table to show you where that money goes. Go back to the pie chart just for a second. Any surprises on the proportions here?

**B. Jaffee:** Well, I actually have a question about the categories. What comes under academic affairs? What does that represent?

**L. Freeman:** The colleges, the library, the graduate school, the provost's office, advising.

**B. Jaffee:** Thank you.

**D. Baker:** I guess we shouldn't be surprised that that's the stuff we spend most of our money on. Any other questions on that one? Go back to the table then. Any questions on the table? Again if you want to study this in detail you can log on to the UC page and go through it. Okay? Now, sometimes you'll hear a legislator say we're putting more money into higher education. Why are you guys complaining? And we kind of shake our heads and go what are you talking about? Next chart.

Here's what we're talking about. The red lines are our operating budgets. They have been going down and, if you go back to 2002, they've gone down by \$25 million from today back to 2002. This rate of decline doesn't look that dramatic. If you go back a few more years, you see a big drop. So \$25 million back when you get on the other side of 2008, you see a big drop here. So we stair step down and then we've been gradually declining in state support as other pieces of the budget have gotten eaten up. Now this green piece says state support on behalf payments. So at the very top here it explains what on behalf payments are. That's employee fringe benefits, your insurance and your retirement. So we know the pension system is troubled. And the pension system is troubled because the curve keeps going up. And so they're spending more and more and more on that and then cutting the operation budget. So if you look at the aggregate to a legislator it might say well wait a minute, we're giving more money to higher education. When we're living it, we're saying, you're killing us. You're dropping our operating budgets year after year and harming our ability to perform or fulfill our mission. Not good. There's the different

altitudes that you're at. You can get different responses. Questions on that one?

The bottom line for us is, with a reduction in operating budgets, it's harming our ability to fulfill our mission. We don't have the money that we need to do what we need for the students, for our research and our outreach activities. So we've got to be rethinking all of this. It looks like my printer died and the next slide isn't in my pack so. You're out of slides? Is that it? Okay, I'm out of slides. So what we wanted to do was lay context. We went from the macro level of: Here's what the state budget looks like, to: Here's what the education budget looks like, then the higher ed budget and then: How do we spend our money? Where does it come from? And how do we spend it at NIU?

Now what do we think is going to happen? Do we think the legislature will actually adopt a 31 percent reduction for universities? No. I think that chart that I showed you could zero out the operating budgets at all the schools except Southern and the University of Illinois and almost get to the reduction level the governor suggested. It kind of puts it in a framework to say no we can't do this, this is just not okay. This will unravel the economy of the state. It can't happen. So now we need to go back and we will talk in the legislature in the coming weeks and months about options. We're going to talk to them about the impact of a \$30 million reduction to the university and we will take some of you down there to help us testify. Last year I took a number of students down and I think that they were very impressive. And legislators listen to students. And I'm sure they can – they just have to tell the truth and it's impressive. We'll work with students and faculty and staff. We'll make our case. I'm testifying on the 19<sup>th</sup> and the 26<sup>th</sup> in the House and Senate, of March. Looking forward to it.

Yesterday I had a meeting with the presidents and chancellors. We held a telephone conference. It's the second or third one that we've held since the governor's announcement. We're all on the same page. We're all feeling the same things, we're on message together. So I think that's important.

Our legislative officers met today, Mike, and discussed next steps from their perspective so they're coordinating around the state and in Springfield. But the reality is the state has a structural deficit and it's going to have to deal with it. So we're going to have debates about revenue enhancements and what might be possible there. Are there different ways to think about taxes in the state, different things to raise revenue from? But there's also going to be an examination of efficiencies and closures. On the efficiencies side, they'll be looking to institutions to do what we have already charted out to do and that is, for example, program prioritization and process re-engineering. Can we look at any of our programs – academic and non-academic – and say we can disinvest in some of these or invest in the ones where we're bottlenecked and could really grow. So that program prioritization process is partly underway. We can have Lisa answer any questions on that that you have. And then also we're going to be working on process reengineering. We can all in this room identify at least one process that isn't as efficient as we hoped it would be inside the institution and make our lives simpler and probably streamline the work. I think we can do these things and we can probably, if we can get a little breathing room, do them without harm to our faculty and staff. But we've got to get some breathing room in the coming legislative session and so we're going to work hard on that. Do you have any questions? I know Lisa has talked about program prioritization in the past, but do you have any updated questions since we last met?

