

10-7-2015

UC Transcript 2015-10-07

Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil>

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2015-10-07" (2015). *University Council Archives*. 3.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/3>

This Transcript is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Council Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, October 7, 2015, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Adeboje, Arriola, Baker, Bauer, Block, Brubaker, Carey, Carlson, Chen, Conderman (for Hedin), Cordes, Dawson, Deng, Dhar, Doederlein, Domke, Elish-Piper, Freeman, Gilson, Haliczzer, Hanley, Hathaway, Jaffee, Keith, Khoury, Lagioia, Lezon, Liberty-Baczak, Long, Macdonald, McCord, Mooney, Moremen, Naples, Nicholson, Nissenbaum, Pavkov, Penrod, Riley, Rodgers, Saborio, Scherer, Siegesmund (for Giese), Staikidis, Slotsve (for Chakraborty), Sto. Domingo, Thomas, Thu, Vazquez, Vohra, Wagenecht

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Bishop, Bond, Campbell, Chakraborty, Farrel, Giese, Hedin, Jemison, Lee, Lupstein, Mogren, Pitney, Schoenbachler

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Bjerken, Bryan, Coryell, Falkoff, Klaper, Phillips, Weldy

OTHERS ABSENT: Kaplan, Levin, Konen

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Hello. Ready to go? Everybody fortified with coffee and sugar? All right. Here we go. Welcome. Welcome to the University Council. Call to order.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: And first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Do we have a motion to approve the agenda? Bill Penrod.

V. Naples: Second.

D. Baker: Any discussion? Additions? Editorial comments? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Well done.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 9, 2015 MEETING

D. Baker: Second approval of the minutes for the September 9th meeting. Do we have a motion? Promod [Vohra].

H. Nicholson: Second.

D. Baker: Any editorial comments? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: Moving onto the president announcement, we will immediately turn to Greg and ask Greg to make announcements about guests and other things.

G. Long: Thank you very much and good afternoon. I would like to welcome we have some visiting professors from Anhui University of Finance and Economics in China. We have Zheng Yaqin, professor in the School of Business Administration, Cao Hurping, associate professor, School of International Economic Business and Trade; and Gao Lili, lecturer, School of Economics. Thank you and well tomorrow for being here. They've been here for three weeks learning about shared governance. We met last week. They came to the Faculty Senate meeting. They're here as well. Giving them an introduction to how at least Northern Illinois University handles shared governance.

Another thing I would like to mention as a quick update. At your table you should have an [advocacy and lobbying note](#). It is something that we distributed to the Faculty Senate last week in response to questions about what are any individual limits, guidelines and so forth as far as communicating your thoughts on legislative issues and other kinds of things. Ask you to take a look at it. We can't use university time and resources or speak on behalf of the university without there being some explicit permission on that topic. So again this is just an information item. Just wanted to share it with you so that you have it available.

Would also mention that the -- our council, the SPS Council and Faculty Senate and Student Association, we've talked about letter writing on behalf of our respective groups. That will be a follow-up for you. Also Governor Rauner is coming to campus on October 29 as part of an event sponsored by the DeKalb County Economic Development Corporation. He's going to be here that evening. Just an information item for anyone who might want to be aware that the governor is coming to campus and we have no budget and nearly 6,000 students on MAP grants, that had an education item, not anything on advocacy.

As an information item, thanks for the work being done on program prioritization and the responsiveness of the leadership team and addressing various authors questions and concerns, adding a little time. Would like to note support for the chairs and both task forces, the chairs are facilitators, not decision makers. As such, the use of SPS staff and tenured faculty members as team leaders provide, I think, an inclusive atmosphere to help the groups continue their work. Wanted to let you know we are aware of changes and mentioned them in Faculty Senate and let you know as well. With that, that's end of mine. I'll turn it over to President Baker.

D. Baker: Any questions for Greg? Okay. Speaking of the legislature, I was in Chicago yesterday with Al Phillips and Mike Mann from my office and met with other presidents and chancellors and

the leadership the staff from the Illinois Board of Higher Education and attended the higher education board meeting. It was an interesting day.

The presidents and chancellors discussed what each of their campuses are doing to try and get the stuck budget unstuck. So it appears that all of the campuses around the state are having -- and this is the faculty, staff and student groups on their own -- are out putting together what you are doing exactly here. I guess there's coordination or discussion across the units. Dillon, are the students talking across the state? I got you with your mouth full. Yes, Dillon says.

Also alumni organizations are doing that. If you have an alum, you can go to our alumni page. There's a signup button for you to be an advocate for higher education. Again, I'm not proposing you side one way or the other. You can vote however you want so-to-speak and express your opinion however you want. Just telling you what the access points are. There's a lot of activity going on out there. That's important. Faculty, staff and students and alumni, please express your concerns and interests.

The presidents of some of the schools are very concerned about -- all the schools, are very concerned about where we are with the budget, the MAP grants, etc., and what's going to break the log jam. There are many parts of the state government getting close to being in real trouble and not being able to go forward. Somebody told me hunting licenses may not be issued, or the Secretary of State said that, at some point, he's going to have to quit issues new licenses for vehicles. These are kind of things without a state budget that get shut down and that will get people's attention. We need to be really concerned about those things if this moves forward.

The presidents and chancellors have a meeting set to go see the governor next week. Is that when it is? Next week. And we'll be down there -- two weeks, I guess. We'll be down having this conversation with him. We were -- met with the staff a couple weeks ago. And asked for that meeting and expressed our concerns and talked about the impact it was having on our students and we're continuing to work all those angles and would like you to express any opinions or concerns.

D. Domke: Because you did catch me with my mouth full, I wanted to let everyone know here know too the Student Association, Senate is looking to create a forum, a rally during the day that Rauner is on campus, probably will start around 4:30. That way any faculty, staff, operating council, anyone who wants to come and support your students, you can do so in a legal fashion without breaking any kind of ethics rules or things like that. Because that is the close of the day. So I'll talk a little more about that when we get to the S.A. report, but I wanted to get that out there right away.

D. Baker: Thank you, Dillon, for doing that. And so the executive and legislative branches of student government are working on it?

D. Domke: Correct.

D. Baker: I think Greg shared you with you a letter that the presidents and -- sent to the leaders of the legislator and it's now being sent to all legislators and being distributed around the state. Anyone read the blogs that followed? They weren't all positive, were they? There still is a misperception about funding higher education in this state. There isn't an understanding that in real dollars, inflation adjusted dollars, we've lost half of our state operating appropriation over the last 12 years. It's a dramatic number. When you say that to people, they go: I had no idea. Well, we need to

have that idea out there. There's still the sense that our faculty and staff are grossly overpaid. That we're fat and sassy and that we have huge foundations that can just float everything. None of those are true. And as we know, we haven't had a salary raise in a long time. We don't have the capital money to be doing the things we want to be doing in the institution. And we need a state budget. And we need MAP grants to help our students. 5700 students get MAP grants. About \$20 million a year in MAP funding comes to our students. We need all that. We need to make our case, and we've not done as good of a job as we should have. I appreciate everybody's effort to get that word out. We're still a strong school, got great faculty, staff and students, but we need the resources to fulfill the mission. It's time for the state to come forward and put a budget together and allow us to move forward. That's my editorial comment today. The letter was a first step along of many stems of meetings that we've had. I'm down there every week now, talking to people.

How about something positive? Was it last night? Yeah, it was last night we had the new faculty welcome dinner. My goodness. What a great evening. Some of the chairs were there. The deans were there. And they introduced their new faculty from excellent schools all over the country doing really exciting and innovative things. It was just an amazing evening. So thanking you everybody that was there. Whoever did the hiring did a good job. Every faculty member was impressive. I saw spark bees flying among the new faculty: I need to talk to you. And: you went to Stanford too? I need to talk to you. A fun evening and the next generation of faculty are impressive. Thank you for doing that.

