

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, March 2, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, D. Baker, G. Baker (for Sagarin), Bauer, Bishop, Block, Bond, Brubaker, Builta, Carlson, Chakraborty, Chen, Cordes, Deng, Doederlein, Domke, Douglass (for Freeman), Farrell, Hanley, Hathaway, Holt, Hulseberg (for Liberty-Baczek), Irwin (for Thu), Joseph, Khoury, Kreml, Lagioia, Lee, Long, Macdonald, McCord, Naples, Nicholson, Novak, Nissenbaum, Olson, Pavkov, Penrod, Pitney, Riley, Rodgers, Saborio, Scherer, Slotsve, Staikidis, Sto. Domingo, Towell (for Schoenbachler), Vander Schee, Vazquez, Wang, Wood

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Campbell, Carey, Dhar, Elish-Piper, Freeman, Gilson, Jaffee, Jemison, Liberty-Baczek, Sagarin, Schoenbachler, Thomas, Thu, Vohra, Wagenecht

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Coryell, Falkoff, Jacob, Kaplan, Klaper, Phillips, Stoddard, Weldy

OTHERS ABSENT: Hoffman, Konen

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Good afternoon. Great turnout. Thanks for being here. As a reminder, everybody that's eligible to have a clicker got a clicker? Okay, good. Oh, yes, excellent. We don't want any people missing. And everybody that's not supposed to have a clicker, put it back.

D. Baker called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: Okay, first item, the adoption of the agenda. Do I have a motion? Bill Penrod. Nissenbaum. Additions, deletions? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you. Got an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 3, 2016 MEETING

D. Baker: Approval of the minutes. Do I have a motion for approval?

C. Wang: So moved.

D. Baker: A second?

D. Chakraborty: Second.

D. Baker: Any edits? Hearing none, all in favor.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you very much.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: President's announcements. I have my phone in front of me because I'm watching what's going on in the legislature. And that's a good thing. It's been an exciting week. Let me fill you in. The House and Senate are both in session. They came in yesterday, working feverishly today. We think tomorrow they'll be in session too. I'll start with yesterday, and I'll start not in Springfield, but I'll start in Chicago where the Board of Higher Education met. And prior to the Board of Higher Education meeting, the presidents and chancellors met and we talked about where we are and what a compromise might look like and our suggestions and relayed those to Springfield in real time. Those have been in debate and those are going on today. Earlier today the House overrode the governor's veto on Senate Bill – or the Senate overrode the governor's veto on Senate Bill 2043. 2043 was the bill that had funding for community colleges and for MAP grants. Nothing for us in operating dollars. And so we in the past did, in fact, support that because we felt MAP was important for our students, and it is. And we felt that funding of community colleges is good.

Now, tactically, you can say we need to have the operating budget in there, but we felt we needed to support our colleagues and students. We said we support it, but we need an operating budget. The Senate's overridden that. As we speak, the House is debating the override, so it may be that we have a vote on. Now, as I was leaving, I was watching Senator Brady or Rep. Brady, discussing his potential support for it, except there's no funding mechanism and there's no operating budget for the four years. So the good news is the sausage is in the grinder and sausage is being made. That's the good news. This is the kind of stuff – analogy is about making sausage, it's not pretty but something's going on. That's good news. Stuff is going on. I think there's a window this week for something maybe to happen or maybe to set up a post-primary election deal. I don't know if it's going to happen today or potentially it comes back and they figure something out for right after the primary. So the primary is the 15th. You all vote for whoever you need to vote for but you all vote, please. And have all your friends vote too. So I think that's good news. I think there's some movement going on. I want to thank all of you who have been to Springfield who have written. I know a number of legislators have said they are hearing from you. Students were down in Springfield, was it Tuesday, yesterday, was it yesterday?

D. Domke: Yesterday.

D. Baker: How many were down there, Dillon?

D. Domke: Christine and Matt both.

D. Baker: Anything you want to say coming out of those? Christine?

C. Wang: It was the first time I ever lobbied. It was an interesting experience. We came up against some fierce opposition, almost like a wall when asking them to consider this bill for, was it is 2043?

And it was an interesting experience. We got to actually give our opinions on this and say it from our point of view. We had some CSU employees, or former employees, were there as well. And they gave a very emotional side to the story as well. It was a pretty interesting experience.

D. Baker: It is. I did meet with President Calhoun, the new president from CSU yesterday. We had a great conversation. They're in a very difficult place. You've probably seen compressed spring break,

to – the president sent himself a layoff notice because of the timing. You know, if they don't get a budget, they've got to have the appropriate timing in there. So it's no fooling around. This is serious business, and I think that's starting to weigh on the legislators and the governor. Thinking about what do we do, can we have a university like that close, and then the dominos, we don't know how long it will be for each of the next ones. We're down a ways but there's going to be others falling before us. And how much can the state suffer that? And the answer is they can't. This is devastating.

So I think they have that bit in their teeth and they're trying to figure it out right now. That's the good news. Stuff is going on and we will see if we get a good resolution. I continue to be cautiously optimistic. I think the value of higher ed's not really been the question, it's the policy decisions about the way government is running the state that's been back and forth. And we're just, unfortunately, caught in the cross fire between those two competing ideas. So we'll see. Keep your eyes open, keep watching the news. If it doesn't happen today or tomorrow, don't give up hope. The house is going to be in session this week and then they're going home to run for the primaries and they'll be back after the primaries, probably at the end of March, first of April. I think it's the first week of April they're back. Any questions on any of that?

V. Naples: Have you heard anything about any contingency plans to help with what will happen to the students at CSU or the staff and faculty? I have been watching as much news as I can get and no one has said a single word about their fate.

D. Baker: The Higher Learning Commission, did we mention the Higher Learning Commission letter in our last meeting? I can't remember. No? Let me mention that. So the Higher Learning Commission is our federal accreditor, our regional accreditor, the top accreditation. Without that, you can't get any federal dollars. That would include PELL grants or any NSF grants or NIH grants. It's important to be accredited. They sent out a letter to all the public and private colleges and universities in the state including the community colleges saying: Are you financially viable and if not, tell us your shut down plan and how you're going to gracefully help your students leave and find other education. CSU has had to develop that and they have that for their students. They're hopeful there will be a solution here. There have been other bills introduced. One by Rep. Duncan, that put emergency funding into the Illinois Board of Higher Education to help schools like CSU who are on emergency life support, so to speak, to help them get through. That hasn't gone anywhere. So that's why it's paramount to get an operating budget, not just MAP dollars.

To remind you in 2015, our state appropriation for operations was \$93 million. Our MAP funding was approximately \$20 million. And from that, this year we have zero. So it's \$113 million short. That \$93 million was reduced to \$91 million after Gov. Rauner was elected. He saw the budget wasn't balanced so he did a rescission. Our base got moved from \$93 million to \$91 million. So one of the analogies I hear is that you can give us the saddle, the MAP money, but if the horse dies, it's not of much use. We need an operating budget – that's the horse. That's the analogy sometime, the

horse and saddle. thanks for the MAP money, really important but got to have an operating budget. I think that's the case for CSU, you'd be giving them the saddle. So we need an operating budget. There's a lot of pressure to do that. But there are plans and we did send our letter back and said we're not going to close and so we have no plans to do that.

