

TRANSCRIPT

University Council
Wednesday, February 26, 2020, 3 p.m.
Altgeld Hall 315
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Ballantine (for Ledgerwood), Barnhart, Bateni, Binderup, Block, Burton, G. Chen, J. Chen, Chinniah (for Freeman), Collins, Doederlein, Farrell, Feniza, Hines, Ingram, A. Johnson (for Bolden), L. Johnson, N. Johnson, Kassel, Lamarre (for Lang), Littauer, Martin, McGowan (for Millhorn), Nelson, Newman, Owoeye, Pearson, Penrod, Peterson, Polansky, Rajagopalan, Rau, Rigertas, Royce, Scherer, Schraufnagel, Shi, Siegesmund, Thu, Walker (for Elish-Piper), Weffer, White, Wilson, Woodruff

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Beyer, Bolden, Bond, Branch, Chmaissem, David, Demeros, Elish-Piper, Freeman, Gau, Hanley, Koss, Lang, Ledgerwood, Millhorn, Mooney, Schatteman, Skarbinski, Staikidis

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Chinniah, Falkoff, Jensen, Klaper, Phillips, Wesener Michael

OTHERS ABSENT: Blazey, Ferguson, Gelman, Groza, Kortegast, Marsh

I. CALL TO ORDER

B. Ingram: I'll call the University Council to order.

Meeting called to order at 3 p.m.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

B. Ingram: Do we have verification of quorum?

P. Erickson: Yes, I can verify quorum.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

B. Ingram: I need a motion for adoption of the agenda.

R. Scherer: So moved.

B. Ingram: Second?

J. Wilson: Second.

B. Ingram: Is there any discussion? All in favor, aye.

Members: Aye.

B. Ingram: Opposed? Abstentions? Great, we have an agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 29, 2020 MINUTES

B. Ingram: Approval of the January minutes. Can I have a motion for approval?

C. Doederlein: So moved.

B. Ingram: Second?

T. Arado: Second.

B. Ingram: Is there any discussion or are there any corrections, additions to the minutes? All right, all in favor of approval of the minutes?

Members: Aye.

B. Ingram: Opposed? Abstentions? The minutes are approved.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

B. Ingram: Do we have timely requests for public comment?

P. Erickson: No.

VI. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

B. Ingram: President Freeman is in Springfield today. She traveled early, because although we missed the snow, Springfield did not. And it was snowing quite vigorously there yesterday. I don't have any announcements. I think you have a very full agenda, and so I want to make sure that there's enough time for a robust discussion of the items on the agenda. So I'm going to turn it over to Kendall [Thu] to proceed.

K. Thu: Sounds good. Thanks, Beth. Just one quick announcement before I introduce Chief Phillips. I think most, if not all, of you received an email concerning an IT survey. I would like to encourage you to fill that out. The IT survey about classroom technology came about as a result of conversations that I've had with a number of faculty having problems, particularly with DuSable, but also potentially other buildings. So that IT survey is part of the Provost's Office's response, and they've been very responsive to try to deal with short- and long-term problems with our classrooms, starting with DuSable. I think that's accurate to say. So, that survey is really a survey that was generated in response to faculty concerns about needed updated technology in the classrooms.

I also would like to say that, if you have a particular problem with a particular classroom in a particular building, of course, go to IT or DoIT. But also let me know, because I want to keep track of what's going on in the various campus buildings.

A. Campus Safety
Thomas Phillips, Chief of Police

K. Thu: With that, I'm very pleased to introduce the chief of police for NIU police department, Tom Phillips. Tom came here in 2013. Primarily, he's here for Q&A. I think he has a few comments. And I asked him to speak to us about fire alarms and evacuation of rooms, particularly when we're on the 15th floor of the Holmes Student Center. Please join me in welcoming Tom Phillips to the meeting.

T. Phillips: Good afternoon. I'll try to be brief. I know that you have a full agenda, and I thought about what I wanted to say today to all of you. First of all, I'm Tom Phillips. Thank you for having me. I wanted to cover the five Cs. The first one is communications. If you have not downloaded NIU Safe App, I ask that you please do that. You can do that from our website and the google store and the app store. It's really imperative that us, as a community, you partner with us in making sure that we keep campus safe. And the first way that we do that is through communications.

Some of the features that we have on that. If you have that, I'm sure that you've received some of our safety messaging. You'll get it through the app. In lieu of a text, you'll get a notification on the app. It's more reliable for us than a text message. There's also a virtual walk feature. It's kind of interesting. We monitor this in our dispatch center. If you want to walk from here to your car, you can activate this. It will notify our dispatch center, and they'll monitor you, breadcrumbs from point a to point b on campus. And then it has a button that you can connect directly to our dispatch center.

We also have Friend Walk. So, if you don't want the police department monitoring, you can send that link to anybody. And they don't even have to have the app, and they can monitor you walking from point a to point b around the campus.

It also has our emergency response guide in there. If you've been here for any amount of time, we used to send out big paper guides. I'm really pushing the paperless life. So, you can access that feature there.

And most importantly, it has two-way communication with our dispatch center. So, there's a mobile panic button on there. So, when you think about emergency call boxes, you now have it on your phone. And not only if you activate that will it connect our dispatch center, it'll tell us where you're at in the campus community, and you'll have two-way communication with our dispatchers. And we'll respond to every one of those.