Following that meeting we had a -- take back the night march. I think some of you here participated that and started in the plaza and circled around campus and down to the lagoon, a couple hundred people showed up for that. Excellent event. I appreciated the three student organizers that did that.

And then last weekend we had a unity march here that brought together the university and DeKalb community, and county, to have a march that started at the school of nursing and went around the neighborhood as a unity march. Another great event that really brought people together and showed how we want to overcome any differences that we have. So lot of positive things are going on right now. Any questions on any of those stuff?

- A. Appropriate Use Policy – [presentation](#)
Brett Coryell, Chief Information Officer, and
Drew Bjerken, Chief Information Security Officer
[Policy on Privacy in the Electronic Environment](#) – Pages 3-6
[Policy on Appropriate Use of the NIU Network](#) – Pages 7-10

D. Baker: Okay. Let's get on to our business. Under the president's announcements, I've got the first one which is information item about the appropriate use policy. From IT. And Brett and his team, Brett Coryell, our chief information officer, vice president has been working on that. I want to turn it over to Brett and his team, Drew.

A. Bjerken: All right. Good afternoon, everybody. I'm Andrew Bjerken, the chief administration security officer for NIU working for Brett. I'm going to kind of walk you through the Acceptable Use Policy as well as the privacy policy that we've put together. Next slide.

So these are the things we're going to go over. A little background about the intent and really have a discussion and question period where you guys can hopefully -- had a chance to read both the policies and then you can let us know what your thoughts are. Next slide.

So the big thing is back in 2014 we revamped the accept building use policy. And NIU got negative publicity on the Internet. So lots of negative feedback, you can see there in quotes what was put out. And then, because of that, NIU started looking back at the Acceptable Use Policy. One of the big things was we put in a new device -- a firewall that does content blocking. Sometimes it's automatic. They were trying to get to a particular church website that had been blocked by the Internet -- lack of a better word, Internet community as being a hate site. So then there was big backlash that the NIU doesn't respect freedom of speech, freedom of expression, which caused us to have to look at the policies that we have in place. So we had the policy written -- next slide.

So there were a lot of procedures. We revamped it. Made the policy, pulled out the procedures and created a privacy policy. There was kind of a merging of the two and what we needed was to have an actual no kidding policy on privacy. And we've subsequently been going through shared governance, the shared dates for the different committees that we met with thus far and now we're here. Obviously the big thing here is we're looking for advice and consent to move forward with the policy. Next slide.

So the overall intent of the policy is really to protect students, faculty and staff. You know, when we look at it -- I will always brief to everybody that we're a shared ecosystem. Anytime you hear me talk about information security, especially when we start talking about the Internet, you will always hear those words that all of us are attached whether we like it or not. We all work together, some of the folks, obviously students, live here. And that make bes us a giant ecosystem. The weak left link becomes the door hold for everybody else to come in through. Other things we want to protect: our resources. Information is vital. We do research here. All of those good things are university mission is to educate folks. So at the end of the day, we need to be able to have access to the nternet, be able to use email, all of those things so that folks can do what they need to do to get their degrees. And continue the university's mission.

There's other things there. We need to look at the -- delineating the difference between different groups. Students are one particular group. For them, this is not just a place where they come to study. For some of them, this is their home. You know, you have faculty here that want to do research. You know, we always have to challenge what the status quo is to explore and to go new places. And then you have staff. You know, staff has a particular function, you know, to support the workings of the university. In those cases, everybody has different rules and regulations that, you know, they have to adhere to. But the overall key is to provide a reasonable and safe environment for everyone to operate. Next slide.

So the big thing is governance. You know, we want to bring consistency and order to what we do. And when I talk about that, you know, the purpose of having this policy is the things we're going to talk about today, the University has been doing them for 15 plus years. The reality is we just had no rules to structure how we do it. So when we start talking about when I said I'm here to protect, you know, everybody here, students, faculty and staff, we put processes and procedures in place so that we can go back and say, did we follow the process, did we follow the procedures that are in place. Or are we just doing things arbitrary and capriciously? And we'll kind of show you some of the

examples. It's user awareness. We don't want folks to think that we're essentially just fishing to, you know, look for bad things that are going on. You know, everybody that we do, when we talk about information security, when we start talking about acceptable use and privacy, is thought out ahead of time. And we want to have solid foundational process that is behind it so that, you know, if that same exact incident happens, that our processes and procedure right side the exact same. Up until now I want to reiterate that's not how it's been. It's been kind of shoot from the hip, how we think we've been doing it in the past, we'll try it this way again. A lot of the things I looked at were best practices. So this isn't just a thoughts of, you know, do it or the information security. We looked at a lot of different universities across, you know, the nation. And looked at how they're doing things, how are their processes and procedures, how do they handle their accept building use. So this is a combination of best practices looking at every -- every one of those policies. Next slide.

So how do I measure success? For me the number one thing is transparency. I think in order to have a successful information security program, you have to be comfortable with what we're doing, how we're doing it, and have as much understanding as you want. So the first thing I will tell you is anybody who is curious about how we actually operate when we start looking at things -- we're going to talk about when do we look at your emails and not look at your emails, I welcome anyone to come back to my office at any time, let me know. We're more than willing to show you exactly what it looks like when we start pulling emails, what information we get back because I want you to feel comfortable with, you know, what controls we have in place. So when we start talking about controls, it's the folks that are actually doing this job, how do we make sure that they stay within the prescribed guidelines, these processes and procedures. So in other words, one of my folks just doesn't start going off on a tangent and looking at emails for somebody else they're not supposed to. Those are controls. And those are the kind of things we didn't have in place but we're putting them in place now.

Regulatory audits, we have a lot. PCI, payment card industry, anything that deals with credit cards, healthcare, privacy act information. This university is riddled with a ton of regulatory requirements, all of which have certain guidelines we have to adhere to. Also equally important is NIU's risk. When we start talking about risk, we're looking at brand protection. You know, it's no secret to anybody in this room that enrollment rates are down. You know, at the end of the day, you know, kids, potential students of this university, they go out on the Internet and do their research when they start looking at universities. Our brand image is out there. It's vital when they Google NIU, we want them to see good things. If they're not seeing it, we work to make sure that we kind of mitigate that as much as possible.

Any potential lawsuits, again, we're in the information age. There's a lawsuit that goes on, there's a high probability that will end up in the news, which means that again it's another negative article that can be Googled. Of course, search engine. As I said before, the weakest link, our job is to make users aware, help them understand what they should and should not be doing out there. I will tell you that, you know, I'm always available when we start talking about, you know, risk, privacy act information, any of that. Even as for your personal stuff, I'll give you whatever information I can to help you out. Because end of the day, we all know that we handle not just university business but our own personal business when we're sitting at our desk. The reality of it. Because everything is done by computers for the most part. We want you to be secure not just in your workplace but we want you to be secure in your personal. Next slide.

So this is where we kind of get into, you know, the soup of it. In terms of the various different discussion topics. So you've got notification to individuals. What we're talking about here is if you've read the policy, when should an individual be notified if we're going to go into their emails or their personal files. So I guess what I'll ask is: Does anybody have any concerns with what they read regarding that, any questions about our process of when we do it? Or wanting to go over it? Sir?

K. Thu: On the second page of the policy, it indicates that -- the first paragraph that personal information stored or transmitted from -- through NIU and -- will not be disclosed or released except for legitimate university purposes. Can you talk about what that means? It's very open ended it seems.