R. Scherer: I assume that the very clear negative impact on enrollment that would come from this uncertainty: I mean, as students are looking at schools, they're going to be looking elsewhere because they don't know what the future is. I assume that's been part of the conversation, that cutting now is deep and making us more reliant on tuition dollars coming in, and is going to force a reduction in the tuition dollars coming in.

D. Baker: I'd like to say that's part of the debate. I don't think that the impact of any of this on any of higher education can is very much a part of it. It's been really about the reform agenda the governor wants to have, and issues around taxes and the opposing views on those. And turns out we're kind of one of the few places in the state budget that hasn't been mandated by the courts to be paid. And so we're kind of one left in the middle of the board that they're fighting about. We can talk about the impact on prospective students, current students, faculty, staff, operations, deferred maintenance. Al Phillips just came in and he's been saying no to all kinds of important deferred maintenance issues like, my roof is leaking, okay we'll fix that but not much else. All that deferred stuff that's going on so we can get through this.

No, I think they are kind of having paradigm debates. But as it's gotten more and more vivid about we're not messing around here. CSU is really talking about shutting down. This is not messing around. Do you really want to do that to that university and that community? Or the other schools that we've read about. What would you do if you were in a small rural community and the university shut down or your community college shut down? That is interesting political implications as well economic implications for that community. You're starting to see that rumble around. It hasn't -- the rationality is a political rationality, not necessarily the stuff we care about. Others?

V. Naples: Do we know if there's any hidden agenda or discussion, hidden or otherwise, that the legislature might consider that, because there are fewer high school graduates coming through Illinois, that we have a mismatch between the number of potential university spaces and the number of students to occupy them so they might not feel as badly as they would have previously if we lose one or more of our public higher education institutions.

D. Baker: Good question. I've talked to a lot of legislators about that and I've only had two bring that up. It wasn't dogmatic a statement; it was a question. What do you think about that? And my answer's been, we send 33,000 students a year out of state. That would indicate to me that we have a lot of need but we have a lot of need for good quality schools, and I would ask you to support us rather than export our students to other states. You could build a whole 'nother university with those students that are going out of state, and I would think that would be pretty good for the economy to keep those kinds of students in the state. So let's support them and build our economy. That's been my position. I haven't heard anything feverish like, let's close down three schools or something, and closing them down by starving to death is not a very strategic way to do it either. You could rationally redraw our map of colleges and universities in the state but that should be a planful, thoughtful thinking about what education should look like over the next decade or two in the state. There is some interest in doing that. I do hear that rumbling in the background: Once we get through

this, we do need to kind of look, but it's a healthful look. How do we become more efficient, effective and better serve our students, faculty and staffs. So that's hopeful. There's stuff in that background once we get through this immediate stuff. Others? Anybody?

Okay, let's see if Mike sent me anything, see if there's breaking news. So Mike Mann, who our legislative representative is back at the office. He drove in after being there the last two days, said that there's continuing talk about the need to fund this bill and override it but also no understanding about where the money would come from to pay for it. So that's the debate going on on the house floor right now. Okay, it's a good question.

M. Holt: I was one of the students that went down to lobby in Springfield this week.

D. Baker: Thanks, Mike.

M. Holt: It's something I wanted to do too. One of the things that we talked about was three possible bills that we talked about with Senator Syverson, that would provide potential funding for these bills. That was the procurement bill that would possibly fund \$200 million to \$300 million that could be put into the funds for higher education such as the MAP grant bill; the gaming bill, which is a potential of \$600 million; and, of course, the Worker's Comp bill that is a potential of \$300 million. So that's some of the things or bills that came up in regards to funding, but they've struggled to get, especially the procurement, on to the floor.

D. Baker: Right. So the procurement reform has a lot of support in a number of corners, but it's kind of one of those pawns that's being moved around. Now, some people will claim its going to save \$200 million or \$300 million from the state. That's a pretty fuzzy number. So it's trying to streamline the procurement process and allow us to purchase in a more efficient way. My guess is that it will overcome headaches we all have when we want to buy stuff if we can streamline it. I'm not sure it's going to save us multiple millions of dollars. It might for let's say the University of Illinois that's running a big hospital or Southern Illinois that's running a hospital, research hospital. It might in those kinds of places, but I think most legislators understand that's kind of a fuzzy number and it would be hard to capture that and put it back into a state budget. The others may have some legs and then you hear different numbers depending whether you're a proponent or opponent of those, but they're potential revenue sources. In general, we approve and encourage procurement reform to make it simpler, faster, cheaper, better. The devil's always in the details, but, in general, we're good with that. Anybody else? If you're a political science student, this is pretty exciting times. Maybe we should have Matt Streb here to give us play by play. All right, I guess I would take all that as a positive sign. There's movement, there's something going on, rather than the gridlock that we've seen for nine months now. So here we go. Let's see what happens.

One thing that we can control relative to our revenue is our enrollment. And so I want to again thank you for your work on retention. We again saw an increase this spring. And I have been watching each week the number of students that drop per week, and we're ahead of the curve this semester. We were ahead of the curve last semester, so that's great. The steps that you all have taken to be more in touch with students, get them to the resources they need, etc., is making a difference. And it makes a difference in their lives. If they stay in school and graduate, it's really important so thank you for doing that.

Recruitment, another big piece, and we've got a lot of competition in this space. And as Reed noted, there's some big currents flowing against us right now. The uncertainty that high school students or transfer students have. Should I go to college in Illinois? My answer is yes, we're going to get a bill and we're going to get a budget and we're going to go forward with our restructuring, and we're going to be in good shape. But telling a high school senior that, watching what's going on in Springfield is a little difficult. So that really reinforces for me the importance for all of us to work together on the recruitment piece, particularly the yield piece. As we get applicants that are interested in coming here, let's follow up, let's really tell them about our great programs here at this university. One of my frustrations is that we continue to be one of the best kept secrets in Illinois. We have the chops but not everybody knows that. Let's all brag about the great stuff that we have going on here.

One of the great things that we did, guess it was last week now, was the Spring Student Symposium of the Honors Council of the Illinois Region. So we had over 50 student poster sessions and presentations from students from all over, from Harper, Heartland, Elmhurst, College of DuPage, etc., really good. Did anybody participate in that while it was here? It was a great session, a lot of great students, a lot of great presentations, and a lot of people went, wow, I had never been to NIU before, this is cool, I really want to come here. Thanks to Joel and folks in the Honors Program for putting that on.

Also another thanks going out to the people working on the Program Prioritization process, the folks that are looking at all the data. It's a lot of work, and so thank you for doing that really important work. I know it's moving along and you're getting a lot of things done. I just wanted to give you a shout out and thank you.

