

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, September 9, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Adeboje, Arriola, Baker, Bishop, Block, Brubaker, Carey, Carlson, Chen, Conderman (for Pitney), Cordes, Dawson, Deng, Doederlein, Domke, Elish-Piper, Freeman, Giese, Haliczzer, Hanley, Hathaway, Hedin, Irwin (for Chakraborty), Jaffee, Jemison, Keith, Khoury, Lagioia, Lee, Lezon, Liberty-Baczek, Long, Lupstein, Macdonald, McCord, Mogren, Moremen, Naples, Nicholson, Parks (for Bauer), Pavkov, Penrod, Riley, Saborio, Scherer, Staikidis, Sto. Domingo, Tahernezehadi, Thu, Towell (for Schoenbachler), Vazquez, Wagenecht

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bauer, Bond, Campbell, Chakraborty, Farrell, Naples, Pitney, Schoenbachler, Vohra

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Bryan, Coryell, Douglass, Klaper, Love-Moore, Phillips, Weldy

OTHERS ABSENT: Kaplan

I. CALL TO ORDER

D Baker: Welcome back. Is this the third week? Third week of the semester. How did that happen?

Wow. Welcome back to the fall semester and the University Council. Do you want to make an announcement about the captioning?

G. Long: You may have noticed a couple of changes in today's meeting, one is the structure of the room in terms of how we set things up. The other is as University Council we need to create a transcript for these meetings...kill two birds with one stone, we have a realtime captioner with us; and she's also helping out with the Faculty Senate meeting. Her name is Cathy Rajcan. One thing I would ask is, you know, obviously she's going along...the faster you talk, harder it is to follow. The more -- but more importantly, it's particularly important to say your name. I know we've historically said say your name if you're going to speak. In this particular situation, more important to do so. She does have all of your names inputted. If we get the name right, the spelling will come up correctly. And if not, we'll make it better next time.

D. Baker: Great. Thanks for taking care of that. That's a step forward, I think. Okay.

Meeting called to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: Call to order and first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Do I have a motion?

C. Doederlein: So moved.

D. Domke: Second.

D. Baker: Any discussion? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

G. Long: Sorry to be a pain here. But from that standpoint, when we make the motion, Cathy Doederlein, from our transcript standpoint and...Dillon. Without saying it, it came up as Diane. Probably not what you want. But this is a practical. We'll get used to it.

D. Baker: Yeah. We need to say our name when we're speaking for captioning, and then it gets into the minutes correctly. All right. Good. You'll only have to remind us a few dozen times and we'll pick it up. Good.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 29, 2015 MEETING

D. Baker: Okay. So let's give it a second try with the approval of the minutes of the April 29 2015 meeting. Do I have a motion to approve those? Cathy, say it again.

C. Doederlein: Cathy Doederlein.

D. Domke: Second.

D. Baker: Very good. Any discussion? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? All right. We got the drill.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: President's announcements. Okay. First news from Springfield, there's no news. I wish I could tell you something different. We're still locked in an epic battle. We'll see. I'll be down there Friday with a couple other presidents, and we're going to talk with some of our legislators and executive branch members and see if we can make any progress. It's not good for our students, it's not good for our faculty and staff and for the state to have this deadlock. So it's just bad. Bad public policy. We need a budget. And we're going to go down and do the best we can.

On a positive note, about coming together, the presidents and chancellors meet on a weekly basis. We talk about these issues. Each of us is starting to work with our faculty, staff, and student organizations. Last week -- was that last week we met?

G. Long: Last Wednesday.

D. Baker: Last Wednesday I met with Greg and faculty and staff, student leaders, and we talked about what role can our organizations play in moving the dialogue forward. And so I think you're going to see from your leadership in all those domains some -- some efforts to try and organize our voice so it can be heard there; and I'm reaching out to the other colleges and universities to see if they want to do the same. And I talked with our foundation and alumni boards in the last week on similar topics. If you think about those organizing groups -- faculty, staff, alumni and foundation board members -- that's a lot of people and a lot of people with some influence. And they listen. I hope. They have in the past. So let's see if our collective voices and our collective voices across colleges and universities in the state add up and do something there.