A. Bjerken: Sure. So you know, there's a lot of concern that anytime we have personal information there's -- I think we added the bullet to the newest iteration that won't be sold. Any of your personally identifiable information won't be sold or given to anybody outside. So legitimate business is anything dealing with university business that there's a -- a valid reason for it. You know, illegitimate is -- got an example of illegitimate. Someone wanting a list of individuals at the university so they can contact them.

B. Coryell: Here's another example. So if you were to receive -- if the university for instance were to receive an improperly formed or overly broadly reaching legal request, then we don't just respond to that and give whatever the requester asks for. We would hold back on that, try to make sure that that request gets properly formed legally. And then only submit the information that we think is really suitable. And not just IT, working in conjunction with HR, with general counsel's office, that sort of thing. What we're -- I think the commercial aspect of it is probably really what we're more concerned about. Is not -- not selling off the information, not -- not volunteering more to the -- more access to NIU's information than is minimally possible who don't live and work here. That's the intent. How to describe what the university's legitimate business is, is an open problem. We're glad for language that clarifies that if anyone has some.

A. Bjerken: So on the notification to individuals, the premise of that is that, if there's no legal reason for us not to, we will try to notify the individual who owns the particular data before we go into that. That is the over arching premise of the Acceptable Use Policy. Obviously, there are legal reasons, rationale, there are times we're told we can't let anybody know, and in those cases, you know, the view is that somebody in your chain of command, probably your VP, should and will know about the fact that, you know, your email is being looked into. Unless there's specific legal language, it's always done in coordination with general counsel. As well as usually depending on what it is, there may be other folks involved. Potentially HR, or ethics. It depends on what the issue is. I want to let you know -- it's never done solely at the discretion of one individual.

D. Baker: Can you say that would be like a police investigation or something where there's a warrant or --

A. Bjerken: Right. So a warrant, any type of subpoena. It just depends on how the wording might be. And usually it says please do not disclose, you know, the nature of this investigation to anyone outside of the parties that are involved and listed on this particular, you know, citation. And it will have who it's been sent to, of which our office will usually be one of those folks. When we start

talking about FOIA requests, I'll jump down. FOIA requests are different. That's Freedom of Information Act, if you're not familiar with it. We're a public institution. Anybody's allowed to request records from NIU as far as how we do business, what goes on. And those particular instances, we always reach out -- it's done by the FOIA officer. Should reach out to the individual first to say: Hey, look these are the following records that they've been asked for. Can you provide those? In cases where the actual individual cannot provide them, they may come back to us and say, they don't have their email dated from eight months ago, can you pull those, you know, emails for them? And in those cases we pull the emails. Take it back to the individual. The individual always has the first right to go and redact their emails. So it was a question that was brought up at the Faculty Senate the last time, but as an individual you should always be able to redact your information, because you're the one that knows whether or not it's your privacy information that's on there. And then what will happen is it will go to the FOIA officer, and they'll redact it as well. They're redacting it more from proprietary NIU information. You know, stuff like that. So if there's account numbers that are associated with NIU, those may not be releasable. It just depends. Questions on the FOIA process?

So one of the things that's usually of interest is the personal cell phones. So you know, a BYOD, if you have your own device, you're paying for your own phone but you're getting a stipend. So when it comes to certain cell phones if you're doing text messages, that kind of stuff that is official NIU business, those are FOIAable. There can be requests for those. In those particular cases the request still comes to the FOIA officer and then it comes to you. It will be up to you to actually pull your particular phone records. And again, that particular case you'll have to redact your information. So - - I'll always recommend you have to look at it. Because there's no need for somebody to have your doctor's phone number, your mother or father's phone number. You know, so you have to think about it beyond just, you know, when we start talking about text messages and the information on there, you have to think about it from, you know, if I go to put on college, I may not want anyone to know that. So you have to look at it from that -- what can be, you know, what can be determined based off of me calling that number, if I knew it. All right?

About monitoring or viewing versus investigations. Are there any questions, comments or concerns regarding that?

H. Khoury: Would you recommend that faculty members and staff have a special cell phone just for NIU business instead of combining -- like in many major businesses? They do have -- they give their employees special cell phones. So do you recommend that NIU faculty and staff for privacy related issues, would buy their own cell phones that they will use only for NIU?

A. Bjerken: So I don't think there's a need for it. Because at NIU we aren't actually able to get to your data. So your privacy is in your hands. So which would be no different than any cell phone that you would buy for yourself. So there's nothing that we're going to see that you're not going to hand over to us. So the only way that that would ever happen is if someone subpoenaed your phone records, which could be done and still could be done even if it was your personal cell phone. I have seen subpoenas that have come through where folks have been subpoenaed for their personal cell phones. But that's a judge saying you must provide those information. And they're very, very scoped down to specifically what they're looking for. So again, you know, you redact it and only provide them exactly what they're asking for.

H. Khoury: That's a different issue. You know, that's privacy issue here we're talking about. And those of us who do, can access NIU email, and through the personal cell phones, what we're doing, it seems, we're combining, you know, our personal emails and NIU emails. So would you recommend -- I'm asking a question -- to separate the two. Two complete different devices, different phone numbers?

A. Bjerken: I think it defeats the concept of why we do the BYOD. We're looking at it as a cost savings for the university across the board versus having the university buy you a device and you have to buy your own device. There's that shared device cost savings. Other technological capabilities out there that containerize your information that we're looking at. We're just not there yet for our maturity for information security. What happens is if you look at this laptop, for example, if I were to split it like this with the cover open, this half would be all of your business information, this half would be all your personal. And the two don't touch. They're segmented from each other. And then for example if were you to lose your cell phone, the university could theoretically say I'm going to send out a trigger signal and it will wipe just this particular -- just this half of the device. So I think that's probably the smarter way to go if you're asking my opinion. But again, we're in a fiscally constrained environment and it comes down to whether we can afford it in dollars and cents. I'd love to have that capability.

B. Coryell: I'd like to build on that answer and give -- without disagreeing with the premise, maybe a different reason why I also think it doesn't get you anything to have a separate personal phone. When I look -- when I talk to people about risk, which is quite often or when I talk to people about privacy, which is pretty often, there are all kinds of -- there are all kinds of motivations for why people want to avoid or mitigate a risk event. So a question that's been -- it's very useful in clarifying is to say what event are you trying to avoid? What unpleasant outcome or risk situation is concerning you? And when I talk to people about cell phones, and whether they should have a second cell phone or not, very often they're concerned about being forced to disclose something that they don't want to disclose. Right? And you don't have to have -- you don't have to have any particular reason. If you just don't want to disclose your mother's phone number or, you know, where you've been surfing on the Internet, then you don't have to. You have a -- in general we all have a right to privacy and liberty and we don't -- we can have good reasons, bad reasons or no reasons at all, and we can still assert that privacy right. And that's fine. If you want to assert that right, to say whether I have a good reason, whether you think my reason is good or not, I don't want you to see my personal stuff, you can do that on a shared device. Just fine. And you don't -- as a user convenience, you don't have to carry two. You don't have to pay two separate bills. It's just easier to live that way. And conversely, if you have two devices, you're not guaranteed to avoid the risky event either. As Drew mentioned, if you are accessing or anybody has a reason to believe that you're accessing something related to work, whether that's phone calls, on work-related topics, text messages, to or from people that you work with, emails or websites that you might browse to on your browser, if anyone just believes that's the case, they can FOIA or try to subpoena the information off of your personally owned device. And whether that goes through or not, it's -- is fact-dependent. But you still haven't avoided that situation. It's just that people don't largely know that your personal device, your phone, your home computer or any other thing that you might own that's personal, people don't generally know or think that that's the case. But it is the case. And it's always been the case. It's independent of the cell phone stipend policy. Since you can't avoid

the risk event of having to disclose something you don't feel like disclosing, by having two devices, and since you can adequately protect yourself by having one device and it's easier to carry one device, I recommend one device. Anyone that wants to carry two is free to do so. Yes, ma'am?