Good news on the fundraising side. The last three weeks we've gotten commitments for a \$1 million or more, each of the last three weeks. So two weeks ago, Doug and Cindy Crocker, who support scholarship in the College of Business announced a \$1 million gift for the college. I think it will be focused on the women in business. So that's outstanding. They've been great supporters for a long time. And we went to Florida to their home for the announcement, and one of our students was there and she blew them away. Every time we put students in front of donors, that seems to happen. They're incredibly impressive. Thank you, faculty, for helping them being so impressive and students for being so good. It was really a great evening.

Last week we announced the fundraising partnership with Rock Valley College. I don't know if Promod is here, no. We're starting two bachelor's and a master's degree in engineering on Rock Valley's campus last fall. And last week, we announced a series of gifts totaling \$3 million to start that program. Woodward was the big one, they're the cornerstone gift at \$2 million, and we're looking to raise \$6 million in total. So we're halfway there and announced that last week. It will support new facilities as well as some of the operational dollars to get started to support our faculty that will be teaching in that. That's a great example of the triangle offense of the students, the faculty and the community, the manufacturing community in that area. I understand there's almost 100,000 manufacturing jobs in the Rockford area. It's a pretty amazing number and they have a great need for engineers. And so the engineering students could be students coming through high school and the community college in to us, or they could be all those employees out there that have associate degrees that want to come back and get a baccalaureate or a master's degree. That would be wonderful for those students to be in our program in Rockford so they can maintain their job,

stay at home, get that degree and advance in their organization. Wonderful synergistic progress and, hopefully, a means to really build the college.

And then today we had a gift announced and a nice ceremony from the Give Something Back Foundation. This is founded by Bob Carr. And they announced a \$1 million scholarship gift for 50 students. So it will be a full ride, partner PELL and MAP money with their money and be a full ride for the students. And they're focusing on Aurora students to begin with, but it will be able to be used more broadly than that. Bob recently sold his company and is dedicating a good deal of his work now to supporting these kinds of causes. We're the first public university in Illinois that they've partnered with, so very thankful for that. If we can keep up about a million dollars a week, that would be great for fundraising. Is that unreasonable? So let's do that. All right, so that's my news, all the news that's fit to print. Any questions on any of that stuff?

V. CONSENT AGENDA

D. Baker: Okay, let's get on to the business. Consent agenda, there isn't any.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws [Article 22](#),
Amendment of Bylaws – Pages 3-5
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

D. Baker: But before we get to the other business, why don't we do our check in to make sure these clickers work. I always want to make sure they work. Mine's not turned on here. Oh, you don't turn it on? Okay. It says new channel, what did I do wrong?

P. Erickson: Push 41 and then the middle button.

D. Baker: 41, middle button, okay. Channel 41? Who knew. Let's all click and see how many people we got here. Make sure your thing works. Should we all vote yes just to have fun? Let's all vote, are we ready, Pat? Let's hit number 1 and see if it works. Did you get an A that came up? You didn't get an A, then you're in trouble. You need a different clicker. How many we got? We only got 48 votes? Everybody got one? 48? Okay, so we got our tally. I would have guessed more than that looking at the crowd. Very good. All right, well, let's move on. Let's get some business done. I'm going to turn it over to Greg.

G. Long: Welcome and thank you. We have under Unfinished Business, proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws Article 22, Amendment of Bylaws. A description of that is on page 3 to 5. I'd like Therese Arado as chair of the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee to tell us what the proposed amendment is, please.

T. Arado: Thanks, Greg. As we had the first reading at the last meeting, the proposed amendment is to adjust the voting threshold for passing amendments or I'm sorry, for passing bylaws within the University Council. And the proposal is to have a 60 percent plus 1 voting membership of the University Council needs to be present in order to have a vote. And of those voting members present, two thirds need to approve in order to pass or -- not approve in order for it to fail. But two

thirds in order for it to pass. And that is of the voting members in attendance as long as we have met the 60 plus 1 percent, 60 percent plus 1 threshold for having a vote. That's being able to start to make changes that we deem necessary in a timely manner. We've heard the discussions before of the timeliness. So I would appreciate your vote on this today.

G. Long: Okay. So we need a motion to accept.

H. Nicholson: So moved.

J. Novak: Second.

G. Long: All in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay, so we have a motion to discuss. Prior to having discussion from the floor, I'd like to take prerogative and ask Dr. Anne Kaplan to give us a very brief history lesson. We've talked about the idea that the Bylaws and Constitution that were revised in 1985 were done within a particular historical context and so thought I would bring some history with us, no offense. To have you hear from the source in terms of how things were organized and thought of at the time. So with that, I'll turn it over to Dr. Kaplan.

A. Kaplan: Thank you, Greg. This won't be as exciting as the president's review of life in the legislature, I don't think. But the Constitution and Bylaws have gotten real attention from folks on campus here only three times in the last 50 years or so. I haven't been around for all of them, but the first time was in 1967 when the Board of Regents was formed and put ISU and NIU and then eventually what was then Sangamon State into one system. That board asked the university to come up with a constitution for the elected representation of the faculty. We had a new president at the time, President Smith. He assigned this to a committee. It took several drafts and several years, and finally everybody sort of gave up and went back and accepted the 1964 constitution, which actually predated the Board of Regents. And so that constitution with some amendments was in place on campus until we took another run at it in 1988.

So the campus environment in 1988, which is what Greg was sort of interested in, really involved a set of issues which started probably in 1985. What you have to understand, I think, is that the Board of Regents was never a particularly popular governing arrangement on this campus. The folks here both in the administration and on campus viewed those three institutions as radically different. Sangamon was a two-year, upper division institution. ISU was focused heavily on undergraduate education and on graduate education in education. NIU, at least in the views of folks here, was an institution with significant research aspirations with a number of professional colleges, with an increasing range of doctoral programs and on top of everything else was located in an area of the state which had a kind of economic and cultural importance, both in the state and in the country, which just was not the same deal as Springfield and Bloomington-Normal. I think people at NIU felt that the governance of those three institutions really constituted a kind of regression toward the mean and the mean was ISU. It was good for Sangamon, which was sort of built up and not so good for Northern, which was kind of constrained. In any case, that's the way we all saw it. Now, because of that, there were clandestine efforts on the part of the administration in every administration back

to president Nelson, I think, to do something about it, namely to get us into a position where we had a board of our own. You can't do that very publicly because the people doing it all report to the board in question. And so these efforts would go on kind of behind the scenes. And we would get someone on the House side to propose or carry that particular goal and then on the Senate side we couldn't find anybody. Or next administration we would get somebody on the Senate side and there would be nobody on the House side, and we couldn't get anywhere.

Well, as it happened, in 1984 the then director of the Board of Regents resigned. And this coincided with a successful, we thought, a successful lobbying effort on the part of the university that got both the House and the Senate sort of lined up to finally push this through so that we could have a board of our own. It also happened at the time that the university was pushing forward its proposal for the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. So these things kind of coalesced in time. And to the, I think it would be fair to say, great amazement of the campus in the middle of this, the board of regents offered the chancellor's position to President Monat. Well, this was not what anybody had imagined was going to take place. There were folks who thought that this was a cagey effort on the part of the Board of Regents to derail the separate board effort. There were others who thought, and President Monat would include himself, I think, in that view, that the only way to get the proposal for the College of Engineering through would be for him to accept the chancellor's position and thus be in a more powerful position to move it forward. So that's what happened. That meant that the provost at the time, La Tourette, became the acting president, and we went into a presidential search period.