Earlier today we held a P-20 conference. We have a P-20 network at NIU, and it's with Northern Illinois community colleges, K-12 systems, employers and state agencies. And this was our one-year anniversary of meeting. We held over 60 committee meetings in the last year. And we're really looking at the pipeline, up and down the pipeline, what can we do to help each other be successful up and down. And at this meeting today we actually extended the pipeline from kindergarten to workforce, to pre-K, knowing that those first five years are so critically important in helping students be ready for kindergarten and school. And if you're behind there, it's an uphill battle. We've added a work group there. The good news is this was 50, 60 people that have been working together for over a year now, trying to help the system be more effective. And reaching out now to communities more with the pre-K kind of stuff. And they're talking about how to come together as a system around higher education issues in Springfield. So lot of forward progress, we're doing what the State wants, integrating better with our eye on helping students be more successful. I'm proud of that group. Marilyn Bellert has been the brain-child of this work and done great work to move us forward.

Friday was census day -- 10-day enrollments. And I was just on the way over here reading the announcements. So let me give you a few numbers; and it should be out later today. So this is not even hot off the press, almost hot off the press. As you probably remember from my conversations last year, we were anticipating a significant drop in our enrollment. One was because of the demography of declining classes where senior is bigger than junior, bigger than sophomore and freshman. And when the big senior class falls off, you've got to replace it with a big freshman class so the demography doesn't follow the downward slide. And all state and community colleges, feeders into us, as well as flat to declining high school enrollment, a lot of things are working against us. We also see 33,000 students leave the -- the state each year to go out of state. There's a lot of things going on. And in that environment we anticipate being down a lot. We were only down 2.3 percent; significantly better than we thought we were going to be. Embedded in that are a number of things showing some very positive trends. So two years ago we worked on retention. We said retention wasn't where it needed to be. And we increased -- collectively we increased retention by 5 percent from 66 percent to 71 percent. That was a year ago. This year we maintained it and actually enhanced it. So it went up another point. It doesn't slip back. So we went from 71 to 72 percent. Excellent. And if you multiply that 6 percent over two years, times 20,000 students, that's a lot of students. So very impressive. Thank you very much. And that's core to our mission; if we're going to be successful in fulfilling it, students have to come and stay and graduate. Excellent news there.

Our two-year retention went up by 5 percent. That's good. Excellent news there. All the quality measures were up. So we were up in average GPA, ACT, and class ranking. Excellent. Our incoming honors class was 99 students better. Increase of 99 students, or a 31 percent increase. Outstanding. So they made a number of adjustments there, and I think the word is out that we've got a great honors program. So I'm -- a 99-student increase is outstanding.

So...Another area that was very positive is that we were up in international students again. That's a place we've put emphasis the last two years, and we're seeing some of the fruit of that labor. So 321 international students on campus this fall. Increased 321 students, or -- and that's a 48 percent increase over two years. So that's a big jump in two years. And as we've approved here, the Nankai College is going to result in two years another cohort of students coming here, we think about 250 students coming to be juniors, and another 250 -- they'll return as seniors, another 250 coming in. That would be a 500-student increase in two years out. I think all those are positive trends. And it's important to have more international students on campus so that all of our students have a richer cultural experience and prepare for a global economy. I think that's good all around. See if there's anything else in this.

I think the positive trends we're seeing here are glimmers of the future and things we're doing to move forward. We've put kind of a whole new admissions and recruiting structure in place. We've got a ways to go with that. But I really see positive trends in the structure in how we're doing it. Thanks to Eric [Weldy] and Dani Rollins and our admissions for all that effort, and all of you for the retention you've done with curricular reform, advising, on and on. We've really been doing a lot of stuff. And it's nice to see it come out in the numbers after all that hard work. So thank you.

So we -- we will know in a month or so about what that means for our budget from tuition and fees, room and board perspective. It takes a little while to get from 10th day to actually finding out how much money all those students paid and discounting the scholarships and all that. Al will work on that over the next month, and we'll have a clear picture on our budget there; and fingers crossed, we'll have more news out of Springfield that's positive. So we will have our budget put together.