The other C is the emergency call boxes. Maybe you've heard some rumors around campus that we're going to be yanking those. We are not. What we're doing is, over a period of time, they're quite costly for repair and maintenance of those boxes, and they're quite antiquated. So, they're essentially pay phones. They're the last vestige of pay phone. While I do value them, we're looking at where they're at. So, they're not going away, but as we integrate and update technology,

we want to look at: Do we actually need one in the middle of the Holmes Student Center? I'm not saying we don't, but we're making data-informed decisions about assessing those boxes as we go along, only when they break. So, if they break, we're going to assess out and see how many times it's been used over the past few years, and if there's any value in keeping that device.

R. Scherer: Have you explored whether sort of a Ring-type device [inaudible]

T. Phillips: What kind of device, sir?

R. Scherer: Like the door

T. Phillips: A Ring doorbell?

R. Scherer: [inaudible]

T. Phillips: I'm actually

R. Scherer: Something like that.

T. Phillips: One of my Cs in cameras, and we'll talk briefly about that. But I also wanted to address the fire rescue zones specifically, and my understanding is the fire alarm in Holmes Student Center. We evaluated our response, and I will tell you we can improve, and we are improving that area. So, we had to revisit our protocols and that as far as our response. And our officers, they knew this, but they were reminded, that they need to sweep every floor during a fire alarm, and all stairwells. So that's our standard protocol in the department. If it did not happen, I apologize. I've been told it did, but others have said it hasn't. I assure that will happen in the future.

We also have, the university has fire rescue zones in particular areas for persons with disabilities that can't go up and down stairs or specifically in the Holmes Student Center. Near the stairwells is the fire rescue zone, and our officers know to go check those areas. That's one of the things that we recently reiterated on my staff, that the list of where those are are housed with environmental health and safety. We've contacted them. We're updating the list. We're reviewing the list. And one of the things that I plan to do in the next year is use that list to build a map and work with facilities to just build a map of where those locations are, and integrate that into our NIU Safe App. So if you go into the app and you're in a building and there's a fire alarm, you can pull that up, and you know where to go, where the fire rescue zone is.

Also, if you're in any building on campus that has a fire alarm, and you need us to come to you, hit that app. That's a two-way communication device that will go straight to our dispatch center if you need assistance getting out of a building during a fire alarm.

K. Thu: And, Tom, if we don't have an app, if a person doesn't have the app, they can still call 911.

T. Phillips: Call 911.

K. Thu: To let folks know where they are.

T. Phillips: Right. The city fire department also maintains a list of persons with disability on campus. It's a confidential list. So, they do have a list where students reside. And if you want your name added to that list, I recommend you contact DeKalb Fire Department, and they can add you to that list.

Cameras. So, a couple years ago, we developed a multi-year plan for upgrading security technology, camera and access control across campus. We're looking at that now. We're beginning a pretty aggressive camera improvement project in the residence halls, and we hope to have that completed before the end of the fiscal year. And then we'll reevaluate, look at other areas in the future, depending on need. But the goal is to integrate what we have, fragmented camera system, into an enterprise software, where we build a monitor that during things, such as fire alarms, and we build access to certain cameras across campus.

The Ring doorbell that you mentioned, sir. We now have those – our pilot project was Stevenson Hall. So, if you go to the residence hall, they have those doorbells, commercial grade, not Ring, on the doors. And we use that, working with IT, we also developed a guest registration software system for housing. It's pretty robust, and it's pretty nice. So, we're working toward improving technology across the campus. It's challenging, because some of it's antiquated. I use a lot of analogies – for a long time we had VCRs, and we're trying to get to Netflix. So, we're moving in the right direction in that area.

One of the things that we're going to be doing over the coming months is we have a draft institutional policy as it relates to cameras and access control for the campus. We're looking at engaging a shared governance model. What that will look like, I have no desire to be big brother over everyone with cameras or anything like that. But a governed access of those systems for public safety.

The last two topics, the last two Cs are probably hot topics in the news and in the community. And the first one is cannabis. I get questions everywhere I go about this. Just briefly, I'll talk about cannabis. And what I tell my officers, the legislators spoke and the governor spoke, and it's legal within certain parameters. So we know it still unlawful to possess and use cannabis on public universities in Illinois, based on federal statutes and funding that the university receives.

Historically, our police officers have not been heavy enforcers of cannabis on campus. It's more of an education awareness, and we're more concerned about health and safety than we are about arresting people for possessing a marijuana cigarette or a joint – what they used to call that (I'm old). So, just a couple of facts that most people don't know. They could have done a better job in communicating this in our state, that less than 30 grams is legal. So, the way that we're looking at it is much like alcohol. So, we're focusing really for possession and use of under 21 is a challenge. And we're looking at health risk, but we manage it the same way we do when our student population or community member possesses alcohol underage. So, we try to get them education, awareness on those topics. It's not something we're arresting for – we can't anymore.

So, the parallel would be smoking cigarettes on Illinois public universities is also, there's a law against that. But we're not taking heavy enforcement on cigarette smoking; we just ask people to not smoke. I've personally come across that where I've said, hey, you kind of put me on the spot

here smoking a cigarette on campus, could you put that out? People are going to expect me to be the cigarette police, and I don't want to be that.

So, we're asking cooperation from our community. If you wouldn't drink alcohol during the day, don't smoke during the day. If you have medicinal purposes, do that in a private area. And if we get a call, we will come. But understand that we're not there to arrest somebody. Again, the governor spoke and the legislators spoke on this issue. So, anything over 30 grams is still against Illinois law, it's still illegal.