**B. Jaffee:** I'd like to see a chart that broke down administrative salaries and faculty salaries.

**D. Baker:** Sure, we can do that. I think we did report on the reduction in senior administrative salaries here recently.

**B. Jaffee:** I'm a sucker for pie charts.

**D. Baker:** Yeah, let me get my glasses. Was there one – there was a slice in one of the pie charts I think that had a hint at it here, let's see. Yeah so executive office and internal audit on this chart. Yep, you're good. Which one is it? It's the general counsel, internal affairs, so it's three back, so it's \$1.3 million.

**B. Jaffee:** For what?

**D. Baker:** That's all the people that report, the suite of people that report to me. But we can give you more detail in that if you want. Lisa do you want to say anything on any of the...

**L. Freeman:** I would just like to commend the Student Association and Vice Provost Douglass. We've had a series of very constructive conversations and through those we found an innovative way to include more student voices in the program prioritization process. We were able to brainstorm together and come up with some really good ideas and we're looking forward to enacting them together. And I think that speaks very well to the spirit and the practice of shared governance at NIU and the importance of our students to the institution.

**D. Baker:** Other questions or comments or any tables you want to go back to? Joe?

**J. Frascello:** I was going to say this in my report but since we're on the topic right now, first of all thank you for that acknowledgement. We feel the same way about shared governance and our Director of Governmental Affairs, Ben, will talk a little bit more about that during the report. I want to mention that I am a part of the Illinois Student Government Association as the president of this Student Association. And I think it's pretty obvious that this is a big topic for students in the state of Illinois. At our next meeting we're going to be going over how this Rauner budget is going to be affecting higher education if it is to be passed, if it is to be unaffected by the state legislature, if it's going to be passed in that same way. If not, then it looks like we're still going to be in a little bit of hot water in terms of budget and prioritization. But the point we want to make is that students should be heard. And education is important. And we looked at the breakdown of the K through 12 how it was much larger than the higher education and we have tremendous respect for education in the state of Illinois K through 12, but we can't forget about what happens to those young people when they hit 18, 19, 20 and they still want to receive their education. That's not to mention the plenty of non-traditional students outside of the age range. So we'll be organizing. We're still in the infancy stage since this is relatively new information and we like to keep you updated. And we're also going to be a part of that as you mentioned, going to Springfield and we look forward to those conversations as heated or as not heated as they have to be.

**D. Baker:** It will be good theater.

**J. Frascello:** Thank you.

**B. Jaffee:** I was wondering, Dr. Freeman, if you could say something about you said there was brainstorming. Maybe that's going to be in this report later, but what are the ways in which students will be involved in the program prioritization?

**L. Freeman:** Ben, do you want me to wait until your report?

**B. Donovan:** You will be taking my report.

**L. Freeman:** Let's wait for Ben's report.

**B. Jaffee:** That's fine.

**D. Baker:** Good question, though. So there are a number of groups that are looking at this and saying we really need to present our case. We're not sure if people really understand what impact this is going to have. So we're on two tracks: One is we need to make our case with our friends in Springfield and really show the impact and effect on the budget in a positive way. There are a lot of things we need to be doing on that and we're working on it. I think having the student voice engaged is good. Bill, you are going to talk with some of your senate colleagues around the state?

**W. Pitney:** Yeah, well, the Council for University Faculty Senate Presidents, we've had some communications this past week to kind of bring our voices together. Next Wednesday, on the fourth, our executive committee for the Faculty Senate and members of the RSB are going to get together. We're going to have some dialog about the budget, but we're also going to take that time to discuss what type of message we would like to send and hopefully consolidate our voices across the state in relation to the budget.