In the interim, the Board of Trustees have approved a draft budget, and we're working through that and going through the budget reduction process. Over \$30 million we're planning on. Not going to be able to get there all in one year. We'll have to do some bridging. And we've been through a process with all the divisions and all the vice presidents down, working through their organizations, coming back with budget proposals. Al and Lisa sat with all them and got back and forth about what are the impacts on these. They have not been across-the-board cuts. We tried to protect the core of the institution as we move forward. So...we're trying to do as much of this as -- we've not had layoffs, we have not had furloughs, we didn't do that last year as we reduced the budget; and that's our inclination this year to make that happen.

We're working on all those pieces. Going forward out in fiscal year '17 and beyond, we need to think about, with the resources we have, where do we invest them to best serve our students and fulfill our mission as a research university in this state. And so as you know, we've been talking a lot about program prioritization. And that's a process for our learned colleagues in both the administrative and academic sides of the house to look at where we're spending our money and see where should we be spending, what's the best use so we can fulfill our missions. That work is underway.

Lisa and I, Al, charged the two committees last week that are going to look at that. I think they're taking that on very seriously. Who in here is on one of those two committees? Thank you, guys, for serving. That's important work. Do any of you have anything you want to say coming out of it or... I'm sure you will be founts of information over the -- my sense was people understand how big a deal this is. And it's important work for all of us. So thank you for taking it on.

Last spring we had a number of dean turnovers, and we have four dean searches underway. I'm going to ask Provost and Executive Vice President Lisa Freeman to update us on that. Lisa?

L. Freeman: Thank you, President Baker. I want to say that all four searches for the deans of the colleges of Education, Law, Business, and Visual and Performing Arts are moving forward. All of them either have the search committees formed or in the process of forming. Per our constitution and bylaws, the committees will be a majority of faculty; and they will be chaired ex officio by the provost with a co-chair or co-chairs. So in the College of Education, Dean McCord will be the co-chair of the committee. And College of Law, Dean Block will be the co-chair of the committee, and there will also be a faculty co-chair, Robert Jones, per the law school's constitution and bylaws. College of Business, Dean Dawson will be the co-chair of the search committee. And in the College of Visual and Performing Arts, Dean Vohra will be the co-chair of the search committee.

All of these searches will be supported by professional search firms. The college faculty have had input into the selection of the firms. That's to help us build the best possible pool of candidates. And what I really want to just share with everybody is, as Liz Wright and I have talked to the search firms, and as we talked to the search committees, it's been a great reminder of what a wonderful university and what great assets our colleges have. In building the leadership profiles and looking at our connections to Chicago, over and over again I've heard from the folks on the search committee as well as from the search firms things like, "Wow, what a great history," or "What great programs, what great opportunities, I had no idea." So I think that it's very easy sometimes to have inside eyes and think about all the things that are going wrong, and it's nice to have somebody from the outside come and talk about how excellent our academic programs are, our outreach is, how happy our students are. There will be student representation, obviously, on all the committees too and along with alumni and external stakeholders. We expect to have candidates on campus probably early next year for all of the searches, with the hopes of having all four new deans named by the next academic year.

D. Baker: Thanks, Lisa. Any questions on that? Could I ask you also to make a comment on the Presidential Professors and the changes we've made there.

L. Freeman: Call for nominations for Presidential Professors has gone out. You may notice there have been a couple of changes this year. For one thing the cognizant vice presidents over the engagement professor, the teaching professors and the research professors got together to align the calendars and have common deadlines to facilitate the process. In looking back over the history of those awards, it was generally felt by the members of the selection committees past, as well as the vice presidents overlooking the awards, that it would be beneficial to the prestige of the awards to move from three to two awards in each category. The increase to base that goes along with each award is now 5,000, increased from \$2,000. There's still \$5,000 in professional development attached; and now the colleges who have to work with the award winner to accommodate the release

from teaching will now get \$4,000 to assist with the staffing of the course that's vacated. And the only other substantive change is, although folks won't be allowed to apply for more than one or to be nominated for more than one of those awards in a single year, it will be possible for someone who was named a teaching professor two years ago to be nominated for the research professorship while they're still holding the teaching professorship title. We felt that this was fair to recognize the excellence of our faculty and, hopefully, helpful with retention. Any questions? Okay.