If you're not familiar with cannabis, which surprisingly I had to refresh my memory on a lot of things surrounding cannabis. What I tell people, it's not your father's joint. So, the marijuana intensity levels out there today are up to three to 10 times higher than marijuana was in 1995. And what we're seeing from studies across the nation is that – again, our focus is going to be on use under 21 and driving while under the influence. We're starting to see that data roll into Illinois with increase in traffic crashes surrounding cannabis. So, we're looking at it from that perspective. It's 30 grams of leaf, what most people are familiar with. Five hundred milligrams of liquid, THC. And five milligrams of edibles, which is the gummy bears. You hear about the gummy bears.

One of the concerns that I have and that we have for our students is overuse. If you eat a gummy bear, it has a delayed impact. It's not like smoking a cigarette. Many people that are not first-time users or not used to the gummies, they'll eat one, and then they'll eat two, and then they'll eat three waiting for that impact. The next thing you know, they're beyond high. And it's hard for us to tell, because the smell is not there. We just know that their behavior is there.

So, please educate the community. You can look on our website for additional information. But know that there's not heavy enforcement action going on in that area.

The last C is coronavirus. It's the big one everyone's talking about. I have an emergency manager that is monitoring this daily. I'm asking him for updates. I'm also watching the news. I know that we're working closely with the DeKalb County Health Department on this issue. Just from a response perspective, an investigation perspective, they would lead that effort. I'm told, and I believe, that there's nobody in DeKalb County that's currently infected. I'm not a subject-matter expert on coronavirus. I will just say that we have response plans for infectious disease, and we work with our partners in the county to manage that.

So, that was a lot, I know, in a quick period of time. I want to be able to answer any questions you may have of me.

K. Thu: So, just before the questions, I want to point out that we have three policies in the informational links in the back of the agenda concerning fire evacuations if you want to look at those or share them with anybody. Questions? Jeffry.

J. Royce: Thank you, Chief. As an employee of the Holmes Student Center, I can attest to your improved response time that you quoted the last fire alarm I experienced literally within 15, 20 seconds, there was an officer over the intercom verifying that it was false, and we did not have to evacuate the building. So, that was record response, and we definitely appreciated it. It was minus

five degrees outside that day. But a question that I have with regard to the fire safety, and I've asked this of a few people. Since this is my area that's responsible for evacuating the building, a lot of times we encounter staff members or people who just don't want to leave. And it's unclear what responsibility our staff has to make sure that happens or not. Can you give a little insight on evacuation protocols?

T. Phillips: Sure. If there's an actual fire, bona fide fire, when a fire alarm goes off, officers respond to every single one of those, fire response to every single one of those, we check the alarm panel, either us or fire, whoever is first in the building. We try to go to the source to determine if it's an actual fire. If it's an actual fire, we start evacuating people, fire starts extinguishing the fire. If we come across a faculty or staff member or student that doesn't want to evacuate the building, we're going to ask him to evacuate the building. But that's really going to be situational, depending on if there's an actual fire. We don't want to get into a situation where we're in a confrontation with one of our community members for a false alarm and saying you must. I think that, if you're responsible for evacuating your area, if you're the designee for your area and someone is being uncooperative, I would use the supervisory system to bring that to the attention of their supervisor, have a dialog with them and use that channel of reiterating how we all stay safe when we all evacuate the building during a fire alarm. None of these are drills. We do have occasional false alarms. But it's important that we, as a community, share that responsibility of doing the right thing during a fire alarm.

K. Thu: Other questions? Comments? Jeffry has another question.

J. Royce: It was more of a comment. I wanted to thank you also for clarifying the position on the call boxes on campus. I did hear some of that confusion myself. The best response I have to it, I think [inaudible] speaking to staff members is say a fire sensor, fire pull box. When it malfunctions, you don't ask how often it's been used in the past when you decide whether or not to keep it functional or not. And being preventative in nature, I think there's a lot of hesitation to see any of the emergency call boxes go away on campus for that reason.

T. Phillips: There's a specific criteria that we're looking at. I don't just make a random decision in a silo and say that call box has to go. When a call box breaks, I go to my dispatch center, I say give me three years' worth of data. How many times has that call box been activated in the last three years, and for what? I can say with confidence, none of the call boxes in any of our parking lots are going to go away, because what we see historically is that they're used in parking lots usually for people locked out of their vehicles or broke down. So, there's a value to them in those lots. There are some places on campus, on a case-by-case basis, if we're spending thousands of dollars to repair the device and it's in an open public area, and again going back to the pay phone analogy, I remember when pay phones started being removed, and everybody said, Oh, I'm not. But when's the last time you've seen a pay phone? And I'm not trying to minimize the box. I'm just saying, we're looking at it from a data-informed position. What is the value of having the box there? If it's in a specific area where there's high value, maybe it's high cost to repair, the box will stay. We just want to make better decisions about, frankly, antiquated technology across the campus, that we could shift our resources to provide better technology to keep you safe.

Again, on the app, you have a mobile call box. There's a button that, if you hit, it tells us anywhere you're at. And what I've found in the 25 years that I've been protecting campuses, is that call boxes

often times people will hit them for whatever reason, and it's not emergency related. It is a good information tool, but they can do that through our app. And if they do hit them, and let's say it is an emergency, and the few that I recall, they hit them and they keep moving. So, it's very difficult for us. They're not going to stand at the call box, let's say if someone's following them or if they're in a situation. They're not going to hit that button and stay there. Rarely do we get there and we encounter an emergency situation unfolding at the call box. It may sound progressive. I just think that we can, over time, move in a better direction, using those resources to better keep the community safe.