**D. Baker:** Are staff groups doing anything around that State? Do Jay or Deb know?

**D. Haliczzer:** No, not yet.

**D. Baker:** Okay, so on one hand we need to be working in that environment making that case. On the other hand, we need to do some planning inside, some contingency planning. I've asked all of my vice presidents to develop contingency plans and at a very high level. And this is going to allow us to then have the data to make the case in Springfield. We need to say: What is the impact going to be? So we have to do a high-level plan and then put that data together and then be able to present that in a fair way, really showing what the impact is.

On the other hand we also have to be doing some contingency planning for management purposes inside. So Lisa and I met with Bill this week and talked through some of those issues. We're going to call a meeting of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee next Wednesday. We'll go over the material with them. It will be a good start, I think, to go over this in detail and dive into it a little bit more and look at options. We'll follow the governance processes and do it the right way. We need to get going on that conversation though. My guess is this is going to be a long legislative session. Mike said they're talking about pack for the summer. Bring your shorts to Springfield. So we'll see. It will be contentious, but you never know, they could come up with a solution too. I'm optimistic. The good news is I think both sides understand the gravity

of the problem, and with the dynamic we've got, they're not going to kick the can down the road. They're going to actually have to come to some solutions with revenue and cuts. That's where we are. Please?

**R. Moremen:** Is there any discussion of contingency planning for either outcome of the court decision with regard to the pension plan?

**D. Baker:** Mike, do you know? Have you heard contingency planning on that, or Jerry or anybody? Oh, Jerry is not here. That seems to be kind of in the darker shadows right now.

**R. Moremen:** Soon to come to the forefront, though.

**D. Baker:** Most likely. It could impact us if they try to do some kind of shifting of the expense on to us. So again we've got to make this case saying: Look, you've reduced us by \$25 million or 20 percent over the last decade. This stair step down is not sustainable. You need to rethink this whole picture. That's the case we're making. Okay? So it's going to be a long session and it will be a roller coaster ride. And there'll be glimmers of excitement and joy and there may even be a positive outcome. There are potentially ways to have positive outcomes from this thing, believe it or not, and we're going to work our hardest to make those happen. Anybody else on the – other vice presidents want to say anything? Got it? Okay.

## **V. CONSENT AGENDA**

## **VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES**

- A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – no report
- B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and William Pitney – no report
- C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – no report
- D. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Dan Gebo – no report
- E. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Greg Waas – no report
- F. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee – Bill Pitney – no report

**D. Baker:** All right. Reports from the various councils, so I think Jay's first up.

**J. Monteiro:** I'm just going to leave you to read our report as it is. I do want to point out that Friday is the deadline for turning in nominations for the Outstanding Service Award and in a time of low morale that's a good way to honor your Civil Service employees. It doesn't cost anything to turn in the nomination forms and that's due this Friday.

**D. Baker:** How do people do that?

**J. Monteiro:** Actually, the website is in the minutes there. You can just click there and it will take you to the form and also to the instructions of what documentation you need to turn in with that.

**D. Baker:** Great. Any questions for Jay on the report or that? Thank you, Jay.

G. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – Deborah Haliczzer, Jay Monteiro and Bill Pitney – [report](#) – Page 3

H. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – no report

I. Academic Policy Committee – Virginia Naples, Chair – no report

J. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – no report

K. Rules and Governance Committee – Jana Brubaker, Chair – no report

L. University Affairs Committee – Greg Long, Chair – report

1. Approve [2024-25 academic calendar](#) – Pages 4-6

**D. Baker:** Greg, I think you're up next, University Affairs Committee.

**G. Long:** The University Affairs Committee is charged with approving the calendar ten years hence and so to look we followed the rules and policies and procedures and as indicated in your packet we've got the academic calendar for 2024-2025. We reviewed it. It appears that we're on target for the things that are planned and we're supposed to be doing. So I'd like to make a motion that it be accepted.