R. Moremen: Could you please reiterate for the record the answer that you gave last week at Faculty Senate about the percentage of monitoring, reviewing and investigating incidents that affect faculty versus staff and administration?

B. Coryell: Exact number? It is very few.

A. Bjerken: Very few. Less than five percent of all of our stuff has been with faculty -- can be even lower than that. The majority of things that we do are usually with staff. So... I mean, very, very small. My 100 plus days... yeah.

B. Coryell: Did you say fewer -- did you say maybe five of all the things -- five from all the cases you've seen were related to faculty?

A. Bjerken: Yeah. A small number. Very small percentage.

R. Moremen: Thank you.

A. Bjerken: So still looking at the personal cell phone -- this is a good segue into personal computers and devices. Just when they're on the NIU network. So the middle bullet there, that really pertains to the issue of when people bring their own computer to the network, you log on and if you're doing research, any concerns about what we can and cannot see with your personal device. So for the record, we can't -- we can't see any of your files on your computer. We're not looking, we don't have that kind of capability. So anything you send over the wire that traverses NIU's network could potentially be seen. You know, by us or anybody else that's -- wants to. Okay? All right. Any other questions on enforcement? Much easier crowd. Go to the next slide. So accountability. We start talking about accountability, this is really from our side when we start talking about information security. Any of the folks that are actually going and looking at files, emails, doing any type of investigation, they always have to have a valid need to know. So -- and you know, just because they necessarily work in the information security office, if they're not working on that investigation, you know, odds are they probably don't know what the specifics are of the other case. So the different folks are working on different things. We always follow the Chinese wall approach. Which is essentially separation of duties. So when we start talking about if there's an investigation and we might potentially need to go look at somebody's emails, myself, general counsel, usually HR, will all be involved as well as the VP for that particular department deciding whether or not you know, there is a valid reason to go in and look at emails. They decide it, yes, and then what happens is I'll go back and assign it to one of the folks on my staff to actually go and pull those particular emails. I say this and the reason why the Chinese wall works well is because nobody on my staff should look at anybody else's email if it hasn't been through that process. And I can easily go and look and see all of the folks that have done whatever searches on anybody's email. And it lists who it was, what they accessed it and exactly what the search terms were and what was pulled back. So I start looking at that pretty much every 30 days. I go in there now. And look to see what searches have been done by my staff. Just to make sure that we're holding everybody accountable to do it. And that's essentially audit checks, looking at the logs. Just to make sure that everything's

done on the same token, I don't ever do any searches for it. So there's never a reason for me to actually go out and search for emails. So if I myself am going to do something, I would have to have collusion, I would have to tell one of my staff to do it and you can see the paper trail starts to fill up. If that counsel met and said we have to do this, they would hold me accountable for why did you search this particular person's email.

If we go to the next slide, it shows -- the flow chart with swim lanes. Not intended for you to be able to decipher it. That kind of shows and articulates -- that's the NIU -- okay.

G. Long: Welcome to the university, right?

A. Bjerken: Yeah. It's intended just to show you -- how we have and work -- accountability for it. So -- and it's -- walks you through the entire process. Of the different swim lanes, who is involved in the process. You can see there when we start talking about what the particular incident is -- and that's general counsel, HR, the VP and my several, if it's a law enforcement or criminal act, that diamond in the center goes down to the NIU police department. And from there they do whatever it is that the police department does. They have their own process for handling things. If it's not, it continues on through the process. And there's always a checks and balance as well as an information flow for updates as far as here's what we've done, here's where we're at, here's our next steps.

B. Coryell: I would like to say a word about the diagram. It is amusing to see it on the screen and there's an evident amount of complexity there. But the value in this flow chart and in the ones that Drew has yet to create is that we've been operating in an environment, as I'm sure I don't have to tell anybody in this room -- where much of what we do isn't properly documented and therefore no one can go and reference it to find out whether they're getting fair and equal treatment. And so this is the first attempt really for some of these types of security or information sharing related processes. The first example we have where we're putting it down on paper, we're able to share it with other people to gain the agreement of each set of -- or each office that's involved in the process. And together jointly agree that this is the way we're going to work with each other. This may not even be the final. But it's the beginning of what I think is a very healthy process of saying, it's documented, we can train people on it, we can refer to it, we can be audited against it, and ultimately therefore we're accountable to University community for behaving in a rational, consistent, transparent and logical way. This to me is a symbol of the right intent. And you know, Drew's goal is to have one of these for all of the security processes by the end of this academic year. Way to go.

A. Bjerken: Yes, ma'am?

V. Naples: Yes, is that available on website or anywhere we can look at the details? Because I can't see enough -- clearly enough to read any of that.

A. Bjerken: Yep. Once we've got it fine tuned we're certainly more than willing to share it out. Because at the end of the day, this process as Brett said, this is meant to be what holds us accountable. So that the university can say, wait a minute, you didn't do this step, so how did you get from point A to point C when you didn't do B? That's what the intent of this is.

B. Coryell: We want to finish it with the other groups that are there. This is almost done. When it is finished, we'll post it.

A. Bjerken: Any other questions? Next slide. That's all we had for the presentation. Unless anybody has any other questions, comments or concerns.

D. Haliczzer: SPS council. I have been one of the people who has watched almost every one of your previous presentations on this. And I have to acknowledge the effort that's gone into careful listening to the concerns raised by all the councils. And by the progress I see in incorporating responses to those concerns in the -- each iteration of the policy. So I have to say I really appreciate you listening. And really following the rules and traditions of shared governance. Thank you very much.

A. Bjerken: If your security guy can't follow the rule, who will, right?

S. Thomas: School of visual and performing arts. When are you planning to put this into effect?

B. Coryell: May take -- leaps as you can see we've been through a long and deliberative process. A year of development by primarily faculty-led group, just to get to the initial draft. Then we've been through shared -- three shared governance committees. Now this one. The last stage for adopting this policy will be -- sort of taking any feedback that you give us, either now or in the days following. Following this meeting. Trying our best to incorporate that. Then it will go to president's cabinet for final review and advice and commentary. After that there will be a date that it goes into effect, pick some logical date shortly after the president's cabinet is done discussing it and we would probably make an announcement through -- I don't know, through what vehicle, whether it's an NIU Today or on a email blast or something. We would make an announcement to say that the new policies are in effect, and they would be posted on a website at that point. Make sense? Do you have other advice? What would you like to see happen in addition to those steps?

S. Thomas: I was just wondering if you had a ballpark estimate or you had a --

B. Coryell: I hope it's no later than -- I hope it's no later than January 1st. I would expect it to be sooner, but if you wanted a nice round date, then I can't see it taking any longer than that. Cross your fingers.

S. Thomas: Thank you.

V. Naples: I do have one more question. We recently got an email saying that for those of us in the biological sciences they are going to discontinue having individual laboratory phones. And instead, people will be anticipating using their cell phones for any kind of communications. They did say in Montgomery Hall they will provide two land lines that you can potentially use for making phone calls or emergency things and things like that. But I'm wondering what contingency has the university planned to protect the privacy of individual's privately purchased and owned cell phones and their cell phone numbers? If someone has your cell phone number, they can potentially track you. And that is considered extremely bad form, even for parents to want to track their children.