K. Thu: Well, real good, Tom. Thank you for coming. Thanks for your presentation and responding to questions. I have to say, when I was department chair of anthropology, I had the pleasure of watching Tom's son become an anthropology major, so we cross paths in strange ways. Thanks, Tom.

T. Phillips: Yes. I love talking about my son, second year law school here at NIU. I'm a Huskie. My wife's a Huskie. [inaudible]

K. Thu: And our daughter may be interning with the NIU police department, so strangely enough. Thanks, Tom.

T. Phillips: Thank you.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

K. Thu: Okay, next, Consent Agenda. Pat, do we have anything on the consent agenda? Okay.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Linda Saborío – report

K. Thu: Roman numeral VIII., we turn to Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. And, Linda Saborío, you're up.

L. Saborío: Good afternoon, everyone. The FAC January meeting was scheduled to convene at SIU-Edwardsville. But due to uncertainties with the weather, most of us on the committee to participate via Zoom. Not the same as meeting face-to-face, but it was still functional.

SIUE chancellor, Randy Pembroke, greeted the FAC and apologized for the weather first thing that morning. He discussed several successful programs at SIUE, including their health programs in dental, nursing and pharmacy. But one noteworthy program is their Successful Communities Collaborative. And what this is, is, the institution reaches out to local mayors to identify challenges within the community. And then they bring the resulting list back to faculty to see what might fit into their classes.

We also asked Pembroke about performance-based funding, and he sees this as a tricky question due to shifting populations and the need for reinvention. We should look five to 15 years down the

road for the vision of what an institution can be, rather than looking back at what an institution was. And he says that numbers need to be a part of the equation, because it takes a certain amount of facilities and staff to serve a program, and those costs can vary greatly, depending on discipline and level.

We also had the opportunity to meet with Dominic Dorsey. He's the director of SIUE ACCESS. That's what they call their disability resource center. And he's chair of the IBHE Disabilities Services Advisory Council. So some comments and concerns that he shared with us are ways to better serve students, essential abilities and technical standards. And he offered the example of a course requiring a nature hike that a wheelchair student may not be able to fulfill. So the FAC, we have a mental health working group, and they're going to be contacting Dominic in the future to increase cross-talk for relevant, authentic solutions.

And then the council had an informal talk with Illinois State Representative Katie Stuart. She is vice chair of the Higher Education Committee with an interest in taking over as chair. And she's also a member of the Bipartisan Higher Education Working Group. Some issues we discussed with her are student financial aid support, teacher licensure requirements in alignment with in-state repairs, dual credit impacts on faculty positions and course offerings in the liberal arts – this is a hot topic as you know, with the community college caucus – performance-based funding and increased reliance on adjunct faculty – another hot topic, right.

At this point, the chancellor came in and announced that the campus was closing, so the meeting was adjourned. It probably would have taken me longer to drive there and back than the actual meeting, itself.

Then I have just two slides that I want to share with you. This first is the Budget in Brief – Higher Education slide from the governor's budget address, just about a week ago. And I'm guessing that many of you have already seen this slide, but if not, it's available for you to view – is it not, Pat, on the FAC information item link on the Faculty Senate web page?

P. Erickson: It was provided via email to all the faculty senators after last week's meeting.

L. Saborío: Okay. Well, we can put it up there as an informational item?

P. Erickson: Yes.

L. Saborío: Then the second slide is an opportunity that I wanted to bring to your attention. It's called the Mental Health/First Aid and Higher Education. This is a free one-day course where individuals receive training on how to recognize the symptoms of emerging mental health illnesses and how to assist adults facing a mental health crisis. It's available to faculty, staff, students, community advisors, counselors, etc. There's a list there. And they will accept up to 30 individuals per course. For additional information, if you are interested in offering one here on campus, you can contact Kate Mahoney. She's on the bottom there of the slide. And I can ask Pat to also upload this flyer to the Faculty Senate link. That way, if you are looking for additional information, it'll be up there.

So, this ends my report. Any questions, comments? I'll even take complaints today; I'm in a good mood.

K. Thu: Thank you, Linda. I appreciate it.

- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
Jeffry Royce, Catherine Doederlein, Kendall Thu
Alex Gelman, Sarah Marsh, Jason Hanna

K. Thu: Next we turn to University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees report. The board met, I think, two weeks ago was it? And it only had two action items on the agenda for the full board. Most of the meeting day for the board was spent in subcommittees. The two action items that the board approved was one, approving an honorary doctoral degree for a nominee. And then secondly, they approved outside counsel for Jerry Blazey's office to deal with intellectual property rights. So maybe a couple things that aren't really pressing on your radar. Cathy [Doederlein], do you want to add anything to the board meeting, because Cathy was there. So, the next board meeting, there will be more items on the agenda for action, and I'll have more to say following that meeting at the next UC meeting.

- C. Academic Policy Committee – Vicki Collins, Chair – no report

K. Thu: With that, Vicki Collins, we have no report, right, Vicki?

V. Collins: Right.

- D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Therese Arado, Chair – report

K. Thu: Then Resources, Space and Budget, Therese.

T. Arado: Good afternoon, everyone. The Resources, Space and Budget Committee met on Friday, February 7, and will be meeting again next Friday, March 6, so we're coming up on our next meeting. But on the 7th, the majority of the discussion surrounded members providing feedback and insights to Provost Ingram and Vice President Chinniah regarding space use on campus.