So in January of whatever that was, 1985, we did indeed get the College of Engineering approved, sort of proving that Monat might have been right about that. But that triggered a call from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for constitutional convention because they felt that the representation of the largest college on campus was now out of kilter. So in the meantime the presidential search is going on and we get President Wingfield, who then established a presidential task force for the study of constitution. The Wingfield administration, for any of you who were around for it, was problematic from the beginning. The president arrived, the student newspaper began to dig up information about his past administrative experiences. He'd had a very nasty public divorce. That became a big issue on campus. The cost of refurbishing the president's house got all kinds of attention. The president got very upset with student newspaper and ultimately attempted to remove the advisor to the student newspaper, which really got a lot of attention so that a lot of organizations and institutions which had been standing happily by watching all this go on began to get nervous themselves. The big press got all focused on freedom of speech. The other institutions in the state began to worry about the expenses they had on presidential residences. And so there was a kind of concerted effort to put an end to this. And before very long, President Wingfield resigned. And then President La Tourette, who was in the Provost's Office went to the president's office to become the next president. And shortly after that, Chancellor Monat resigned as well and returned to Northern.

So, the task force to draft the constitution in 1985, '6, '7, was operating in this period of really unprecedented turmoil and commotion and bad publicity and all that. We had had three presidents, two provosts and a chancellor in the two-year period. We had added a fairly sizeable professional college in addition to the College of Law, which had been there since '78. And so I think there was a lot of understandable concern on campus about whether the governing board really had a clue about the interests of the university and the interests of the faculty. And I mean the really sudden

imposition of the chancellor and then the appointment of a president who lasted only nine months and then the return of the chancellor was, to put it mildly, fairly destabilizing. And so I think that the campus leaders who were involved in the review of the Constitution and Bylaws at the time were understandably concerned to, you know, to nail down to the extent possible whatever policies and processes they could get their arms around at the time. And they did that. And I think they did everything they could do to defend the campus from what they considered to be unhelpful outside interference. And so that proceeded, and in 1988 the board of regents did approve that constitution. It's a fairly simple constitution but the details are in the bylaws, which can be changed without board approval.

So that was the constitution which was in place when finally we did get a separate board in 1996. That board accepted the existing Constitution and Bylaws without further discussion; and I think, although there certainly had been tweaking of the Constitution and Bylaws since 1967, the reality is that there are components in the current Constitution and Bylaws which predate most of the doctoral programs, three of the colleges, the university's admission into APLU and, you know, a great many other things that occurred over that period of time. It is in many ways, I think, a defensive document. It's very difficult to change. And in many ways, it was written to resist the influence of structures which no longer exist. So that's my five-minute history of the Constitution and Bylaws.

G. Long: Thank you very much. I think that's very helpful. Any quick questions for Anne? All right. Then I'd like to say a couple of things real quick. When we had our meeting last month, our first reading, there were a couple of questions with regard to data and some other things. So I have a couple of slides I want to show you real quick and then we'll open it to general discussion. Okay. I'm sorry, it's hard for me to talk when it's at my back. So one of the questions that has come up has to do with what are our voting patterns and how things worked. So I went through and looked at these are the failed votes we've had, failed bylaw votes we've had since 2013, okay? And you know, without getting into the specifics of them, what I'd like you to note is the column where it says "votes cast." You know, we're hitting the 40 plus per meeting certainly. And "percentage support," look at those numbers: 93 percent, 95 percent, 98 percent. And all of these were failed votes because they only missed by a couple of votes. e had to hit a criterion of anywhere between 39 and 43 depending on the number of seats assigned in this group.

So I wanted to show you this to say you know, from a governance standpoint, if we were talking about votes that were 23 to 25 or something like that, that would say one thing. To have votes where you're seeing here, that these are failed votes, they're losing by one or two votes, three votes, four votes, that's probably not what we are looking for.

To give you an alternative, I didn't want to bore you with another table, but I did today look at the past votes that we've had. So the votes that passed over these last, that same time frame. We've had 12 bylaw amendments during the same time frame that have passed, and the average vote to get them passed, 43. So think about that. So even the ones that we passed, we just the passed just by the thinnest of hairs much so that is our concern with all this. Either fail or pass, by virtue of oftentimes just a couple of votes whereas the majority of people are saying, hey, let's look in a certain way. So that's the concern I wanted to share with you there.

And then the second slide I want to show real quick, is just an attendance slide. I can't go back beyond this year because we don't have the specificity of data. I can say that based on, you know,

some previous years we're saying we're averaging 45, 46. To our credit, we have up to 50 this semester. I'm really pleased our overall attendance this year has been 50. We're making movements in the right direction there. But this graph is just meant to show you the relative participation by percentages of the various constituencies. So it's pretty clear to see and a tip of the hat to staff, because our staff colleagues are here, thus far, 100 percent of the time. So you know, you guys rock. If you look at the yellow line, that's the students. And to get fairly high, you'll notice that not surprisingly, the one date that they were a little low, is the week before finals, you know? Who would have guessed, right? And then you look at the faculty there in blue, and our average attendance is anywhere between 80 and 90 percent across this year. And, administrators are the red line, and they have the same kind of trend going there. So I just wanted to show you this because we had talked about, hey, there's no data. Well, here's the data that we have for this year to demonstrate that we are getting good attendance and that attendance is represented pretty much across the different constituencies. We don't have anyone that's here more than others. Any questions on either of these two places? I don't want to take up too much time. I want to turn it to you all, but any questions on either of these? Okay, so with that I'd like to open it for discussion. John and then Mark.

J. Novak: I think the graphs speak for themselves as well as the discussion from the past month. It's just crazy that we have a stalemate or not progress with voting just because people aren't showing up. That's just not right. Also we learned last month that people who miss three times and don't get replacements are to be dropped. And I would suggest that we do something about that. That's my comment.

G. Long: Thank you. Mark?

M. Riley: I just wanted to mention that, based on the attendance graphs that Greg showed, I know there was some concern about the number of faculty that would be necessary to pass a bylaw change. But I think the odds are pretty long that a bylaw change would get passed with as few faculty as are suggested on the attachment that you provided, Greg. I think if you combine, for instance when there are 45 members here, attending, this table would presuppose that there are 13 of those that are faculty members. So only 13 of the 45 present are faculty members. And then it further presupposes that there's complete division between the faculty and the other constituencies present. And I think if you multiply the odds of those two things together, it's pretty low probability that something could get passed with extremely low faculty support. And if it does get passed with extremely low faculty support, I hesitate to say this, but it's kind of shame on us, the faculty, for not showing up.