D. Baker: All right. Perfect timing. That was Dori asking me to read the press release for enrollments. Had to give my thumbs up. So thumbs up. Any comments or questions on anything else?

V. CONSENT AGENDA

A. University Council Standing Committees – Per NIU Bylaws, Article 2, approve the [2015-16 membership roster](#) – Pages 4-5

B. [University Advisory Committee to the BOT](#) – Per NIU Bylaws, Article 16.4.1.1, confirm 2015-16 membership roster and confirm Leanne VandeCreek for a three-year term (2015-2018) – 6

C. Northern Star Publications Board – Approve the nomination of Rick Baert, for re-appointment to the NSPB. Mr. Baert graduated from NIU in 1981 and subsequently earned his M.A. in 1992. He has worked at the Daily Herald and has been with Crain Communications for several years as a reporter and editor.

D. Student Conduct Board

1. Approve the nomination of Danae Simonsen, Academic Counselor, Department of Counseling, Adult and Higher Education, for a new three-year term, replacing Dane Gotto. Simonsen is a supportive professional staff employee replacing a supportive professional staff employee.
2. Approve the nomination of Sarah Ransom, Office Manager, Student Legal Assistance, for a new three-year term, replacing Kelli Bradley. Ransom is an operating staff employee replacing an operating staff employee.

D. Baker: All right. Let's get on with the agenda. The first is the consent agenda. And we typically have a motion here and vote to adopt the consent agenda. So we'll do that and see if anybody has comments on it. If we're all in agreement, it's consent agenda. Do I have a motion to approve the consent agenda?

D. Domke: Dillon Domke.

C. Doederlein: Cathy Doederlein

D. Baker: Okay. Any discussion on the consent agenda; any concerns about anything beyond here? Hearing none, all in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? All right. Thank you.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposed revisions to NIU Constitution, [Article 7](#) – Page 7
Related Councils

SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

D. Baker: So Unfinished Business. The proposed revisions to Article 7 of the Constitution. I'm going to turn that over to Greg to talk about that for the second reading.

G. Long: Great. Thank you. Just as a bit of background information on this. This is a change to the constitution, not to the bylaws. And so as such, from a voting standpoint, we need no minimum attendance, but we do need two thirds of those present who are voting to support the measure here. And then it would go to a faculty referendum. So that's a difference in voting simply because this is a constitutional change versus a bylaw change. On Page 7, you'll see that it's a pretty straightforward change. The argument for this was that in the Article 7 of the university constitution where they talk about councils, the students were identified as the only ones who were, quote, an integral part of the university's system of governance. And so the suggestion has been made -- and this is our opportunity to vote on it -- is that that notion of being integral to the University has been then extended to each of the other groups: The operating staff, university faculty, and supportive professional staff. So it's just a strategy to make things more consistent across the groups.

D. Baker: Any questions or discussion?

D. Haliczzer: On behalf of the University Council Steering Committee there was a friendly amendment we would like to make to this item. So –

D. Baker: We need to move and then amend.

D. Haliczzer: Okay. I'll back off.

D. Baker: I guess I should have asked that.

J. Hathaway: Moved.

H. Nicholson: Second.

D. Baker: Holly's warmed up now. Deb, any discussion?

D. Haliczzer: Yes. I jumped the gun, I know. The UC steering committee had discussion over this particular article, and we wanted to make a friendly amendment to add one small edit that will clarify. There was some discussion asking the question: What constitutes the university community. And so we are proposing that in Article 7.2 the first mention of -- no, Article 7.1, when we define

the "university community" we would like in parentheses, i.e., faculty, staff, students, and administrators, so we state clearly who constitutes the university community.

D. Baker: I think we have a motion to amend. Do I have a second? Which would be to include faculty, staff, students, and administrators to define university community. I think we have a second.

P. Liberty-Baczek: Patricia Liberty Baczek.

D. Baker: Well done. Discussion? Hearing none, let's vote on the amendment to the original proposal. So all in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you. Now any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, are you ready for a vote? Yep. Can we do this without clickers; we can do this with a voice vote?