Members shared their thoughts on the concepts of space ownership, allocation and responsibility of space, and how these concepts intersect with budget allocations. Specifically, what things are, or should be, under local control; and what are, or should be, centralized, were discussed. Discussion topics such as pride in our space and the importance of creating a sense of belonging were addressed. And prioritizing room scheduling to assist with things such as providing discipline-specific needs in classrooms.

Other topics included were maintaining the footprint of campus that we currently have, even with bringing new buildings online. In doing so, identifying ways to repurpose space and identify spaces that may be decommissioned due to underutilization or no use.

The provost and CFO asked the group to reach out to their constituents for additional feedback on these topics. And when we meet next week, we have questions out for our members to talk to their constituents as well.

Provost Ingram and Vice President Chinniah also are hoping to engage in several open meetings in how university budgets work, and asked for insight on how the group understood and saw university budgets working and to solicit feedback from their constituents.

And as I said, we meet again next Friday.

K. Thu: Thanks, Therese. Any questions for Therese? I will add that the state released a little over \$7 million for the health IT building, for planning purposes. And another survey was sent out to, I think, most, if not all, of you concerning the proposed location of the health IT building. If you have that email sitting in your email box, please respond to it.

E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – no report

K. Thu: Next we have, well Richard Siegesmund, Rules, Governance and Elections, we'll just save that for the shared governance structure conversation.

F. University Affairs Committee – Hamid Bateni, Chair – no report

K. Thu: Hamid, no report? Okay.

G. Student Government Association – report
Naomi Bolden, President
Ian Pearson, Speaker of the Senate

K. Thu: Student Government Association. I don't see Naomi, but I see Ian. Is Naomi over there? Go ahead, Ian.

I. Pearson: Good afternoon everyone. President Bolden has no report today. I'm not feeling well, so I'm going to boil this down to one main point. Wednesday, April 1, is NIU Advocacy Day. That's a day in which students, faculty, staff and alumni will go down to Springfield to advocate for higher education.

The Student Government Association is sponsoring a bus to take students down and back that day if they want to participate. So, if there are students you know of, or work with, that would be interested in attending Advocacy Day, have them contact me at ipearson1@niu.edu. We can get them signed up. We'll be offering a workshop on how to be an advocate and how to conduct yourself in those meetings. And then we'll also plan the trip.

At this time, I'll yield to any questions. Thank you.

K. Thu: Thanks, Ian.

H. Operating Staff Council – Jeffrey Royce, President – report

K. Thu: Next we have Jeffrey, a report from the Operating Staff Council.

J. Royce: Thank you, Kendall. In favor of, hopefully, what will be a lively discussion in a few minutes, I'll keep this short. We also hosted the provost and CFO at our last meeting, and most of the talking points that Therese just reported on from the Resources, Space and Budget Committee, we spoke about at the council, as well.

A quick announcement: Deadlines for Operating Staff Outstanding Service Awards are on Friday. So, if any of you work with or alongside any operating staff members, who you feel you'd like to nominate for an outstanding award, that deadline is Friday. And we appreciate all the nominations you can submit.

K. Thu: Sounds good. Thanks, Jeffrey.

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Catherine Doederlein, President – report

K. Thu: And Cathy, SPS?

C. Doederlein: Thank you. We will have notification of our award winners out to the community soon, we hope. We had our nomination process a bit earlier and will let folks know. And that celebration of those recipients will be in April, so be looking for information on that.

Additionally, notification has gone out to SPS to encourage them to self-nominate or nominate their peers to serve on the SPS Council, as well as to consider serving as president of council, as that term is up this year. Definitely, if you have SPS colleagues, please encourage them to consider running. If they are facing potential transition to operating staff, our constitution has changed such that we allow them to continue serving in a capacity on council during the fiscal year of their transition. So, if they aren't certain if they'll still be SPS, we want them with us as long as possible. So, please encourage them to self-nominate or nominate their peers. Thank you.

K. Thu: Thanks, Cathy.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Reimagining Shared Governance

K. Thu: That brings us to Roman numeral IX. Unfinished Business. We have two items under unfinished business, and they're both related. One is the ongoing discussion of academic governance, and we're going to go through some of the updates to that. The second is a first reading for a proposal or a concept to reimagine the University Council. And I'm going to tag team this with Richard Siegesmund, who is the chair of the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, because a lot of the heavy thinking and the conversations have occurred in his committee.

And so, what I want to start out by doing is to sort of give you an update on where we are by turning to this lovely graphic. There are three big issues – the three main points of our proposed changes to shared governance are, one, to move academic matters out of University Council and swoop them up into Faculty Senate. So this pink swoop is that swoop.

The second is to make things more efficient, to cut down on the number of committees that we have, because there are committees that are duplicate between University Council and Faculty Senate. And if we're moving things from University Council over to Faculty Senate, we don't need the same committees that are currently in UC.

And then the third thing that we want to talk about is reimagining University Council. Since academic matters will fall under the Faculty Senate, if this is approved, then the University Council doesn't need to be – how many members now – 63 members. So, when we get there, I'm going to ask Richard to walk us through that.

Each month I try to keep track of the comments and suggestions as we move along. So, a few things have come up in the month of February, and I want to respond to three of the four and then probably turn it over to Richard. One faculty member commented that we should have a body that serves as a liaison between Faculty Senate and University Council. And in the reimagined University Council structure, we don't have that. So we added a duty to Richard's current committee, Rules, Governance and Elections, that that committee, which is composed of the Faculty Senate and UC members, will formally serve as the liaison between the two bodies.