G. Long: Thank you. Other comments? Paul?

P. Stoddard: Again, I'm not a voting member, so take this with a whatever grain of salt you feel is appropriate. I raised this last time and I'll raise it again. With the way it's currently written, you could pass a bylaw change with the approval of 40 percent of the membership of this body. I think that's very problematic, to me. Bylaws are supposed to be very carefully considered and passed by a majority and often a super majority of the body I would suggest that wording be added that to pass a bylaw you need 50 percent of the of the membership of the University Council to approve it or two thirds of those present at a meeting, whichever is greater. And we ran through the numbers at Executive Committee meeting last week or two weeks ago. That still gives you a lot more flexibility

instead of needing 42. With 63 members, you would only need 32 to actually pass something so that gives you 10 more people to play around with. You still achieve your goal of making it easier to pass instead of by these razor thin margins, but you still honor the majority will of the body, which I think is essential for a bylaw change especially.

G. Long: Thank you. Other comments?

H. Khoury: Thank you for adding the table that I had shared with you.

G. Long: Certainly.

H. Khoury: With the agenda, I'd like to mention that when there is a new treatment that we're trying to figure out its impact, be it in the sciences, social sciences, or humanities, we tend to control some variables, and see how others, you know, valuables are changing. So in this table, the attempt was to see from a faculty perspective some of the variables were controlled, and attempt was to see how would this impact the possibility of having faculty members being included. So apparently to have again a vote to go through with 30 approved, assuming there are 45 attending, faculty members attending, it means it's possible that 15 faculty members were against it. So that's what I meant last time when I said we need to make sure that the voice of the faculty is included. The faculty members in this body makes up more than 50 percent of the total University Council. And in doing so, if we apply this, if we adopt this, this is not taking care of that percentage. So I wanted to clarify that point. And I mean, I understand that decisions need to be made and that we need to have, maybe make changes. But with this suggested change, really the possible impact of the faculty members is being diluted quite a lot. So if you think 42, or 39, is okay to be a good possibility to pass something, then we can work through it. There are percentages, that can be included instead of this. And I don't know if we are up to suggest amendments to this suggestion, but it's up to you. Thank you.

G. Long: And I would just make a mention from my standpoint that certainly, as we talked last time, the numbers that were presented, they are correct theoretically. From a historical standpoint and also from a governance standpoint, I mean we're trying to practice democracy in this room and democracy requires participation. And so if you don't participate, you don't get protected. And so I don't have a lot of sympathy for the argument that says, well if some group doesn't show up they still need to be protected because that's our job, that's our duty to show up and participate. So to cover, you know, to protect ourselves to the exclusion of the staff and students and administrators, from my standpoint I think that creates a difficult situation. I saw a hand. Chris?

C. McCord: I agree with your sediments. At the same time, I think Paul's suggestion is a reasonable one, that if a simple majority of the body does not support something, that is a bit problematic. So

I would like to propose an amendment along the lines that Paul indicated so that it would read, must be approved by a vote of two thirds of the voting members in attendance or a majority of the body, whichever is greater.

G. Long: Okay. Do we have a second for that? Tom Pavkov seconds. Okay. On this, where are we considering this a friendly motion? How are we looking at this? Friendly amendment, excuse me.

C. McCord: That's up to the originator of the motion.

G. Long: The originator of the proposal. Holly made the initial motion, right?

H. Nicholson: I'll accept that as a friendly amendment.

G. Long: Okay. It's accepted as a friendly amendment. Okay, Terry?

T. Bishop: This is a bit of a non sequitur given the suggestion for the friendly amendment. But you know, it's not like we don't get adequate knowledge ahead of time that there is issue that we're going to vote on, we have a first reading and a second reading. And so I feel like it's not like something is being thrown into this body without warning. And so some significant shift in our policy's going to happen without ample opportunity for the sides to be heard on it. I'm not opposed to Paul's suggestion and but beyond that, you know, maintaining rigid voting numbers seems to suggest that there is some sort of fiat that's going to be presented and an ambush. You know, we do know, even if you miss a meeting, with the circulation of materials you know what's coming up. I want to remind everybody of that caveat in our operating system.

G. Long: As a somewhat related caveat, we need to keep in mind that the executive secretary/ Faculty Senate president is always going to be a faculty member in this role. So to be honest with you, if we're playing politics, if there was a particular concern, the person who's in this role as a faculty member could decide to table something. I've read our transcripts of meetings since 2002, a cure for insomnia, but very helpful to do. And there have been meetings where we've canceled meetings because there's no business. So, part of the issue too is, in this role it will be a faculty member and if that faculty member had a concern about lack of representation, or issues that were not within the realm of being beneficial to faculty, certainly that individual could have some influence on the process. Chris?

C. McCord: I don't want to truncate a debate if there is debate, but we're already beginning to see members of the body who need to get up and leave. And we are aware that exactly to pass this we need the current requirement. Is it out of line to call the question?

G. Long: Okay with that? I'm fine to call the question. We need this as a two thirds.

C. McCord: We are still under the old bylaws, so you need two thirds of the total body.

G. Long: So Pat, we need

P. Erickson: 41.

G. Long: We need 41 votes. We had 48 people identify early on. If you have not picked up a clicker and you're embarrassed to pick up a clicker, we'll put our heads down and you get that clicker. But we do need to vote and you need to make sure you have a clicker if you're eligible to vote.

F. Bryan: Can I clarify, was the amendment agreed to? And I want to clarify what the content of the amendment was, please.

G. Long: I thought that, as a friendly amendment, we didn't need to vote on that.

F. Bryan: That's fine, it's just since it is a bylaw change, I want to make sure everyone is clear. And since there's already concern about changing things and how fast things may change, I want to make sure we're clear on what the amendment is and if that's going to be accepted by both the maker and is that correct?

G. Long: Okay.

F. Bryan: Holly?

H. Nicholson: Yes.

W. Penrod: Mr. President, we need the motion read with the amendment, please. To make that perfectly clear because the way it sounded to me is that, if you didn't have a quorum, we'd go with a simple majority vote and, of course, I think that's problematic. But we need to have that amendment the motion read as amended.

G. Long: Right. Pat, do you have that?

P. Erickson: Here's what I think is the newly amended language, reading from 22.2. A vote on an amendment to the bylaws requires the presence of 60 percent plus 1 of the voting membership of University Council. No change there. To become effective, an amendment must be approved by the greater of: a) two thirds of the voting members in attendance, or b) a majority of the voting membership of University Council.

G. Long: One of the things that we had talked about in our Steering Committee was this as a potential amendment if there was a concern. So we did write it up so you can see it. The only change in this is, as written there, the majority of the University Council, that would be the only change to what we already have in the process. And so we're saying there we have 63 members, obviously you'd need 32 to endorse something. So it does ensure that any bylaws that we would change would, in fact, have at least 50 percent of the body in support of that. So otherwise, it's not a big change to what we're suggesting. And, as Paul mentioned, it still gives the flexibility. Doris?