**D. Baker:** Have a second?

**D. Haliczzer:** Second.

**D. Baker:** Any discussion? All those in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**D. Baker:** Opposed? So it passes. Anything else, Greg?

**G. Long:** No.

**D. Baker:** All right, thank you.

M. Student Association – Joe Frascello, President – report

**D. Baker:** Joe from the Student Association. You have your report.

**J. Frascello:** Thank you. Since we discussed the budget and how the Student Association is going to be a part of that discussion, I want to ask Ben, our Director of Governmental Affairs, to talk a little bit more about the prioritization process and the students' role in that which will, hopefully, answer your questions.

**B. Donovan:** Hi everyone. So, last week Speaker Domke, myself and our Director of Academic Affairs Alex Martin sat down with Provost Freeman, Dr. Pitney and others to have a discussion about the concerns of the administration about having students on the prioritization task forces. I think we had a very productive conversation. A lot of misconceptions were straightened out. Concerns were raised, we had some good arguments. I think it was, like I said, a very productive conversation and the meeting ending with us, I think, exploring two possible ideas getting student members onto the coordinating committee for the prioritization and the possibility of maybe having a student panel review the recommendations of the prioritization task forces. If I'm not mistaken, at the senate meeting this past Sunday, it was announced that there will be one undergraduate and one graduate student on the coordinating committee for prioritization and the panel idea is going to be developed, as far as I know. I said at the end of the meeting that we had last week, I'm sure it was reiterated in the senate, we are very happy that the administration put so much care and concern into involving students in the process and we're happy that we were able to come to you and have this conversation about increasing student involvement. Like I said, I think it was very productive.

**B. Jaffee:** I just want to be sure I understood that. So there will be one undergrad and one grad student on the coordinating committee and there'll also be a student panel that reviews changes after the fact, is that correct?

**L. Freeman:** If the overall question is what's different, that's the answer. And the panel process isn't outlined. If the overall question is how are students involved, that's a slightly different answer. And so we have just completed, and Bill and Caroline are here if I screw something up, please help out here. We have just completed the criterion survey in terms of getting the responses. Those responses will be looked at by a joint panel of the Academic Planning Council and the Resource, Space and Budget Committee with a couple of additional members from various constituencies including the SA. There's also a student on the Resource, Space and Budget Committee. So into the criteria choice and formulation and resolution, students will have an opportunity there.

As soon as we've completed the criteria finalization, we'll also be asking for the nomination of people to serve on the task forces; the administrative review task force and the academic review task force. And students will be able to nominate faculty and staff to serve on those task forces so students will have an opportunity for input there.

In terms of the data that programs analyze and the narratives that they submit in support of those analysis, student preferences will be reflected in a couple of different ways. First of all, some of the data that we look at will provide information about student preferences, enrollments, etc. Those will be both in the quantitative metrics and then in the qualitative data that programs can use to support their narratives. So we suspect that there'll be student data from surveys or teaching evaluations. We'll have a special template for student input for the programs to use to help build their cases.

So there will be student voices coming in the advocacy phase which is really what the programs do with the data and the criterion. Then those will go to the task forces and the two task forces are the places where there will not be students sitting and we had a very robust discussion about that. I was very impressed with the passion and the intellect on both sides of the question and in the end we decided, because of the time commitment and because of the vulnerability of students in a position like that, it made a lot more sense to build a new step that honored the importance of students in our governance process without creating issues related to graduation, time, vulnerability, intimidation. And so we will be working with the S.A. to construct that second student panel. And what it's going to look like so that student feedback on the prioritized programs becomes part of what's used by the leadership to connect the prioritized programs to action. Then, of course, after prioritization, the various recommendations that come out of the task force will have to go through our normal shared governance process. And so then the student representation on the curriculum committees, Resource, Space and Budget, the student trustee, I mean all of that will also come into play. There are two new places that we were able to identify as a great way to increase student participation, but there was significant student participation at a number of places along the way.