I'm going to come back to the UC.

Also, on the Faculty Senate side, and I've gone through all of this stuff with the Faculty Senate that met last week. We previously added ten instructors to Faculty Senate, and we propose to have one instructor from each of the seven colleges, and then three selected by the instructors' union. I was advised that it's not probably wise to get any union involved in our shared governance process. So, instead of the union selecting those three remaining members, we're going to have them possibly elected at large. But there will be ten total instructors, and I'm very pleased that we're going to have those members represented in Faculty Senate. As you can see in the swoop chart – maybe you can't see it – we've moved the University Council Personnel Committee over to the Faculty Senate. How many of you have ever served on UCPC? Several of you in here. So, you know what the UCPC does. Ninety-nine percent of it is tenure and promotion, and sabbaticals. That's mostly what we did. And some piece of it is policy. So, tenure and promotion, sabbaticals, is really the purview of the Faculty Senate. It's not that UCPC reports out; we really don't. The UCPC has its own authority to make decisions, but if it ever needed to report out, it would now report out to the Faculty Senate. So that change has been made as well.

With that, we have an example on the next, if you can move ahead, Pat, to two slides forward, right here. So, this is an example of a committee on senate and a committee on UC that are duplicative. You don't have to read the language actually. You can if you want. But the duties for each of these committees mirror each other. So, the green duties on the left-hand side are also covered on the right-hand side. The blue duties on the left-hand side are also covered in the right-hand side. And,

therefore, we can get rid of Academic Affairs, because it's not needed. We've already got it covered in the Faculty Senate.

Those are the changes since the last time we talked about this. I'm going to turn it over to Richard, because what's new this time is a proposal for reimagining University Council. So, Richard, do you want to take it away from here? You want to go up to the podium? Maybe that's easier. And then we'll talk about process and certainly leave plenty of time for feedback.

R. Siegesmund: The Rules, Governance and Elections Committee has met several times now, twice now, trying to think about what a revised University Council might be if the academic affairs moved to Faculty Senate. And that part of this movement, too, is trying to create a more streamlined governance system.

The primary responsibilities for University Council would be essentially the work of what Resources, Space and Budget does now. And so, in that revised organizational chart, you'll see that Resources, Space and Budget is sort of this shadow committee. Really the University Council becomes Resources, Space and Budget.

Our discussions in committee have largely been, if you're trying to create a small, manageable – and by small, we're thinking somewhere in the 20s. There is no magic number here in terms of what's going to be rendered – but the point is to do something that doesn't duplicate the current system of 60-some people on the University Council. And there's really no algorithm, no formula for trying to dictate what that body would be. There is what I said at Faculty Senate, what the philosopher, Nelson Goodman, calls goodness of fit. So, you can't really depend on an algorithm to produce this.

There are faculty positions for representatives from each college and the University Libraries. Then there are five positions for students, two positions for instructors, one for clinical faculty, because one of the things that has certainly come up in this process is trying to honor the contributions of instructors and clinical faculty into the decision-making process of the university. There are then five operating staff positions and four supportive professional staff. And then there would be four administrative positions, which we, in terms of Kendall's conversations with President Freeman, we believe probably should be voting positions, which is something that has been suggested. And then the Faculty Senate president/UC chair would be a nonvoting position on the committee.

So, what's the magic number? What's the magic formula? What's fair? We certainly, in committee, thought it could be larger. And there have been voices, as well, that it be smaller. I think that is something, as Jeffry said, perhaps a lively discussion that we might have here today. But that is a point – the committee doesn't want to say, this is a recommendation. It is a point of departure in the discussion.

K. Thu: Well put. So, I think at this juncture – and I want to make sure we have plenty of time, if there are questions and feedback, to allow you to comment and get your reaction. And then once we go through that, whatever it looks like, I'll talk about what the process might look like going forward, because this is something that has to be attended, both in Faculty Senate and the University Council. So, Jeffry, I bet I can ask your question for you.

J. Royce: Probably not.

K. Thu: Oh, okay.

J. Royce: I might surprise you this time. Given that the last version of this circle that I saw and that most of us saw, Richard, you had mentioned that it showed the administrators as nonvoting. Kendall, I was wondering if you could clarify a little bit about the conversation you had to change it?

K. Thu: Sure. I had a meeting with – we always have a UC prep meeting with the leadership team. And Lisa [Freeman] expressed concerns that we're taking away the voting rights of the leadership team. Previously, or as you know in the current UC structure, the leadership team, the president, the provost, the CFO, are all voting members. And then all the deans in various colleges are voting members. My thinking with that proposal was that administrators actually get to act on things up flagpole once UC acts on them. And I thought was the way things would work. Lisa pointed out that there are actually matters that come only before the UC, and only the UC has power for. So, for example, the UC retains the right to change UC [NIU] bylaws. They retain the right to change the Constitution. And, so the leadership team doesn't have any voice in that vote unless they vote on UC, because there's no other place where that takes place.

The other thing that Lisa mentioned was that it's a recruiting issue for administrators, or for leadership positions. If you talk about our shared governance system and you don't have our leadership represented in some way in the UC, it might be a turn-off for potential leaders coming to campus. Beth [Ingram] was part of this conversation as well. I don't know whether you want to add anything to that, Beth?