F. Bryan: Sure.

D. Baker: All right. Unless there's any concerns. Okay. All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Congratulations.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 17.1](#), Athletic Board – Pages 8-9
FIRST READING

D. Baker: I'll take on the second one. This is dealing with the faculty athletic rep. And in the past the faculty athletic rep has not chaired our advisory committee on athletics. So this amendment is to make that change and bring us more into alignment with what other universities are doing around the country. The faculty athletic rep does an enormous amount of work and delves into the athletic programs, keeps an eye on graduation rates, they're the eyes and ears into the athletic department. Since that person is doing that on an intensive basis, it seemed like they were most in the know, and it made sense for them to chair this committee. So that's what this amendment would do. And you can see the other pieces there. So I would entertain a motion for the approval of that --

G. Long: It's first read.

D. Baker: Can't I just have them vote now? All right. I would entertain comments, then. Questions, concerns?

- B. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 2.2](#), Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Pages 10-11
FIRST READING

D. Baker: Okay. Let's move on. So getting back here. The next is a first reading of another NIU bylaw. I'm going to turn that over to Greg.

G. Long: Okay. Next two. In this particular bylaw the suggestion again -- this is a first reading, so it's not a vote for today. But our goal is to consolidate the Faculty Senate Rules, Governance and Election Committee, with the University Council Rules, Governance and Election Committee. Last week on Wednesday during the Faculty Senate the senators did vote to consolidate the committees with the goal of then merging with the University Council. So the rationale to do this would be to have faculty be involved earlier in discussions and potentially have more involvement as we move things up through the University Council ranks. That's the rationale behind this. It's -- offers greater efficiency and greater opportunity for input. Any questions; discussions? Kendall.

K. Thu: Department of Anthropology. Greg, so is this -- does this mean that the -- if a committee has to vote on a matter, that the Faculty Senate members will be voting equivalent to the University Council members?

G. Long: Within that committee structure, yes. People would be equivalent. We did -- just as background, we did a similar thing with regard to the Resource, Space and Budget Committee. We have a shared Faculty Senate-University Council and resource committee; that has shown to be an effective strategy for us. We have a precedent for doing this.

D. Baker: Go to the next one?

C. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 15.8.1](#), University Assessment Panel –
Pages 12-14

FIRST READING

G. Long: Okay. Moving on, then, our next item of unfinished business has to do with the membership of the University Assessment Panel. Carolinda, did you want to say anything about this, or -- it's primarily just a -- keeping names and everything current. Right?

C. Douglass: If you want me to say something.

G. Long: Please.

C. Douglass: Yes, some of the changes there are just updating people's titles.

G. Long: Introduce yourself.

C. Douglass: Carolinda Douglass, Office of the Provost. Some of the changes are updating titles, and then the more substantive changes are putting on three ex officio members. The associate, vice provost, the director of academic accreditation, and the associate director of educator licensure and preparation. These individuals have served as guests for a number of years. And their input's very valuable, but they would be ex officio, so no voting.

G. Long: So discussion on this? No discussion?

D. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 15.3.1.3\(B\)](#), Academic Planning Council – Pages 15-17

FIRST READING

G. Long: Okay. Moving onto the next item. Item D. Academic Planning Council changes. And it's very similar from the standpoint of, if you look on it, it's discussed on Page 15. First two items on that, for the rationale, are basically just clerical, making titles be appropriate to current positions; and there are then three additional members being proposed to join that committee: The vice provost for academic outcomes assessment; the director, Academic Accreditation; and the director of the Office of Academic Analysis and Reporting. Broadening the scope but including some additional relevant individuals in the discussion. Any discussion on this one?

L. Freeman: I would point out that we no longer have a position vice president for research and graduate studies; it would be vice president for Research and Innovation Partnerships. While we're making changes, we might want to consider making them all.

G. Long: Absolutely. Thank you for the clarification. So we will make that clarification. Because this is a first reading, we'll add that and correct it for the next month's meeting. Anything else from anyone? All right.

D. Baker: Voting on that soon. All right.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report
[May 15, 2015](#) – Page 18
[June 19, 2015](#) – Page 19

D. Baker: We're -- reports from the council's boards and standing committees. We've had some Board of Higher Education meetings over the past few months, and Sonya Armstrong has a report.