**D. Baker:** Joe, any other pieces?

**J. Frascello:** In other news, Student Association elections for the executive branch is going to be at the end of next month. What are the dates on that? The 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> so just a heads up. Thank you.

**D. Baker:** Any questions for the students? All right. I do appreciate you inviting the folks in last Sunday to work with them and I applaud you on your creative solutions to this. I think it will strengthen the process. I appreciate that dialog.

N. Operating Staff Council – Jay Monteiro, President – [report](#) – Page 7-8

**D. Baker:** Jay, you're back up, Operating Staff Council.

**J. Monteiro:** I am and I need to apologize. I actually gave that report the last time. I'm not used to giving this other report and it just kind of went out there so if we can just swap them around here. For the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, again the report is right there, but basically the meeting was spent finessing some changes to proposed bylaws and listed there in the report are the different subjects that were discussed. And these were bylaws that had actually been brought up at a previous meeting, they were just doing a second reading on those. There it is and it sounds like the next meeting will be spent doing the same thing.

**D. Baker:** Questions, comments? All right, thanks, Jay.

O. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczzer, President – [report](#) – walk-in

**D. Baker:** SPS Council. Deb you have a walk-in report?

**D. Haliczzer:** I do have a walk-in report and so you have in front of you the walk-in report to read. You can read most of what we're up to certainly going around participating in the events of campus and trying to push morale. Morale is the theme that's being discussed extensively by

SPS and Operating Staff Council, Faculty Senate, and University Benefits Committee. And we all recognize that some people are concerned about the financial side of morale. It isn't everything and so what can we do within our abilities. So morale issues, collaborations, what we're working on. SPS Council was pleased that HR is expanding the amount and degree and variety of supervisor training that we're offering this semester and upcoming semesters. So that's been well received. Working on customer service and that's going to be expanded more and so we'll have a report for you very soon.

And let me announce a few of our staff awards which I can announce at this point. We had 14 nominations for the presidential award, four have been selected. I can't give you their names yet because they don't know they're it yet. We've only presented two of the awards. We have two more to go. So at next meeting you'll know who they are. That being said, we have announced the staff awards, the additional ones that address morale issues. So the award for advocacy on behalf of the institution, this is a person who will work on keeping us out of trouble, keeping us in compliance, goes to Laura Sala of General Counsel who has done dual duty with procurement over the past year. The award for cultural competency goes to Deborah Pierce of International Affairs. And Institutional Advancement, his is providing our data, working on business things behind the scenes people that most of us don't know, goes to Roger Maas from the Provost's Office. Excellence in Supervision and this was a nomination by her entire staff, goes to Marilyn Bellert of Outreach and P-20 Engagement. Partnerships and collaboration which is our really peculiar award goes to either a person or an office or an entity which helps out SPS in multiple ways and that award goes to the NIU Annuitants Association for all of their advocacy on behalf of all current employees not just retirees. So those are all out. Award for service to the SPS Council is going to Melissa Burlingame of Environmental Studies and the other four are still unnamed. April 14 will be our awards event and I'll remind you at our next meeting but again, let me reiterate what Jay is saying, please always remember to nominate because all of us who have ever been nominated for any award, it's the nomination. It's the vote of support by your supervisor, your staff, your colleagues that makes all the difference in the awards. And getting the award, icing on the cake. Thank you.

**D. Baker:** Thanks. Any comments for Deb? Dillon?

**D. Domke:** I wanted to make one about the first point on there. The representative that came, Joshua Nixon, is not part of the Student Association.

**D. Haliczzer:** Oh, I thought he was, sorry.

**D. Domke:** He is part of the Honors Student Association so easily confused. But I also wanted to say just on the initiative that he has brought up, I actually sat down with him this morning and we're going to have legislation on the floor of the senate to possibly fund about a quarter of the project that is spoken about in your report.

**D. Haliczzer:** Thanks. We got a lot of support for the concept and a lot of enthusiasm by the whole council and we had over 50 people there. So good job, more collaboration in the future.