B. Ingram: I think that pretty much covers it. You know, when you think about shared governance, it's really shared governance. And if you exclude an entire group from it, it's not really shared governance anymore.

K. Thu: This was a compromise in our conversations, as a lot of this is. And so I like the way Richard talks about this body as it's currently proposed. No one group can predominate. You have to act in a parliamentary manner where various groups have to work together. And that includes the leadership team. So, that's where that came from, Jeffrey.

J. Royce: Thank you. I have a quick follow-up to that, and I know you're surprised. You had mentioned how UC will retain the ability to change bylaws and Constitution. And I assume the vehicle for that will continue to be the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. And I was wondering if the membership there was going to change to more mirror this structure as well.

K. Thu: I've been recently been dealing with updating committee membership to reflect what we're doing here and in the senate. Maybe Richard or Pat, you could help me with that. Have we done anything with membership on RGE?

R. Siegesmund: I don't believe we have yet.

P. Erickson: Let's look it up?

K. Thu: Okay, so we'll put that question on hold.

P. Erickson: We can look it up right now.

K. Thu: Okay.

P. Erickson: Maybe.

K. Thu: In your packet, what you have is not only these charts that give you sort of the 36,000-foot view of what's going on. In the interest of transparency, all of the proposed language changes throughout the Constitution and Bylaws are there if you're so inclined. Maybe you're bored some night and you want to read the proposed changes in our Constitution. Why, by all means, go at it. Here we go. FS Rules, Governance ... yep, we have changed it. You can see the gray highlighted areas are language that I've added to accommodate what we've just talked about. Phew, glad I did that. Other questions or comments?

J. Chen: [inaudible]

K. Thu: Could we get the microphone?

J. Chen: I just have a question about clarification for the eligibility for the tenure-track faculty for both Faculty Senate and University Council, because I noticed that they both called tenure-track faculty, but currently I think of for Faculty Senate, we include tenure-track faculty, not only tenured faculty, right?

K. Thu: So, it includes both tenured and tenure-track faculty. Currently, you have to be tenured to serve on UC. So that's correct. It's going to be tenure-track or tenured.

J. Chen: So, you mean University Council, the faculty representative, you have to be tenured.

K. Thu: You want to bring that language up, Pat, if you can, for membership, the proposed membership. So, I'm looking at my summary, here we go.

J. Royce: Can you clarify what page number that is?

P. Erickson: 17.

K. Thu: So, apportionment of faculty representation in 2.2: The faculty shall be defined as, I'm sorry.

P. Erickson: Kendall, read it up above, in the gray, 2.1.2.

K. Thu: So, seven tenure-track faculty. So it includes both tenured and tenure-track faculty.

J. Chen: For Faculty Senate?

K. Thu: For the representation of faculty on UC.

J. Chen: UC. Oh, both, okay.

K. Thu: Yes.

J. Chen: So that's a change.

K. Thu: Right, that's a change.

J. Chen: Okay, thank you.

K. Thu: Although, you know, in my department, we try to steer non-tenured faculty away from doing that kind of service. But there might be a glutton out there, so who knows. Other questions or comments? Reed.

R. Scherer: Richard and Kendall know exactly where I'm about to go, because in RGE, we did have a discussion of the, in Richard's words, not magic number, of this oval table. And every group has got their own sense of what is fair representation. And I made the argument, understanding that each college gets one seat, I thought LA and S, being as large a footprint as it is and having a direct impact on all of the other colleges, and the fact that LA and S subdivides into three natural groups, that being the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities, I argued for three chairs for LA and S, which I think is pretty close to proportional for one chair for each of the other colleges. And so that was an argument that I made, and I still hold that view, so it's a point of discussion.

K. Thu: So, I thought you changed your mind, Reed.

R. Scherer: I didn't change my mind. I was willing to discuss. So here we are discussing.

K. Thu: Just to clarify and in keeping with what Richard has said, we're not suggesting or proposing membership for stakeholders based on proportionality of the size of colleges or the number of divisions within a college. We're trying to do this in the spirit – I can't remember the philosopher's name.

R. Siegesmund: Nelson Goodman.

K. Thu: In the spirit of, are there voices there? And in the case of tenure-track faculty, the tenure-track faculty will predominate in the Faculty Senate, and we've made proposed changes to the Constitution that empowers Faculty Senate to have the authority over academic matters. It requires – I'm a member of your college too. It requires some sacrifice. I'm willing to give up some of that representation from my college to allow for a more equitable representation from other sectors, because of what they're going to be doing going forward. So, there are really three functions that the UC will do going forward once the academic piece is pulled. One is budgeting. Two is the

building planning. And three is proposed changes in the bylaws and constitution. And there are some other miscellaneous policy issues as well.

R. Scherer: And I would argue that all of those things that you just listed disproportionately impact LA and S.

K. Thu: I understand, and I completely agree that's what's going to happen. But for me, I'm willing to make that sacrifice. Other comments or questions? Jeffry. Why don't you sit up front?

J. Royce: I like to hide in the back. Thank you. With respect to Reed's comment, who I enjoyed a short debate with at RGE, and at the risk of sounding repetitive, but I suppose I should say it here as well. Unfortunately, yes, not every college can be represented proportionately. And same goes for staff. There's just no way every division or college or union or body of staff can possibly be represented with five seats. And I've come to see that that's a fair compromise. At first, I argued that eight tenure-track faculty versus five staff and four SPS has its unfairness as well, but I see the benefit of the compromise. And I think the way it looks is probably the best we're going to get. So I would say that maybe the two instructors and one clinical faculty might be pushing it a bit too far. I think their representation in Faculty Senate now is definitely moving forward, because we can't give the same proportion representation to everyone else.