S. Armstrong: I'll just answer any questions. This is old news and, as Dr. Baker pointed out, there's been no movement, so nothing new to report yet.

D. Baker: Well, that was short.

G. Long: They said --

D. Baker: The meeting seemed longer than that to me.

D. Baker: The board is concerned about the budget. And they're thinking hard about encouraging us to take all the steps we're taking. But 'til we get the thing in Springfield figured out, it's -- in light pencil, the budget. I want to thank Al Phillips and Lisa Freeman for all their work they've been doing over the summer, and the resource space and budget committee that's worked so hard to review the budget and going over it this summer.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees
Greg Long, Dan Gebo, Rebecca Shortridge, Leanne VandeCreek
Deborah Haliczzer, Holly Nicholson

1. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee
[May 28, 2015](#) – Page 20
2. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee
[May 28, 2015](#) – Page 21
3. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee
[June 15, 2015](#) – Page 22
4. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee
[June 15, 2015](#) – Page 23
5. Board of Trustees
[May 7, 2015](#) – special meeting – Page 24
[May 28, 2015](#) – special meeting – Page 25
[June 18, 2015](#) – meeting – Page3 26-27

D. Baker: Okay. University advisory committee to the Board of Trustees. Does anybody that's sat on that want to reflect on anything?

G. Long: From our standpoint what we did on this was include the reports and have it -- encourage you to look at them. Part of a strategy for making the meeting move along a little faster would be not to have people read every report to you, as in past meetings. The idea would be, come in, have some sense you have a question, feel free to ask it. But we don't want to use valuable time simply to read a report to you. That's -- represents a bit of a change from how we've done things in the past, but I think we may be more effective in engaging discussion if we ask questions versus simply reading reports to you. So in terms of the BOT, all the reports are in the -- in your packet in the latter portions of it. They're all fairly brief. So if you do have any questions, don't hesitate to ask. But we're not going to just summarily give reports if there's no new information to present.

- C. Academic Policy Committee – no report
- D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Mark Riley, Chair – no report
- E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – no report
- F. University Affairs Committee – Linda Saborio, Chair – no report
- G. Student Association – Nathan Lupstein, President – no report

D. Baker: Before we close this section, I want to give the students an opportunity to talk too from both the executive and legislative branches. Nate, do you have anything on how you're starting up the year in.

N. Lupstein: Good seeing all you guys. I've seen a number of you throughout the first few weeks back. We're excited to be back with the students -- Nathan Lupstein, for the typing. But there's two huge initiatives that we're starting next month. So we'll see a more concrete report for that coming forward at our next meeting; but two issues that we're focussing on as far as student life is concerned here on campus is for -- or are, rather, sexual assault awareness/prevention and mental health awareness. Two initiatives that we are passionate about as a cabinet. Initiatives I have spoken with some of the administrators in this very room that we're going to, hopefully, collaborate with and move forward and create a positive change here on campus with. I'm very excited.

I'm very grateful for all the wonderful and warm reception I've received from the administrators in the room, and very excited and looking forward to working with you all this year.

D. Baker: Thanks, Nate. Relative to violence against women, we had a task force on violence against -- on the Violence Against Women Act last fall. And then over the late spring and summer we had an implementation team that was chaired by Kristin Meyer. Her team did amazing work. Some of you served on it: Thank you. We had a series of meetings and kind of had the almost closing meeting last week I guess on that group. Lisa Freeman and I have been meeting on implementation steps, taking their recommendations, and moving them into the University that people have the positions to implement those. That's where we're headed in those. Outstanding work by both those task forces. Thank you very much; and they're critically important issue. So we're moving forward, and we'll report back to you in more detail.

Dillon, anything from the legislative branch?

D. Domke: Yes; two quick things. First off, we're getting close to the legislative branch election time coming up in about little less than a month here. We're trying to cultivate our new kind of student leadership from freshman transfer students. And I'd like to give kudos to everyone who's been working on that. Because I've seen a lot more advertisement and got the word out for it much better than the SA has in the past. We're looking to get a lot more student leaders involved this year than we have in the past. So I'm excited about that.