**D. Baker:** Any other comments? All right let's move on. Thank you, Deb.

P. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, FS Liaison to UBC – [report](#) – Pages 9-10

**D. Baker:** The next one is just a written report. It's from the University Benefits Committee. Brian is not here today so just written. Any questions or comments on it?

Q. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Mary Beth Henning, Chair

## VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 9](#) – walk-in Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor

**D. Baker:** Hearing none, we'll move on to new business and Bill you had some new business.

**W. Pitney:** This is just a first reading of some small additions to Article IX. As our evaluation committee for the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor was getting their processes in place to conduct their evaluation, they noticed that there was some missing language in the article. Conspicuous by its absence was Supportive Professional Staff in the language there. So just in an effort to clean up our bylaws and make it clear, the change is just to add Supportive Professional Staff member in there as well as faculty throughout that article. So pretty simple change. Any questions or comments?

**D. Baker:** So, do we need a motion?

**W. Pitney:** I don't think so. We take the motion and second the next time, right?

**B. Jaffee:** Has this position been filled by someone from the Supportive Professional Staff in the past? I guess if the language isn't in there, the answer to that would be no.

**W. Pitney:** The requirements to fill the position is the person has to be faculty status.

**B. Jaffee:** So, it's not a small change.

**W. Pitney:** Well, in 2008, the SPS Personnel Advisor, the SPS piece was put into the title to represent both employment classifications. What was never changed throughout the rest of the language is adding SPS in there throughout the other language.

**D. Baker:** All right, so that's a first reading and we can vote on it down the stream.

## IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

**D. Baker:** Next is comments from the floor? No okay. I direct your attention to the information items and I think that oddly enough concludes us pretty early. Is that okay? Thanks for coming out on this snowy day. Just as a closing remark, I really wanted to get that budget information in front of you to give you a context because you're going to see stuff written and spoken about and I want you to have the facts about how the budget is structured at the state level and education as

a whole and then here at the university so you know how much money we're really talking about and what we spend it on. Please look at that and if you hear inconsistencies among your friends, direct them to the information or give them a little primer on it and then that will help us shape our contingency planning in your units and more broadly across the institution in academic and non-academic areas. But the first step here is to understand where we are.

**J. Stafstrom:** We are beginning the process of prioritization on this campus. Is there something comparable going on at the state level (no microphone)

**D. Baker:** It's an interesting question because you could look at that pallet and I kind of gave a whimsical in saying you could close seven campuses and solve the problem for the state. You'd create a whole bunch of other problems. Yeah, that's an excellent question. Do you cut everyone 31 percent or do you look at structural relationships? Do you rethink the structure of education or higher education in the state? Do you think about – if you were to think about how to design an education system, you wouldn't do what we do in the United States. Kind of what we do in the United States is the first five years it's critically important for brain development and child self-efficacy and getting kids off on the right track, what do we do? Nothing, right? So you're on your own. If you live in poverty and your parents work or your parent works and you don't have the time or the resources, you come to kindergarten behind. And then if you're in an impoverished neighborhood, you probably have a low tax base and you have less money for your school system so, if you're behind, we put you in a less well-financed school system and then we hope you catch up and then we start testing you, right? And then, when you get to be in high school and you're not tested, we try to remediate you back to health on something that started a decade before.