And it's a safety and a security risk. If somebody gets that information and, number one can find out actually this person does have a cell phone, we've had very sad incidents on campus of people having their cell phones taken away from them. And that's a very big concern.

B. Coryell: Sure. So in general the question is if you have a -- if you have a cell phone, how do we safeguard that information. Right? And for lots of good reasons. You don't want that number to get out. If it's a personally-owned cell phone, then there's no -- there's -- I -- there's -- say it this way: If it's a personally owned cell phone and you are not receiving a stipend, then the only place that I can think of that the university is going to store that information is inside the directory so that it feeds the emergency notification system so you can be notified in the case of an emergency and you get to control whether you put that in or not. So if you wanted to, you could remove or blank that emergency cell phone number so that you are no longer notified by the Everbridge emergency notification system. If you have a personal cell phone and you are receiving a cell phone stipend, then by policy that number is supposed to be available to your department for work use. Because the stipend is to cover work use. The numbers for those cell phones are in HR self service. They're not loaded yet. That's a change that was discussed by the IT Steering Committee in February of this year. And the changes have just finished within the last week or so. We haven't rolled that out yet. But the number and additional cell phone number will be an HR self service. You can populate that with that cell phone number and for my department, because we do have lots of work-related cell phone use, I will be requiring and checking up to make sure that those cell phone numbers are in. Because we need it for on call purposes or when something breaks at night. From that place those phone numbers would also then go into the directory. So that when you look people up, on the online directory at this off of the website, you either can or can't see that depending on whether you're logged in or not. And if you're not logged in, then you would not be able to see it. So if you're not affiliated with the institution and have the ability to log into the directory just like you would log into email, then it would be invisible to you. It's not visible to the public world. But it would be largely visible to those inside the institution. The other place it would go is into the directory inside the email system. And those are either both present or not present. We don't have a lot of configuration choices for that.

So the end of all of that is to say that if you're not receiving a stipend, you have every ability to remove that so that the university is not storing it at all and the only cost you pay is not being notified when there's an emergency by the Everbridge system. If you are receiving a stipend the university does expect you to have that stored in a place that we trust. But it's not visible to the public. It's only visible to people who have log in credentials and then it's as secure as the rest of our restricted class data, financial data or FOIA records or HIPAA records. Yes?

H. Nicholson: Just to clarify, there's no way to both be notified by Everbridge and keep your personal cell phone private; is that correct?

A. Bjerken: So currently there's no way -- I know that we're looking into creating other fields that potentially could hold the mobile phone number. Whether it's going to work or not, can't tell you right now because it's still just in test and development. But it has been an issue of contention across the university. We've heard from multiple folks. So the field it specifically designated as mobile phone, it's either there or it's not. That's just the reality of it which is what Brett was saying we can't configure it. We're looking at can we create another field that we can hide, but still have it

there where we can pull the information when we need it. But we don't know yet. It's too soon to tell. But we are testing on it.

B. Coryell: And I would answer the same question slightly differently. In the past we had one place to store a mobile -- a cell phone number. And so where that information went was easy. Now we have two, based on the desire to differentiate emergency notification from other types of work notification. So you've got multiple cases. And one of those cases itself splits and goes into two places. The email system and the online directory. Drew's talking about a third way so that we can have even more granularity in where it goes and doesn't go. That's under consideration and development for exactly the privacy reasons you're talking about. But whether we have one, two, or three, I would have looked at your question and said, can I be notified and still keep my number private? And the answer is no. In order to notify you, you have to share your personal cell phone number. And I have to store it. Therefore it's known to at least some people. Maybe you mean can it not be -- can it be seen only by IT and not by the rest of the university community? And that's what the third choice for cell phones is. And there are some technical hurdles for doing that. It's going to take us a while to explore it. And we're about to do an upgrade of the Everbridge system that does emergency notification. So give us until next semester to work that one out.

H. Nicholson: Coming from the division who handles emergency notifications I'm concerned how people will opt out because they don't want the -- just anybody seeing their cell phone number and then we are creating a safety issue. So I appreciate your work on that. Just want to -- if you can do it as quickly as possible, that would be great. Thank you.

V. Naples: Is there a possibility of creating an emergency contact system using email? The university already has our email addresses and it doesn't require reaching any cell phone number security or anything of that sort. I get emails from the university on a regular basis every single day of my life.

B. Coryell: Drew's writing, so I'll talk. Yes, you can do that. The best emergency notification system you can have is actually multi-modal so it tries to reach you in many different media or through different communications channels. Those communications channels optimally are a website, digital signage, text messaging, email, personal phone, work phone, home phone. And by personal phone I mean cell phone. Right? Child of the cell phone age. The Everbridge system has a capability of using some or all of those. And I think, but I'm not sure, that the new version of Everbridge may have the capability of letting users say what your preferred mode is. And maybe even saying you want -- your one preferred mode but not any of the others. Since we haven't really looked at -- we're looking to do an upgrade for that. But we're just not far enough into it where I know all the features of it yet. That may be possible for us. And the risk, of course, that you'd be taking is there was something happening that you wanted more immediate notification about, it went to your email, you didn't notice you had a new email, you could have been texted, you could have been called by voice, but you didn't get. That's a risk that maybe you could choose to take. I don't know that everybody would make that same choice. So I have to design a system that allows the possibility of storing that number and then everyone's got kind of a privacy versus safety choice they can make for themselves. Again, assuming that the upgraded version of the notification system has that granularity in it. If you'd like, can have one of my staff contact you with an answer for that.

V. Naples: Sure.

B. Coryell: Is that good? Okay. Thanks.

D. Baker: Other questions? Lot of work's gone into this. And you talk today a lot of groups. Thank you for doing that. I'm sure we'll be revisiting it once it's in, we'll revisit how well it's working and making any changes along the way. Virginia, do you have another one?

V. Naples: No, I'm just digesting what he said. And I'm very encouraged because I am extremely concerned about cell phone security. Because in the biology department we were told that we were required to provide our own personal private cell phone numbers for emergency contact. That's one issue. But the other thing we were told was that those cell phone numbers would be published on our lab doors. And then they revised it to say that our cell phone numbers would be placed on the inside of our lab doors, except my lab door opens outward. So whenever anybody's in the lab, the door is open. And there it is.

A. Bjerken: Lisa, you want -- the posting of cell phone numbers on lab doors?

D. Baker: That's not here. That's Jerry, who's not here. Why don't we --

L. Freeman: Virginia, we'll definitely forward your question to Research and Innovation Partnerships who oversees lab safety and environmental health and safety. It's a great question. And I don't want to pretend to answer it when I don't have the facts.

V. Naples: I appreciate your attention to the issue.

D. Baker: Good question. Thank, Virginia: All right. If you have more -- when you walk home tonight, Brett Andrew are available for your emails. And they will read those. So... Okay. Thanks. Thank you. Okay. Let's move on. That was a long president's announcement. Full hour.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. Baker: There's good news, no consent agenda. We'll move on to unfinished business. And I want to start this section with a dry run call. So I want to make sure all of our clickers are working and we've got a good head count. Let's do a fake vote here. And -- yeah, kind of an attendance. So if you don't have your clicker, go get your clicker. And only one. We're not in Chicago. I shouldn't have said that out loud. Does everybody have one? Okay. So I want to do something that may never happen. Could we have everybody vote yes? Just to take a poll so we don't have to add them up. Can we do that? So yes would be 1, is that right? Yes is 1? Can we have everybody that's got a clicker to push "1". Is the poll open? Poll's open. Go ahead and push 1 and we'll get a tally of everybody and see if it's within the laws of physics to get everybody to push 1. Number -- Okay. So is everybody done pushing one? No. No? Puh 1. It's the only time I'll tell you which one to push. Push your button. What did we get up to?