K. Thu: Other comments? Cathy.

C. Doederlein: I suppose just to kind of add on to Jeffry's comments, to the extent that changes to the Constitution always require a referendum, which is a referendum of the faculty, I think the faculty voice gets amplified through that referendum process. Not that I wouldn't be very open to the idea of that referendum process being adjusted to include the broader campus, other than just faculty, which is not in any way to diminish the importance and significance of faculty, but just to kind of note that the proportionality or potential equity concerns based off of the numbers being proposed there are, I think, more than taken care of by that referendum factor.

K. Thu: That's a good point. Other comments? Questions? So, I wanted to get everybody out of here by 4:30. I think we're going to get there. Richard, do you have anything else you want to add, because I want to turn to talking about the process going forward.

R. Siegesmund: Other than that the committee really wanted to bring this forward to University Council for discussion. And so this is first reading. This is something that we felt really needed to be discussed here and hashed out here in this room. And so we look forward to the continuing conversation.

K. Thu: Absolutely. Thank you, Richard. So, the next meeting – we have no UC meeting in March. So, the next meeting of UC is April 1, April Fool's, and Advocacy Day in Springfield. So, as Cathy rightly mentioned, any changes to the constitution that are passed by UC have to go before the faculty for a referendum. I believe, I think faculty, for the referendum includes some full-time instructors, or just tenure-track?

P. Erickson: I don't have that language in front of me, but just from my memory, I believe it's all full-time employees who hold the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, professor or instructor.

K. Thu: Okay. We have two more meetings, right, after this one. We have one on April 1 and then another one on April 29. Then we have Faculty Senate meeting on March 25. And so, if we wanted to try to get this done before summer, we would bring this for a second reading at the April 1 meeting of UC. That would give us an entire month plus for any outstanding issues that you want to bring to us. And I'm going to send out updates on what we're doing early in March, so that if there are things that you don't want to share here, but you want to bring to our attention, we have plenty of time to do that.

The reason for doing it on April 1 instead of at the April 29 meeting is, if we pass it on April 29, we have how much time left for the referendum? Semester ends the first or second week of May. It's just enough time to make sure that we give everybody the opportunity to participate in the referendum.

After the referendum, then it has to go to the Board of Trustees, because constitutional changes have to get Board of Trustee approval. And they're meeting in June. So, I've already had conversations with Matt Streb and the board chair, just alerting them to the possibility that this might be coming their way.

If it doesn't. If the body decides we don't want to move in this direction or that you want more time to vet the proposal, then we can come back to it next fall. And there's no special, you know, motion that you have to make for that. You just come back and go at it again.

So, that's kind of where we're at. Any questions about the process, the timetable? Just want to make sure that there are no surprises. I want this to be completely transparent. You know, as Richard has said many times, we're not going to get this completely right. There's just no way. We're going to have to come back and tweak it. We also would have to go through an implementation phase, because this changes the way people are elected to committees and to bodies. So, that would be the summer period where Pat and I and others would work on how do you implement the proposed changes.

What I really need, and I've sort of said this going along, is some sense of whether you think we should proceed with the second reading at the April 1 UC meeting. The Faculty Senate, I think, is at a place where they want to have a second reading for the changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws at their March 25 meeting. And their proposed changes would be contingent on what we do. So, it's contingent on each other. Would anybody see a problem with having a second reading on the April 1 meeting. I know we've got some issues with the leadership team being down in Springfield that day, students being down in Springfield that day. And we just have to work through them. There are alternates that we can call on.

Questions about? So, no strong objection to having a second – you can always vote it down on the second reading on April 1 if you'd like. But I think we're doing the right thing here. I think it's the right movement. There are things that I don't necessarily agree with, but I can live with. And so,

that's sort of the bottom line for me when you're doing these kind of policy changes. Can you compromise, and in the end, can you live with it. Any final comments or questions about this conversation? Okay.

1. Academic Governance
ONGOING DISCUSSION
2. University Council Governance
FIRST READING

X. NEW BUSINESS

K. Thu: If not, we have no new business. And is there anything else?

XI. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Policy Library](#) – Comment on Proposed Policies (right-hand column on web page)
- B. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- E. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- F. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- G. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- H. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- J. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), Student Senate
- N. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- O. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- P. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- Q. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- R. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- S. [2018-19 Annual Report](#) – Office of the Ombudsperson

- T. 2019-20 Faculty Senate meeting dates:
Sep 4, Oct 2, Oct 30, Nov 20, Jan 22, Feb 19, Mar 25, Apr 22

- U. 2019-20 University Council meeting dates:
Sep 11, Oct 16, Nov 6, Dec 4, Jan 29, Feb 26, Apr 1, Apr 29

- V. HSC Fire Alarm – Response from Chief Thomas Phillips

General fire safety evacuation information is available in the [NIU Emergency Response Guide](#).

Access to the guide is also available via the new NIUSafe App at:
[Subscribe to Safety Notifications - NIU - Emergency Information](#)

A list of evacuation points for the campus is maintained by EH&S, which also publishes an [Annual Fire Safety Report](#).

XII. ADJOURNMENT

K. Thu: If not, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn. Richard [Siegesmund] moves. Second by Reed [Scherer]. All in favor.

Members: Aye.

K. Thu: Have a good evening, everybody.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.