D. Macdonald: As a clarification for a), a majority of the voting University Council membership?

G. Long: Yep, correct.

D. Macdonald: Thank you.

G. Long: Any other questions, comments on this? Okay, well, then like to call the vote on this based on the revised amendment there. If you support the amendment, as amended, that would be vote 1. If you disagree with it, vote 2. And if you abstain, vote 3. As I mentioned, we have 48 people here. So hopefully we'll get at least 48 votes on this one.

Unidentified: We only have 47.

G. Long: All right. Okay, so fingers crossed. All right, so let's go ahead. Ready for the vote? 1 if you approve, 2 if you disapprove, and 3 if you abstain. Has everyone voted? Yes? Yes. Okay. Woo-hoo. Yes! Thank you all very much. As weird as it sounds, I'll be able to sleep tonight. This has been keeping me up. I see us as having a situation in the university where we are really in a world of hurt. This is unprecedented. And to figure out how to work together right now is going to be really critical. And to not be handicapped by this, you know, because we'll still have the opportunity for debate, for disagreement, that's fine, but to not have this as an obstacle, I'm really quite pleased. So thank you very much.

The motion passed 46-3-0.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws [Articles 15.5 and 15.6](#)
Undergraduate Coordinating Council and
Standing Committees of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council – Pages 6-27
FIRST READING
[Presentation](#) – Chris McCord

D. Baker: Should we go on to new business? Why don't you do that, you're on a roll.

G. Long: Yes. With new business, I would like to ask, we've got proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, Article 15.5 and 15.6 with regard to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council and standing committees. While I've been involved in a number of those meetings, I'd like to ask the chair of that committee, Academic Policy Committee, Chris McCord, to give us the background on that first. Chris?

C. McCord: Thank you. So this is, in some ways, one of the motivating issues for looking hard at our bylaws is the realization that our curricular approval process has been Byzantine and as Anne has explained, has been deliberately Byzantine. It has succeeded beyond its founders' wildest expectations in hindering change in our curricular process. Unfortunately, we're in an environment where that's no longer a good thing. We need to be nimble. We have the process of approval at the university level, never mind the department and college level that brings it up. Never mind the Board of Trustees and IBHE approvals that follow. Just the process at the university level can easily take a year or more for a curricular change to be approved at this level. We are no longer an environment where that's tolerable. So we have been looking for some time now at modifying this and the Academic Policy Committee has done a pretty extensive overhaul to the bylaws relative to this. Articles 15.5 and 15.6 describe what is currently the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, and its subcommittees. The changes that are proposed do two things. I'll walk through the details, but, broad picture, what it does is we've significantly reduced the number of distinct committees and, in so doing, we've significantly streamlined the curricular approval process. I'm going to walk you through what that looks like.

So right now we have an Undergraduate Coordinating Council with six subcommittees: Admissions Policy and Academic Standards Committee, APASC; the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum, CUC; the General Education Committee; the Honors Committee; and two committees

that make up the lack of what they do in the length of their names: Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education and the Committee on Undergraduate Academic Environment.

So we are proposing to restructure these seven committees, most importantly, to take the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, APASC, and the CUC and consolidate them into a single Baccalaureate Council. And then to also take the two committees at the bottom and consolidate them into a single committee, the Committee for the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Environment. I think it's still got a long name. The top of these changes is by far the more consequential. The consolidating of these into a Baccalaureate Council, first of all, will parallel, in many ways, the Graduate Council. And I'll walk through in a moment the impact this will have on the curricular approval process. So we will have a much cleaner committee structure. We'll have a Baccalaureate Council with three subcommittees reporting to it: one for general education, one for honors, and one for the Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Academic Environment.

Okay, so here's our current curricular approval process, and I think I've got this more or less right. Curricular proposals come up from departments, colleges, go to the CUC. If they involve admissions requirements or academic standards, they also go to APASC. If they are specific to general education or honors, they typically originate from those committees. Those committees are the ones that do the real work. They report, through the minutes of their meetings, to the UCC, which either approves those minutes or disapproves the minutes and sends them back. And this process can go for as many iterations as it takes until either the proposal is finally approved or the committee just says to hell with it and gives up. Assuming that the UCC eventually approves something, it is then reported to University Council. University Council is given the right to act on substantive changes. It does not have the right to modify them. What it does, is again in the same fashion, can either approve it or send it back. If it sends it back to the UCC, the UCC can reaffirm its position, University Council then has the right to, if it will, to finally disapprove that proposal and it has six weeks into the next semester after the semester in which it came forward in which to act. That can easily take it a year or more.

So this complicated process we propose to boil down very simply. APASC, UCC, CUC, we're just going to consolidate into the Baccalaureate Council. It will simply act on curricular proposals. The things that are specific to general ed or honors will remain specific to general ed or honors. Those are not changed at all. The Baccalaureate Council will not do this dance of looking at minutes and sending them back. It will simply say yea or nay to proposals. This by the way is what everybody else does. I've looked at a lot of bylaws, a lot of curricular documents. Every other university simply has a body at the university level that just says yes or no to curricular proposals. Sometimes those curricular proposals go up to a body like the University Council, sometimes they don't. Our language makes it clear, our constitution makes it clear that it has to go to University Council, has to have the right of review and so we don't change that because that would require a constitutional change. However, we've also significantly simplified this process. A proposal, again, substantive proposal can go before University Council, if the Baccalaureate Council says it – designates something as substantive, then it goes to University Council automatically. University Council has the right to say, whoa, wait a minute, you didn't call it substantive but we think it is. We want to look at it. But you have one shot at that. You have one meeting after it's reported to tag it as we think it's substantive. Either way, whether it was identified by the Baccalaureate Council to the University Council or University Council tagged it itself, University Council then has two meetings in which to act. And they simply act. They don't send it back. They vote it up or they vote it down.

Again this is what everybody else does. You just vote. You don't do this back and forth, back and forth stuff. We're given two meetings in which to do that. We are not stripping and, in fact, we're actually proposing in this language to simply make a simple majority necessary to approve or disapprove. So University Council still very much has the right to act. It just has to act in a timely fashion.

So the other thing I just want to note briefly, in case you're curious, I totaled up the number of people serving on these various committees, what they look like currently, what they would look like in the new. The Baccalaureate Council basically preserves the committee structure currently of UCC. Gen Ed and Honors, I think we actually added one seat to General Ed. Honors is completely unchanged. We sort of boiled together the CIUE and CUAE, to come up with a new membership. I don't think it's a small thing in our environment that we have significantly cut the number of seats on committees. And I really don't think that's lessening shared governance. It's making shared governance at a manageable scale. So the people who are on the Baccalaureate Council really do something. They don't read minutes of other meetings. They act on what they're charged with acting on. So we are reducing a redundancy which has often been difficult to deal with. Many of these seats go unfilled because we can't find enough people to sit on all these committees. So I think the reduction is actually, well, it's helping us be a bit more nimble while not at all taking away anything from the essence of shared governance control of the curriculum. That's the proposal. Happy to address questions.