P. Erickson: 47.

D. Baker: 47. Just to remind you, when we do things like constitution -- yours didn't work? Okay. Soon there will be 48. And if it comes up no, we'll know the provost did it. So for constitutional amendments, you have to have a lot of people vote. What's the score, Greg, that you would have to have for constitutional amendment to pass?

G. Long: There would be a difference between an actual constitutional amendment and bylaw. For bylaws we have to have two thirds of the entire body. Our body right now is 63 people. So we have to have -- 61. Okay. And so we need to have 41 people vote in favor of anything. As a constitutional amendment, it's a majority in here but then it goes for a faculty referendum. So there's that distinction. What we're looking at today, however, are just changes to the bylaws and with 47, or 48 people present, that hopefully will be helpful. That's roughly our average vote. One issue we always have on this is, to get a bylaws change, we have a rule that says two thirds of the entire body. So it's not a quorum, not a proportion, we have to have 41 people in this case vote to support anything. If we have less than that, it doesn't -- it doesn't pass. That's the basic framework that we're working within.

D. Baker: Thank you. So now we know. Any questions on that stuff so now we know the rules of voting. And I'm going to turn it over to Greg to run us through the next four items under the unfinished business. Greg?

A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 17.1](#), Athletic Board – Pages 11-12
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

G. Long: This is the second reading for all four items we discussed each of these last month. Wasn't a lot of discussion but certainly now bring it back again. I'd like a motion to accept the proposed bylaw listed under No. -- listed under A, the proposed revision to Article 17.1, the Athletic Board. Do I have a motion to accept?

D. Domke: Moved.

G. Long: Need a second?

M. Riley: Second.

G. Long: Any discussion on this? This was just an item to basically make things a little more streamlined where the Athletic Board chair is going to also serve at -- as the NIU athletic representative, will serve as the chair of the Athletic Board, ex officio nonvoting and the constituencies that are part of the board will be selected within their own groups. So that's -- that's what we're asking about here. No discussion? Okay. If you would, if you're in favor, press A or 1. Excuse me. Wait. Hold up. All right. So 1 for support that you support the changes. 2, if you don't. And 3 is abstain. If you would go ahead vote, please. Everybody had a chance to vote? We good? And the results are...

P. Erickson: 45, 1 and 1.

G. Long: Excellent. All right.

B. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 2.2](#), Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Pages 13-14

SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

G. Long: Moving forward, then. Our next item has to do with the combination of the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. That is on Page 13 of your document. It's basically a consolidation of the Rules, Governance and Election Committee with the -- excuse me, into one Faculty Senate/University Rules and Governance committee. The idea is here much like the Resource, Space and Budget Committee. We're working to consolidate committees across Faculty Senate and University Council. So that's the essence of that. May I have a motion to accept?

G. Slotsve: So moved.

J. Hathaway: Second.

G. Long: Any discussion on this? Okay. Seeing no discussion, let's vote again. Again, 1 is in favor. 2 is opposed. 3 is abstain. Are we ready to vote? All right. So vote, please. Okay. And...

P. Erickson: 45, 1, 1.

G. Long: 45, 1, and 1. Two for two. That's great.

C. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 15.8.1](#), University Assessment Panel – Pages 15-17

SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

G. Long: Third issue, third item is a proposed revision to the NIU Bylaws Article 15.8.1. And that essentially is some language to clarify the membership of the University Assessment Panel, description of that is provided on Page 15. I need a motion to accept this.

C. Doederlein: So moved.

P. Vohra: Second.

G. Long: Any discussion on this?

H. Khoury: I have a question. Regarding on the second page, in the make-up that -- we're having now one faculty member. But you're saying the number of faculty members from two to one. What's the rationale behind it? The ratio basically of the faculty being presented -- being different now.

G. Long: That's a good question. That's the first time that's been brought up. I don't have an answer for you to be honest with you.

D. Baker: (Inaudible).

G. Long: From the academic support unit, not the actual departments and programs. So there is... so I would guess that we're see something a reduction because we're also seeing an inclusion of the associate vice provost, the director of academic accreditation and the associate director for educator licensure preparation.

H. Khoury: But these may not be faculty members at times in the future. At times they are, but at times they're not.

L. Freeman: Originally it said faculty or staff, so (inaudible).

G. Long: Right. No, these are faculty members for programs, not colleges. Right. Like advising office. Yeah.

D. Baker: Do you understand the difference?

H. Khoury: The question is why the number was reduced from two to one.

G. Long: And I do not know the exact answer to that.

D. Macdonald: No. 4 of the rationale seems to explain that.

G. Long: If you're looking at No. 4, if you don't have it available, it says, "With the permanent addition of the associate vice provost as an ex officio nonvoting member, it is proposed that the vice president – vice provost appoint only one additional faculty member or staff member from their academic support unit.

D. Baker: So it was the vice provost is added. And before it was the vice provost nominating two people. So with the vice provost there, if you didn't reduce that number, then that office, vice provost office would have three instead of two. This is keeping the number equal from that office.

G. Long: Other discussion?

D. Baker: Is it still unclear?

G. Long: Patricia?

P. Liberty Baczek: My question comes -- kind of trailing along -- faculty or staff. And being staff and being one of our two representatives here from Operating Staff Council, I look around the room and staff is clearly outnumbered in representation on this council. And being that I've been around the university for a number of years, that seems to be more common of a practice, that operating staff aren't necessarily always invited to the table. And I think that operating staff employees have a different perspective than SPS and/or faculty would. So I don't know, maybe rethink that. Because if you're choosing between a faculty or staff, my assumption is you're going to put a faculty person on the academic council. And I'm just respectfully asking you to reconsider the exclusion of a staff member. Thank you.

F. Bryan: (Inaudible).

D. Baker: Any other discussion on this? So I wonder if the confusion is we have -- like fully got a feel for this particular one. And I'm not arguing either way on this. Just to clarify where we are. But this is formerly two faculty or staff members from the academic affairs support units much so that's not colleges, those are support units. Like what would that include?

L. Freeman: OSAF.

D. Baker: OSEL?

L. Freeman: Athletic support.

D. Baker: The academic support unit the. Those kind of offices. And previously the vice provost for undergraduate education would appoint two people. And in this case, it says one person and that vice provost would be a nonvoting member. So that's -- I hope that clarified it. Maybe it didn't.

G. Long: Do others have concerns about this? I mean... all right. Should I bring this to a vote, then? How do we... all right. So again, if you are in support of this bylaw change, press 1. If you don't support, press 2. And 3 is abstain, please.

P. Erickson: 39, 9, 3.

G. Long: 36, 9, 3, that does not pass. Is it -- is it safe to say on something like this, some of this had to do with the -- you know, name changes. Basically getting clarification in terms of titles and such. Bring that back and have a -- another vote on that just from the typo standpoint? Are we looking at this as dead from the standpoint of it's not -- we didn't support at this point? Any guidance in terms of how you would like to see this pursued?

V. Naples: I don't know if I need to make a motion, but if it's appropriate, could I make a motion that we clean up the language and then look at the content as a separate question?

F. Bryan: That would be a motion to reconsider, which is (inaudible)

G. Long: In talking to our parliamentarian, that would be a motion to reconsider, and that would require a two thirds in support. A 40-person vote in support of that. Chris?

C. McCord: But just to clarify, a motion to reconsider usually means to take up the motion -- the item as is. Virginia's trying to parse it into two pieces and asking if we need a motion to do that.