Also the legislative branch will be working this year -- we kind of mentioned it last year at the end of University Council -- the green initiative in regards to the printing. Students often feel that their quota goes quick; and after this year there won't be one anymore. And we need to work both as a student body and faculty, staff, administration to make sure that we're moving forward with that in the greenest way possible. Because a lot of students do feel that professors, teachers require printing when it may not be necessary. So we're going to be getting that off the ground here soon. I will have a meeting this week with CIO Brett Coriel and a few other people. And anyone who would like to join in that as well, feel free to contact me, or see me after the meeting.

D. Baker: Great. And so the basic premise there is you would submit your stuff electronically, not in paper. And get feedback electronically without paper, rather than printing it out and --

D. Domke: Correct.

D. Baker: Okay. How 21st century of you.

D. Domke: It's more so the fact that there's a handful of people that require both. They'll say you need to turn it in online, and also have you print something out as well. Which that's -- I mean, why do one if you're doing the other?

D. Baker: Guess that's a good question. I don't know.

D. Domke: Just looking at efficiency.

D. Baker: Yeah, right. Brett, do you know what we spend on printing per year at the university? Or do you want to tell us? Speaking of cost reduction.

B. Coryell: It's not actually easy to determine how much we spend on printing because the printing operations are distributed over many different departments. In my area we run a large-scale high speed print operation with real printing presses that print admissions brochures and other things like that. And I think that the paper costs alone for that are somewhere in the order of \$750,000 a year. And then in addition to that -- and I can get the official numbers for the record, just to make sure that we clarify. But it's that order of magnitude.

And then we also -- in my division we run computer labs. And there I just don't know off the top of my head the volume of print that we do. But again, we just see in the labs where we have printers -- you know, just reams and reams of paper every week that are never even picked up off the printers. So they get printed and never collected. And then in addition to that, we wheel out giant recycling bins full of paper that are just left in the lab. So they're printed for some purpose, reviewed, and left in the same location where they're printed. So even just a waste I would estimate at hundreds of thousands of pages of pure waste. Not to speak of that paper that goes to maybe good or useful purposes such as printing out the -- printing out the slides for a professor's lectures and carrying them and taking notes on them. That's an area that has mixed reviews from some students. Outside of my -- many of the colleges are maintaining operations as well. I don't have a cost for that. More than we need to be spending.

D. Baker: You talked about desktops being the most expensive form of printing.

B. Coryell: In addition to what the Student Association and my area are going to work on, there's another initiative that's going to happen that's more driven out of the administrative function of my office where we have looked at a proposal to address the printers that are on everybody's desks. So we have a variety of print, ranging from those high speed printing presses that we've talked about that do a unique function -- collating, sorting, and super large jobs you would never want to do on your ink jet printer -- all the way down to departmental multifunction device, to personal laser printers, to an expensive way to print, which is an ink jet printer sitting on your desk.

In the initial audit of some of the buildings on campus, it looks as though we have actually more printers on campus than we have employees. So that's a counterintuitive result for all of that. And

that many of those printers are, you know, personal print -- personal laser, personal ink jet printers. This is a very expensive way to print.

If you just do reasonably sensible things like, say, could you walk maybe 10 feet to get to a printer, and then we only have one printer within any 10-foot radius; then we think that there's over half a million dollars a year of recurring cost savings that we could get by removing those printers and those consumables and going to a managed print device; and at the same time we would in many cases get a higher reliability printer, which is good. And that you could have higher quality and maybe more finishing options, like duplex printing or stapling as well. That's a pretty good win in most cases. You can save half a million recurring. It's good to cut things rather than people. So if we can get rid of the things and not reduce our functionality, that's a win for me. So we'll do that. And it will be in the beginning an opt-in program for the departments that want to try it out and receive the cost savings coming out of their budget today anyway. They would be the ones to immediately realize the benefits.

D. Baker: Creative solution. Thanks for doing it. Maybe we don't need to print at all. Dillon? There you go. Well done. Pat?