And I think you've heard me, maybe you haven't heard this. One of our graduates here, Ehren Jarrett, is the Superintendent for District 205 in Rockford and he has 2000 seniors this year. Of those 2000 seniors, 40 percent will graduate and be ready for college or a career, 40 percent. Thirty percent will graduate and need remediation and 30 percent won't graduate. When you ask him what predicts who is going to be in each of those three categories, he says, I can predict fairly accurately by third grade math and reading scores. And what predicts third grade math and reading scores? Poverty. So we've got a generation in the pipeline that we need to address and then we're here trying to recruit students and 40 percent of those 2000 seniors are ready to come be with us. We've created a system that doesn't work particularly well. And then we don't coordinate as well with the high schools or the middle schools or the community service folks that are working in the first five years as we could to fix the system. And we don't dovetail as well with the community colleges. So you could probably look at this as a P-20 or lifelong learning kind of system. By the way, we don't do a great job for adult learners either and their continuing education as a system. You could rethink the whole system or you could rethink chunks of the system and say: Could you put this together differently? Could we work on this? There are probably better ways to do it than what we've drawn up. It will probably be upon us to think about it. We know more about education than the legislature does so, if we can come up with ideas on how to do that, I think we should probably present them. So I'm open to that if we want to think about those structural kinds of priorities and reorganizations. Do you have ideas?

**J. Stafstrom:** More task forces.

**D. Baker:** Yeah, committee on committees. Maybe we need everybody to go have some

beverage and sit around a round table and get their pens and napkins out and redraw the education system.

**Unidentified:** (No microphone) I'm currently working for a non-for-profit organization that works with children in that particular age group and that particular situation where they're dealing with poverty. Maybe having a university endorsement to those types of organizations so that perspective students, parents, people in the community can say, you know what, that type of organization is going to help my child get into a university like NIU.

**D. Baker:** It's not a bad idea. You know we've got that P-20 collaborative that the P-20 Center Marilyn and Laurie Elish-Piper are leading, and that's bringing together the northern regional community colleges, us, and the K-12 systems as well as employers looking at these pipeline issues. We've made a lot of progress over the last nine months. That was the thing we got invited to the White House for a couple of months ago. Coming out of that, we had four committees working and we decided we needed a fifth focal area and that was birth to grade three, that we hadn't focused enough on that, that we were looking at the other segments in the pipe.

And so now we've gone back and we've had some meetings with our folks and the Rockford school system to see if we can get a birth to third grade group going and sharing ideas around this. So your idea fits very well into that. We've also been working with, Anne's been leading an effort with four community colleges to build strong linkages with the community colleges so where students aren't transferring the way they ought to or they don't know about us or financial aid and advising are not as seamless as they should be.

There are probably ways at that end of the pipeline that we need to be looking. You could probably take every piece along the way as well as the context that it lays in. So birth to kindergarten, if you're in poverty there's different pipes, and that piece of the pipe is laying in a more toxic environment that's not facilitating the kids' growth as opposed to being in a different neighborhood with a more affluent community. We've got to think about all the manifolds going into our pipe and the context they're laying in and what do we as a higher education institution do?

I saw an amazing speech at the 2012 Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. It was by the president of the University of Texas at El Paso, Diana Natalicio. And if you Google APLU2012 video you'll get a page that's got like six videos on it. Secretary Gates was one of the speakers. She was another APLU2012 video. It's worth the 20 minutes. She was the keynote luncheon speaker and she talked about what she found when she took over at UTEP. What she found was a heavily Hispanic service area, about 75 percent. And among the lowest, if not the lowest, going to college rate and lowest high school graduation rate. And 25 years later, fast forward, they have the highest going to college and graduation rate in the state. How did they do it? When she got there, she went to the school system and said why are you guys sending us all these ill prepared students? They said, why are you sending us all these ill prepared teachers? Oh. It's a circle it's not a line. So the pipe was a circle.

And so she spent the next 25 years working with her faculty across multiple disciplines, not just education, working out into communities to work on all these issues from poverty on through and today it's a great success story. So if you want to watch an inspiring talk to give us some hints about what we might do to think systemically about transformations we can make and the

linkages we can make and the partnerships we can make and the resources that flow to that when you're making progress, check out her talk. It's an inspiring piece. Thanks for the question.

All right, think systems, think big. We'll show up here in a few weeks and we'll do round two and we'll update you on where we are with the legislature. Thanks.

## **X. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- E. [Minutes](#), Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- I. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- J. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- O. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- P. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee

## **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**D. Baker:** Motion to adjourn. Second. All in favor? Farewell.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.