G. Long: Any questions on this from anyone?

C. Douglass: My question is on the CIUAE, why are the students nonvoting?

C. McCord: What that means is there are seven students who are voting and one who is nonvoting.

C. Douglass: Why is there one student that's nonvoting?

C. McCord: Okay, fair question. So the student representative is, sorry, I'm looking at the old guidelines, give me a second. So seven students shall be selected from the undergraduate colleges. A representative of the Student Association appointed by the president of the Student Association shall serve as an ex officio nonvoting member of the committee. So the students from and that the students from the colleges had been traditionally the only make-up of these. So we're adding a representative from the Student Association and at the moment adding it as a nonvoting member.

C. Douglass: Thank you.

G. Long: Other questions, comments? Paul Bauer.

P. Bauer: Anything that make participation on committees more effective, efficient is something I would support. And anyone here remember the Committee on Committees that was convened, the end result being eliminating two committees and adding one? I want to stand up and applaud and so this is a terrific solution I think.

W. Pitney: I just want to say thank you for the committee as this was work that was done quite a bit last year and then it's been extended this year with some excellent changes, I believe. I think this is

one of the most important decisions we can make. With a similar structure proposed last year, this was the item that failed despite having 93 percent of support from this body. So hats off to the committee for putting this together. And I think this is an important change in the structure.

G. Long: Thank you. Okay, anyone else? Okay, thank you for the discussion. Thank you for the presentation, Chris, appreciate that. That takes us through new business and so I will turn it back to President Baker.

D. Baker: Thank you. I think that was a great example of how do we with lessen our own workload. Sometimes we hoist things on ourselves that we don't need to do to be efficient and have good governance. Maybe we can lighten the load a little bit through a vote if that comes up, so we'll vote on that next time.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

D. Baker: Let's go to the reports now, and Paul Stoddard has one from the FAC to the IBHE.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. In the interest of time, I will try to summarize this quickly. We met a couple of weeks ago at the University of Chicago on a very warm February day in Chicago so keep an eye out for global warming, it's real. The IBHE staff meets with us by phone these days. Their travel budget is virtually nonexistent. They informed us of the governor's fiscal year 17 budget proposal for higher education, which involves basically a 16 percent cut to fiscal year 15 levels. That's actually a 20 percent cut to the operating budget with a \$15 million pot for the IBHE to award for performance funding. So that gives the IBHE discretion to reward schools that are performing well or programs that are performing well. But overall then the rest of the higher ed would be cut 20 percent according to the governor's proposal. At that point there's no news at all regarding fiscal year 16 budget. The president has updated us on that a little bit to the good, I think.

It was also reported that IBHE Chair Lindsey Anderson had stepped down to take a job at U of I. And it has been since announced that Tom Cross will be filling that position. For those of you who don't know, he's the former Illinois House Republican leader, a post he held for about 12 or 13 years. As chair of the IBHE, he will also be chair of the SURS Board of Trustees. So that's got implications for a lot of us.

We got a presentation from folks at University of Chicago on their efforts to improve diversity, basically from the baccalaureate level, undergraduate level all the way up to their faculty. They had some interesting programs they talked about, one of which is reaching out to the inner Chicago area and making it easier for Chicago area students who are perhaps not those naturally inclined to apply to places like the University of Chicago, making it easier for them to apply, waiving application fees, giving them workshops on how you actually do this and so forth. I think it's a very interesting idea to work with students at the high school level to get them involved and not so intimidated by the college application process.

The rest of the meeting, main part of it was the caucus meetings where, in our case the four-year publics get together and talk about things. As you might imagine, that discussion was dominated by

the bad news emanating from Springfield or the lack of news which is bad for us. We've heard about CSU and their issues. Eastern has had their third wave of lay offs, 177 people were laid off in this last wave. Those are noninstructional. They're also looking at faculty, staff and administrative furloughs, a total of 24 days if budget issues are not resolved soon. And the report was that morale is really low among the students there, as you might imagine. You know, gee, if the university isn't going to be here anymore, why am I bothering to study for exams and finals and things like that – I'm sure an unintended consequence of the inaction down in Springfield, but a very real consequence that's going to have very negative effects on our students in the state.

Other places, Western was looking at announcing the termination of 45 faculty, 15 of whom were tenured. They backed off the tenured dismissals but still this is, as the president said earlier, this is serious stuff. These are real consequences to what's going on, or not going on, down in Springfield.

There was also some discussion of the progress on HR477, that's a bill that was passed which is looking at the transition from high school into college. There are mismatches in some of the state regulation, state requirements for high school students compared to what the colleges are looking for and various other things. So there are a series of committees that have been set up, specifically looking at things like the competency-based high school graduation requirements and that misalignment I just referred to, college readiness and transition courses, college pathways, taking you from high school all the way up through your career. So at the age of 15 or so, you should know exactly what you want to do with the rest of your life. But if you do, then they want you to be able to plan that out. Post-secondary and career expectations, so, starting grade 8. At 13, you should know what your chosen career might be able to provide for you. Anyway, but those things are going forward. I think overall my personal take is that it's a good idea to ease that transition and we saw a couple of those, both with Chicago's program and with the legislature is looking into. And that's basically my report.

D. Baker: Any questions? I got to meet Tom Cross yesterday for the first time, and he met with the presidents and the chancellors of the public universities. He came across as very honest and candid about the current situation and pretty insightful. My sense, he's somebody that actually understands higher education and will well represent the issues to the legislature. I was impressed in my first meeting with him yesterday, so I think that's good news.

- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Greg Long, Dan Gebo, Rebecca Shortridge, Leanne VandeCreek
Steve Builta, Holly Nicholson
- C. Academic Policy Committee, Chris McCord, Chair – no report
- D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Mark Riley, Chair – no report
- E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Therese Arado, Chair – no report
- F. University Affairs Committee – Linda Saborio, Chair – no report
- G. Student Association – report
Giuseppe LaGioia, Student Association

Dillon Domke, Speaker of the Senate
Stuart Nissenbaum, [Green Office Initiative](#)

D. Baker: All right, the next report is from the Student Association, we've got Giuseppe LaGioia and Stuart all lined up. Who's first?

G. LaGioia: So, a few different tasks have been going on in the Student Association right now. The first is we're moving forward with the locker repairs in the recreation center. Hopefully, those will be getting repaired soon. And the other one is we are moving forward with the spring prep fest program for spring. That's all.

D. Baker: Great.

D. Domke: Got a handful of things at the senate is working on. First off, I want to talk about the green printing initiative. This is different from something that Stuart is going to talk about, but nonetheless I've been working on it with Stuw and other members of the Student Association. I've spoken about it a few times but we are going to start going out to different departments on campus. Hopefully, at your departmental meetings or when colleges have their specific Faculty Senate meetings, you'll be seeing us students come out to talk to you all about the various ways on how using technology can, first of all, lower the reliance on papers for students, because our printing quota is being eliminated, but also make it easier on faculty to teach. There's a handful of different tools that we want to make sure that faculty are aware of to make your life easier when it comes to grading papers and having different assessments and things like that. So we'll be coming to you guys. You'll see us very soon. We're going to start getting on your schedules for when we get back from spring break. We're going to take the next few weeks to finalize our presentation and make sure we have everything together before we come out and present to all of you. But we want to thank everyone who's been working on it. We've had a good turnout at the meetings we've had. As I said, this is a student-led initiative. We've had input from administration, faculty and a handful of the different other shared governance committees. It's been a good team effort from a lot of the different places on campus.