G. Long: Okay.

C. McCord: I did not understand that as a motion to reconsider.

V. Naples: Thank you.

F. Bryan: She's asking to divide the motion, divide -- that doesn't require (inaudible).

G. Long: All right. So apparently if we want to divide this, that only requires as majority. So we could divide it into two motions and pursue it. Would that be -- at the next meeting, then?

F. Bryan: Yes.

G. Long: Promod?

P. Vohra: Since this is being sent back to the committee, why do we need a motion to split it and resubmit it? When the work is done, they'll come back and resubmit it. We don't need a motion. I mean, the motion has failed. Now it goes back to the committee. They work on it. Address some of the issues that have been raised today. And bring it back. I don't think we need a motion.

G. Long: I'm fine with that as well.

W. Penrod: Point of order. I don't think the motion was sent back to committee. I think the motion failed.

G. Long: It did fail. Okay. So I'm sorry, I'm three months in this job and fairly new as far as leading these kinds of meetings. I will admit my ignorance on this. I think there's value in getting the wording right in terms of the positions. If there are substantive issues as they relate to representation, I think that's a valid thing to look back. I don't think there's any intent when this was written to be exclusionary. But I can certainly see from a reading of it that the points you raised are reasonable. So I -- there's no disagreement with the points raised. We still have a business that we want to make some consistency to make titles be as they are. So... we -- split this in two -- I need help with -- Ferald.

F. Bryan: If you want a motion to refer it back to committee.

G. Long: How about a motion to refer it back to committee? Would that satisfy people that we could subsequently bring it back with some additional review of it?

R. Moremen: I'm not going to make the motion. I have a question. Sorry. If we make a motion to send it back to committee, does that mean that whatever the committee decides, we then have a first reading, a second reading and a vote, which means it will not be decided until spring? I just want to have this in the record. It will not be decided until spring.

G. Long: That would be my understanding, yes.

R. Moremen: Just wanted to clarify.

Unidentified: And interest if -- I have a suggestion. Suppose we don't make a motion and the committee chooses on a volunteer basis to take it up again? Then we don't need a motion. It's up to the committee.

F. Bryan: (inaudible).

G. Long: This... this would have originally come from the University Assessment Panel. University Assessment Panel can resubmit.

F. Bryan: It's dead as of this point.

G. Long: All right. At this point we -- perhaps we look at it this way. It's dead at this point. If the University Assessment Panel wants to bring it up, they can. And we would have to do a first and second reading again. We would convey to them the concerns at this meeting. Next time it comes up hopefully that will be addressed. Is that reasonable solution?

Unidentified: Yep.

D. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 15.3.1.3\(B\)](#), Academic Planning Council – Pages 18-20

SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

G. Long: All right. And then the last -- the last item is a revision -- by law revision to article 15.3.1, the Academic Planning Council. Talked about that last time as well. Basically it's a clarification

of participants and their roles on campus. So if you look at it, you'll see that Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies is now the Vice President for Research and Innovation Partnerships, largely cleaning up language. I need a motion to accept this.

P. Vohra: So moved.

J. Hathaway: Second.

G. Long: Discussion on this, please? (Mode on first).

H. Khoury: I noticed the change in name, the title. Position of vice president. It's quite a change. It has implications. I'm a person, a faculty member who really values innovative partnerships, and I've been very active in basically getting funded partnership for the last 13 years. But to drop the term “graduate study the,” what was, again, the main intention behind dropping graduate studies?

G. Long: Let's have Provost Freeman address that. That's nothing something that this body -- we had no decision on that.

L. Freeman: So the dropping of the name “graduate studies” and the adaptation of the name, innovation partnerships, accompanied a change in the reporting line of that particular vice president. That vice president, when I came in 2010, actually in that role, reported to the executive vice president and provost. And the Graduate School reported to the executive vice president and provost through that vice president. In subsequent reorganization, NIU adopted a structure for the vice president for research equivalent that's held by 73 percent of research universities where that vice president reports directly to the president, reflecting the external nature of that particular position. When that structure was adopted by NIU, the dean of the Graduate School remained

reporting to the provost with only a dotted line to the vice president for research, reflecting the academic nature of the graduate school. So when the Graduate School remained predominantly under the executive vice president and provost, and the research and external portion of that office moved under the president, the name of the research division was changed to reflect the operational portfolio.

G. Long: Thank you.

L. Freeman: I got that right?

G. Long: Thank you. Any other questions on this? I would remind you that the name changes here have nothing to do with anything other than we're keeping them consistent with what titles are currently in the university. All right. So... call a vote. Pat, are we set? Okay. All in favor, press 1. Opposed, 2. 3, abstain, please.

P. Erickson: 42, 5, 1.

G. Long: 42, 5, 1. That one passes. Thank you very much for this.

D. Baker: Thank you, Greg. Thanks for the voting. Okay.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of [Proposed University Holidays for 2016](#) – **ACTION ITEM** – Page 21

D. Baker: Next, new business, approval of the proposed University holidays for 2016. Everybody take a look. See if you want to take a holiday. Do I have a motion to approve?

D. Haliczzer: So moved.

D. Baker: Second for holidays?

P. Vohra: Second.

D. Baker: Any discussion on any of these dates? Shall we click away?

G. Long: This one we just need a simple majority.

D. Baker: All in favor, 1, opposed, 2, abstain 3. Are we ready? Vote away. Hey, a no-hitter. [The motion passed with a vote of 48-yes, 0-no, 0-abstain.]

G. Long: Anyone have a cell phone, please take a quick picture.

D. Baker: Holly's going to go tweet this now.

L. Freeman: And Christmas.

G. Long: Thank you, thank you.

D. Baker: High point for the day.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – [report](#) – Page 22

D. Baker: Reports from councils, boards, and standing committee. FAC, IBHE: Sonya?

S. Armstrong: The Illinois Board of Higher Education Faculty Advisory Council met on September 18 at Midwestern University. You can see there, there are a lot of bullet points in terms of information items. I do want to encourage everybody to go to the IBHE website. There are those two additions. Most of what you see here are things that came up as information items. We did not get to discuss these as a body. So just want you to know that I don't know, for example, a whole lot about SARA, except for the basics.

The other thing I just wanted to mention briefly is that the Faculty Advisory Council is currently in a transition with regard to our website. As distinct from the IBHE website. So usually in my reports I'll link you to that website for the full minutes. And I'm not doing that because we don't have a website at the moment. But if you are interested in the full meeting minute, you can email me and I'll be happy to share those. Any questions?

D. Baker: Great. Questions? All right. Thank you very much.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees
Greg Long, Dan Gebo, Rebecca Shortridge, Leanne VandeCreek
Deborah Haliczner, Holly Nicholson – no report

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 – report

D. Baker: Next we have Student Association. And Nate's not here, right? Is anybody else from the executive branch here who wants to talk? And if not, we'll have Dillon talk as well. Anybody? No report? Okay. And Dillon, you wanted to follow up?

D. Domke: Yes. As I mentioned earlier, we're going to be seeing Governor Rauner here on campus on October 29. The state budget right now is a very large issue for the university. But especially to the students in the part that the MAP grant funding is in the air right now. Fortunately enough, the state senate has passed senate Bill 2043, which provides for the funding of \$373 million for the

MAP grant funding. Currently it's sitting in the house. And it looks like it will pass that. But the governor has vowed to veto that because he doesn't want to line item the budget. He wants to get one done completely.

