

5-4-2016

UC Transcript 2016-05-04

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2016-05-04" (2016). *University Council Archives*. 10.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/10>

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, May 4, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Arado, Baker, Bauer, Bishop, Block, Bond, Brubaker, Builta, Carlson, Chakraborty, Chen, Cordell (for Olson), Deng, Dhar, Doederlein, Domke, Elish-Piper, Freeman, Gilson, Hanley, Hathaway, Holt, Jacob (for Lagioia), Jaffee, Joseph, Khoury, Kreml, Liberty-Baczek, Long, Maconald, McCord, Mooney (for Lee), Naples, Nicholson, Nissenbaum, Novak, Pavkov, Penrod, Phillips, Pitney, Riley, Rodgers, Saborio, Sagarin, Scherer, Schoenbachler, Slotsve, Staikidis, Sto. Domingo, Thu, Vander Schee, Wang

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Campbell, Carey, Cordes, Farrell, Jacob (for Lagioia), Jemison, Lagioia, Lee, Olson, Thomas, Vazquez, Vohra, Wagenecht, Wood

OTHERS PRESENT: Briscoe, Bryan, coryell, Falkoff, Hoffman, Kaplan, Klaper, Stoddard, Weldy

OTHERS ABSENT: Konen

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Ready? Ready or not, happy last meeting. So I'll do the official come to order.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: Our first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Do I have a motion to adopt.

D. Domke: Moved.

S. Nissenbaum: Second.

D. Baker: Additions or deletions? All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: So moved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 6, 2016 MEETING

D. Baker: Motion to approve the minutes.

W. Pitney: Moved.

C. Doederlein: Second.

D. Baker: Edits? Hearing none, all in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

D. Baker: Now that we have that, we get to go into executive session. So we need a motion to go into executive session. Can I have a motion to go into executive session?

D. Domke: Moved.

T. Arado: Second.

D. Baker: All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Whoever is nonvoting gets to leave. All the voters get to stay, except for Greg, kicking him out.

A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/
Executive Secretary of University Council – Cathy Doederlein

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. [Recognition](#) of University Council members whose terms are completed, who have been re-elected and who are newly elected – Pages 3-4

D. Baker: Welcome back everybody. That was a report to the University Council on the performance of Greg in his two roles in Faculty Senate and University Council. And we thank him and congratulate him for his good work.

Presidential announcements. The first thing I’ve got are certificates for those completing their term. So you spend thousands of waking hours, and I’m going to give you a certificate. Thank you for your hard work. Greg, want to help me do this? [off-mic during distribution]. Again, I want to thank everybody that’s served and whose term is ending. It’s a great deal of responsibility to consider these issues and represent your constituents. Thank you for that hard work.

All right, other president’s announcements. Another thank you to the Program Prioritization Task Forces. I see a couple of our chairs here, Matt and George. Thank you, really appreciate your work leading those teams. I’ve had a chance to read them and I’m struck by the amount of hard work and good thinking that went into them. They’re good reports, give us a lot to think about. And I would say this is the beginning of the conversation. You know, we took a year and a half to talk about doing this, develop a process, develop the criteria, develop the data systems, collect the data, write

the narratives, get it to the teams. The teams have now spent four months working hard on this and have now given us a good report to think about. So now is the discussion phase and the consideration phase for all of us in the university to provide feedback, including the students with their panels as well. So we've got until May 23 to provide that feedback and please, please do that. I expect you to do that. I hope you'll do that. We need people's thoughtful responses in reaction to it. I would say both the thematic pieces, because I think the task force identified some interesting cross-cutting themes as well as specific items. Thank you for all them. May 23 is when that feedback is due. Go to the Program Prioritization website. You can find the link there. And then that feedback will go back to the various units around campus for them to consider and develop their own action plans, and then those will be back to us for consideration. Very much appreciate everybody that worked on this. Also want to thank Lisa Freeman, Carolinda Douglass and their teams for organizing us through a complex process for the first time. We've learned a lot in the process from how to do these things well. For first round, I think this is a great effort. Thank you very much. Any thoughts or comments on that one? Study them hard.