P. Liberty-Baczak: I have a question. Do you have a timeline for the bigger, more economical printers for --

B. Coryell: Yes. So what we have is when we do -- when my division does large projects like this, we begin with a business case and take the business case to an IT governance group. That governance group has approved this for release as soon as my division has the resources ready and can marshal some of the distributed IT groups around campus to be ready on the local support end as well. We have just internally this week I think released that project and assigned a project manager to it. That project manager's first task will be to develop a quick charter that essentially recapitulates the business case but allows for anything we've learned in the month or two since it was approved to be set out. And then she will develop a project plan for it. In general, we hope to finish this academic year with the first roll-out probably being in my division, where I'll go through and easily sweep up all of the extra printers in my own area. The president has offered to be one of our early adopters as well, so the president's office will probably go next. I expect both of those will happen by Christmastime with a spring deployment for most other units on campus. Uh-huh.

H. Khoury: I have a question regarding the labs for the students. Sorry. Helen Khoury. Will the student activity fees be reduced eventually? If they're -- cannot use the printers in the labs? So would this decrease, basically, their activity fees maybe?

B. Coryell: So, I don't think it will, but it's a valid and sensible question. The reason why it won't is in most cases it is because the colloquially named student technology fee is not actually a student technology fee. And I think I heard last year that it would even be renamed this year. So I -- I'm not sure whether that's happened or not. That fee collects a little over \$10 million a year. Twenty-eight percent of that comes to my division. And it doesn't pay for things like the labs or printing, it pays for things like Peoplesoft and the staffing that goes along with that. So the removal of print doesn't actually get paid for by the fee that might seem like it would get reduced. It is a possibility that other departments and colleges -- and here I think especially of education as one of the larger areas that does some interesting things with print -- if technol- -- or if the College of Education pays for their

printing through a student technology fee, and that's reduced, then they might be able to cut that particular college-specific fee. But I don't know whether such a fee exists. I just mention it as a possibility because we have so many different things going on with printing, and I'm not familiar with the funding level for all of them. But no, central lab printing will not reduce the student technology fee, because they're distinct or disjointed.

D. Baker: Other questions?

H. Operating Staff Council – Holly Nicholson, President – no report

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczzer, President – [report](#) –
Page 28

D. Baker: Good. Thanks. All right. Let's go on to the academic policy committees. And there's only one I think that has report. That's the SPS council. And Deborah, you're up with that?

D. Haliczzer: I'm not going to report on business as usual, but I wanted to report on a new initiative SPS Council is sponsoring. In the past we've had leadership initiatives for faculty and for students. This year SPS Council took the leadership and is sponsoring the first leadership development initiative for SPS and operating staff and anyone else who wants to come. So we will take faculty as well. And so we'll be doing one session a month starting this month in two weeks. Faculty -- everyone is welcome to come to this. But we really appreciate the support of Provost Freeman, SPS Council, HR Center for Training, professional development, Faculty Development, Student Affairs, and Enrollment Management has had a part in the planning of this for a long time. And Operating Staff Council are joining us in this initiative. We will report on that later. And in the first advertisement we sent out we have over 120 people who signed up to participate. So clearly the demand is there. And they represent people from throughout the university in almost all employment categories. I'll have more specifics later.

D. Baker: Thank you, Deborah. Any comments for Deborah? Hearing none -- oh, go ahead.

H. Khoury: Is September 4 still open? Can ones that -- anyone wants to register for these?

D. Haliczzer: If you want to register, I would say at this point, because they closed the registration; email me. I have some pull with this process.

D. Baker: Got to know people, I guess.

D. Haliczzer: It's a joke, guys, it's a joke.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: Okay. Let's move on -- any new business? Or comments from the floor? Hearing none, you just captured another hour in the day.

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. [Meeting Schedule](#) – 2015-16 – Page 29
- U. [Annual Report](#), Athletic Board
- V. [Annual Report](#), Academic Planning Council
- W. [Annual Report](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- X. [Annual Report](#), Graduate Council
- Y. [Annual Report](#), University Assessment Panel
- Z. [Annual Report](#), University Council Personnel Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Do I have a motion to adjourn?

K. Thu: So moved.

C. Doederlein: Second.

D. Baker: She got a trifecta. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Very well. None opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.