So these two things tie in together – the state budget and the MAP grant funding – especially because we have more than a quarter of our students here at Northern Illinois who rely on MAP grant funding. Just imagine a quarter of the student population here just disappearing because they could potentially not afford to be here. Now, Sunday we had our first Student Senate meeting, and during my report I asked everyone in the room if they'd share whether or not they had the MAP grant. About a quarter of the room raised their hand. And then I asked, well, who knows someone who receives the MAP grant? And almost every single hand in the room went up. So this is a big, big issue for students, because financially, you know, we're constrained. Generally as a university, we represent first generational college students. And, generally, those students do not come from families of affluence and wealth. And we need to make sure that we are protecting the students here, especially the Student Association, as we are their representatives.

And so, as I mentioned earlier, we are going to be staging a rally at 4:30 in the MLK Commons on October 29 so that we can be sure to let Governor Rauner know when he's here that, hey, we are Northern Illinois, and we deserve a voice, and you need to listen. So I would like to invite, as I did earlier, all of you out to – to that rally. You know, mention it in your classes to your students, help us get the word out as best you can. The students of Northern Illinois would greatly appreciate as much help from any of the facets of shared governance that we can get. This is one of the biggest issues that I think we faced in the Student Association since our inception in 1968. So I just want to place a great importance on this issue, not only because of the importance to the students, but overall the budget and how important it is to higher education in the State of Illinois.

More than just that, I encourage everyone to write their – their local leaders. I sent out to all the student senate places where they could find their local leaders. I'm working on drafting resolutions with other student senates across the state so we can send one joint one down to Springfield. We're also working with the facets of shared governance to get a letter together from all of us to send to the state. And we're going to start letter-writing campaign as well where you might see us in the MLK Commons getting students to sign letters stating that, hey, you need to approve MAP funding and you need to get the state budget back in order.

So if anyone has any questions for me, please feel free to ask afterwards or now. But again, I just want to say that we appreciate that all of the faculty, staff, operating with council, all the different councils do for students here at this university. And no more time than now when we need you the most. We need as much support on this issue as we can get.

D. Baker: Provost Freeman?

L. Freeman: Dillon, first I want to thank you for your voice and for educating so many people around the state and bringing people together. And I want to go on the record as saying that the MAP funding issue is not just about protecting our students and not just about the university budget. It's about the future of this state and the future of our country. And it's an extremely important issue. And talking to people outside the university about the importance of this issue in that context, the context of our economic future well being, is an important thing that we can all do.

D. Baker: Kendall?

K. Thu: Thank you. Dillon, do you think it would be of any value to you for this body to pass a resolution supporting your efforts in procuring the MAP funding by your demonstrations and meetings with Governor Rauner?

D. Domke: I believe so. Like I said, we've been meeting with the various bodies of shared governance throughout the past probably month or so now. Getting our things in line. And I do believe that's one thing that is going to come out of all this. So I can foresee a University Council resolution coming through.

K. Thu: Before I come up with something off the top of my head, have there been any other shared governance efforts to pass a resolution of that sort, in the Faculty Senate for example? Any other bodies?

G. Long: At this point, we have been talking about it. We've been at some level waiting to see what the students want to do in terms of how we can best support them. We've not yet made any formal resolution but I certainly think there can be some value to doing that. I'm certainly not opposed to the concept. But we have not gone beyond having some joint meetings to discuss educational issues and how to -- how we might talk about this further. There has been no resolution from -- for example the Faculty Senate body or operating staff or SPS at this point.

K. Thu: Seems to me this is of such vital importance to us, having all sectors of the university on board seems a reasonable action for us to take. So I'll propose a motion to support the Student Association's efforts to procure the MAP funding, period.

D. Baker: You don't want to extend that into the state budget for higher education?

K. Thu: Friendly amendment accepted.

D. Baker: And then I guess we need a second. So we can have discussion.

H. Nicholson: Second.

D. Baker: We'll let Holly be second. And Deb had a comment. Maybe you had some information about SPS?

D. Haliczer: As Greg said – and Holly and I and Greg and Dillon and Nathan have been meeting with Mike Mann to get the advice on legalities and procedures on this – all of the councils will be writing letters, encouraging letter-writing campaigns. We love the idea of a University Council resolution. We are he going to be encouraging all of our membership. Our meeting is tomorrow, so this will become fact tomorrow. We will be encouraging everyone possible to join the rally, which will, of course, be right after work ends; therefore, not a violation of the state officials Employees Ethics Act. And I think it's really critical that we talk about, as Lisa said, the impact of the state

budget impasse on our students as well as our employees, our local economies, the nation and the future. So all activism is a wise idea. So my council will be having letter-writing campaigns. And I'm going to hand it to Holly too.

H. Nicholson: Operating Staff Council met last week. So we will -- I will be communicating to them via email about the development. Also we have a draft letter to go out to state leaders and I'm hoping to pass that within the next week or so and mail that out. But yeah, we absolutely will be spreading the word.

D. Haliczzer: One more point. The Operating Staff Council of Councils will be meeting. And I am thinking that this will be an agenda item as all of the Operating Staff Council equivalents around state universities around the state will take up this issue, and I think our representatives are quite likely to be advocating for similar efforts and banding together. So we support them.

D. Baker: Any other discussion? Parliamentarian, do we do a voice vote on this? Shall we do a voice vote? Unless there's a call for clickers? Are you ready for the vote? All in favor of Kendall Thu's motion to support MAP funding and the state budget, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? We got another 48. Thank you. Dillon, thank you for your efforts. It's a great piece of work and I think we all need to rally and let the state know what our opinions are. So thank you very much.

D. Domke: Thank you.

D. Baker: Dillon, do you have anything else?

D. Domke: No.

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

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczzer, President – [report](#) – Page 23

D. Baker: All right. Next, Deb, you're up with SPS Council report.

D. Haliczzer: I'm not going to read my report. It's very short. We're just starting the beginning of our year. What I wanted to talk about very briefly is: I have the pleasure of announcing the beginning of staff award season. And so we've seen some solicitations for faculty awards. The SPS solicitation for the Presidential Award will be going out within a few days. And then we have other SPS awarding. I want to encourage everyone to think of the SPS and then the operating staff who work for them. Think about the awards that are there. Think of the morale benefit of nominating people Whether or not they get the award. The nomination counts so much for people. So I hereby launch the award solicitation season for all staff. Please think about it.

D. Baker: Thank you, Deb. Questions?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: All right. Moving on. Any comments and questions from the floor?

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. [Alternate Policy](#) – Pages 24-25

D. Baker: Hearing none. Information items. There's two, letters T and U. And, Greg, will you take us through letter T?

G. Long: Letter T is really very straight forward. As we've talked about today, we need people here from a voting standpoint. If you're not going to be here, your place is still counted, so to speak. If you're not going to be here, we would ask as early as you know, please contact Pat or me in the University Council office and let us know and we'll try to get an alternate for you. They're listed on Page 25. You can certainly help us out if you're from a particular college, you want to -- know you're not going to be there and you can identify your alternate for us, please do and let us know. But, at the very least, please at least give us a head-up if you're not going to be here for a meeting, give us an opportunity to try and find a replacement for you. If you're not here and we have a vote, that's a no. So I would encourage you please to have some diligence if you're not going to be here to let us know so we can try to find an alternate.

D. Baker: Anybody else?

U. University Council triennial faculty membership [reapportionment](#) – Page 26

D. Baker: All right. The last item on the list is item U. And that's on the back page of your document. And that is a report on the reapportionment calculation. So the NIU Constitution

dictates the apportionment of voting members for this body. And based on the calculations and under the NIU constitutional bylaws, the Article 2.2, those have been calculated and reported here for you. Any questions on those?

G. Long: Just as an information point, these data were gathered from fall of '15. They are the most current data we have available.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: All right. All right. If there's no other business, could I have a motion to adjourn?

D. Domke: So moved.

D. Baker: Second? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Thank you.

G. Long: Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.