Secondly, coming up, we had a few people run out from our students today because we have the S.A. elections coming up. We have the candidate meetings yesterday and today. This is actually the first time that we're going to be doing the senate and executive elections together. It will eliminate a lot of redundancy in our elections, eliminate some extra erroneous spending we won't need to do if we run one election instead of one in the fall and one in the spring. So encourage your students that will happen at the end of March, those elections. For all of you, most of you do interact with students, please encourage them to get out and vote, choose their student leaders and have their voice be heard.

Next, as many of you heard, there is a student trustee vacancy. We are working currently to fill that position as well. The Student Association as was mentioned, has been in Springfield over the past two or three weeks. I think we've been down there twice in the past three weeks. I was down there a few weeks ago. Matt and Christine were down there yesterday speaking with lawmakers. We're trying to get on Mike Madigan's schedule to meet with him. Next week I have a meeting with Beth Purvis, the secretary of education. Hopefully, if the stalemate is not broken this week, my conversations with Beth next week might move the governor a little bit closer to our direction.

D. Baker: You go, Dillon.

D. Domke: Move might be a very, very generous term to use, maybe budge or even just consider. So hopefully that does something. And then we are looking to continue our lobbying efforts into the spring. Hopefully, we won't have to, but nonetheless, we are looking to organize a large lobby day for any students who are interested in partaking, not just students that are involved in the S.A., the first week of April. Again I ask all of you to kind of spread the word to the students that you interact with about that. This upcoming week on Tuesday we will be hosting what we're calling Pizza with Pritchard, an effort to engage more students in the democratic process. We're going to be hosting it in the New Hall community center swing space. Bob Pritchard, our representative for this area, is coming out to meet with students in a very social and relaxed setting. A lot of people might not be involved in the democratic process, especially people our age, but if you see representatives, elected representatives out mingling, meeting people in the community, you get to put a face with a name, and you might be more adept to take action, call legislators, and actually hopefully go out and vote, which will be great because next week is the Illinois primary. And that will be taking place on Tuesday, 5:30 in the New Hall community center swing space. And finally, something that I've been talking about for a few weeks now, the Program Prioritization Student Task Force. I want to thank everyone on the coordinating committee, especially the communications team that helped get the link live on the Program Prioritization website. That link did go live this Monday. I'd like to let everyone know that so far we do have 51 applications from students to be on the student task forces, and those students are very diverse in nature, coming from all types of different organizations, different resource centers. We have varying different academic levels, freshmen all the way with through final year doctoral students wishing to be a part of this. And you know, as I said, this is something that has not been done at universities who have done Program Prioritization before. All the professionals have said minimal input from students or disinclude the students, so we're kind of trailblazing here, keeping very good records of everything we have been doing so we can kind of be a leading force in the student involvement category with key decisions on campus.

So those are the things that I've been working on, on the senate side of the Student Association. So again, if all of you could hopefully spread the word about some of the initiatives to the students that you interact with, that would greatly be appreciated by us in the Student Association.

D. Baker: Stuart.

S. Nissenbaum: So, in front of you, you'll all see there's a green office initiative form. This is a project I started with OCELA, Department of Environmental Studies, and in my new Student Association position of the director of environmental affairs. It's a really simple program that we're trying to create a bronze, silver and gold certification for the various department offices. The achievements for each one are really simple. First bronze, you certify yourself. Some of the actions that we ask you to take for bronze is: recycle bins available for paper and other materials in the office, or paper printed on one side to be used again. These are very simple tasks that create a new awareness within your office. It holds you accountable, makes you think about what you're doing. On silver, another one is computers are programmed to go to sleep mode after 10 minutes of inactivity, or offices reduce their binders, folders and other office supplies, all very simple tasks.

When it comes to gold, you would have to either meet with myself or the coordinator of this program, and those tasks can be a little more difficult. Currently we have three offices that have gone gold, one that's currently in silver, which is Student Association, and another one in bronze. I want to thank President Baker's office – they went gold last Friday, our second office of that day to go gold. So it's a really easy program. If you want with to talk to me about it afterwards, I would love to help get your office certified. Thank you.

D. Baker: Any questions for any of the student speakers? Just one comment on the legislative thing, as I thought about Dillon's work. The debate, I've been watching my feed here. The debate's continuing on the floor, and it sounds pretty vigorous, and it may not pass the override. That may not be bad for us. Some of the criticisms of it are there's not a funding source and it doesn't include an operating budget for the four-year universities. So there was some concern by some that this would get passed and would take some heat off and there wouldn't be work on an operating budget. So there may be a silver lining here if it gets overridden. It did get overridden in the Senate, but if it doesn't in the House, there could be a push to get the operating budget for the university. If you read in the paper tonight or tomorrow online, it didn't get overridden, that may be okay in the grand scheme of things. You can kind of argue both ways, okay?

H. Operating Staff Council – Holly Nicholson, President – report

D. Baker: One more report. Holly?

H. Nicholson: Thank you. First I want with to express my thanks to Provost Freeman and Vice President Phillips. They've approved support for the staff councils and staff council presidents to make our situation more equitable, and this is going to include release time and clerical support. I think this will allow greater participation in shared governance leadership, and we're very excited and thankful.

Also, we're pleased to pilot an operating staff personnel advisor which would be similar to the faculty SPS advisor, and we hope to have the person in place in July and can report again on that in the spring.

Our election season is beginning, and we're going to have seven vacancies to fill, which is a lot. So please encourage any staff that you work with to get involved in shared governance and work with our council. Submit an interest sheet. They can stop by, we're going to have a booth at the Wellness Fair as well to get information. Interest sheets are due April 8. The election ballots will go out the 18th and they'll be due May 2. I'll give those dates again next month.

We created a standing committee for employee morale. That committee would be happy to work with any other councils and committees on improving morale on campus. Feel free to contact us. Thank you.

D. Baker: Thanks, any questions for Holly?

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Steve Builta, President – no report

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: I'm looking to see if there's any updates, nope. All right, any new business?

P. Stoddard: Comment from the floor.

D. Baker: Sure.

P. Stoddard: Just to emphasize on your call for people to vote, the primary day is actually during spring break. So if you're not going to be here, you can vote early and you can do that downstairs in this building in the Blackhawk Annex. It's very convenient and I echo president's call that we should all vote, especially the students.

D. Baker: Yeah, absolutely. And if you live out of this district, it's okay to talk to your representatives in other districts too. I would encourage that, particularly the students. You can go home and say this no MAP funding for more than 5,000 of our students is not okay. Other comments? Questions?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: All right, you get 25 minutes back to your life. Enjoy. Thank you so much.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.