State budget update. Since we last met, the state gave us a partial budget, about 30 percent. I think that that was precipitated by a lot of political pressure, seeing what was happening at Chicago State University and them being a week or two away from closing their doors. So there was a good deal of pressure on them. There's also growing pressure in a number of congressional districts that have universities and community colleges in them to get the rest of the budget done. There's a lot of talk this week. There will be more talk this week and next. It's critically important that we all provide feedback, whatever side of the aisle you're on, using your home email. Or using your home phone. to leave messages to let people know what your thoughts are. I do continue to be surprised at how many legislators say, I haven't heard very much from my stakeholders on this. It's kind of shocking. We live it every day, but most people don't. And most people are not in higher ed and they're not calling their legislators or writing. So you have the opportunity to express an opinion one way or the other, feel free to do that. I continue to be optimistic that there's going to be more budget than the 30 percent that we got for '16. I know there's a lot of discussion about '17 budget right now too. They're looking at ways to enhance revenues as well as cut costs. Leaders from both parties are talking. Stuff's going on. I was down Monday and on a Commission on the Future of the Workforce, and there were four legislators on that. Three didn't show up because they were in meetings on the topic, and the fourth left during intermission because she had to go to a meeting on it. So a lot's going on, stuff's in place, let's do what we can. And in that regard, all the schools in the state appear to be having impacts on their enrollments. So it's important for us knowing that we're in solid shape and that we're going to be okay in this coming year that we let our students know that we're okay, we're going to be good, you're getting a great education here. So both on the recruitment and retention side for faculty and staff, as you work with students, please reassure them and encourage them to stay in school and stay in Illinois. Any thoughts or questions on the budget?

A couple thank yous before we go to the next section. I want to thank Pat, who's not here, and Ferald and Sarah for their great work this year. Very much appreciate it. Also like to thank Cathy, who's been with us this year as our captionist. It's the first time through and we're really appreciating it. It's added a lot, thank you very much.

And I thanked Greg before, but I will thank him again. He does come to my office on a fairly regular basis and we talk about things in an open and honest fashion. I appreciate your collaboration this year, Greg. You represented the faculty, staff and students very well.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. J. Dennis Hastert honorary degree rescission follow-up

D. Baker: We don't have a consent agenda, but we do have some unfinished business. And that unfinished business, unfortunately, deals with former speaker Dennis Hastert's honorary degree, law degree that was given at this university some time ago. A question was asked by this body to examine whether or not that should be revoked. The Honorary Degree Committee did take up that issue, that concern this week and voted unanimously to revoke the honorary doctorate. They wrote to recommend that, and that recommendation will go to the Board of Trustees. They're the ones that actually give the degree or, in this case, take a degree away, due to the unfortunate findings that we've had about his felony conviction and sexual abuse of children. So if you want to have a motion to endorse that.

P. Liberty-Baczek: So moved.

D. Baker: Is there a second?

C. Vander Schee: Second.

D. Baker: Any discussion? We have a motion and a second. Ready for the vote? All in favor, please say aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? [None] thank you.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Student Grievance Annual Report per NIU Bylaws Article 12.6 – Greg Long

D. Baker: Let's move on to new business. The first item of business is the student grievance annual report. Greg, can you help us with that?

G. Long: As far as the student grievance appeal process this year, that's in Article 12. So in 12.6, there's a requirement that Faculty Senate president provide a report. And so that's what I'm doing right now. We did have three student grievance cases that came to our office this year. And in terms of reporting, I would say one of the grievances was heard and denied. Another one was withdrawn. And a third one was disqualified. So we had the three and those were the three outcomes that we had. Beyond that, there were no additional grievances filed or things done in that regard. We recognize it is an issue where we still want to look at policies, procedures, make sure we do things well and efficiently. But in terms of the summary of this year, there were just the three cases. Any questions on that?

R. Scherer: I was curious, three is a pretty low number. How has it been historically?

G. Long: Three the year before, and the student grievance policy has only been in place, three years maybe now at this point? It's fairly recent. Any other questions, comments? Okay, I'll turn it back to President Baker.

B. [Temporary Appointment Timeline Waiver](#) request per NIU Bylaws Article 19.5.2.2
Chalermsee (Ete) Olson, Interim Dean, University Libraries – Pages 5-6

D. Baker: Second order of business, B in the agenda, is the temporary appointment timeline waiver for Ete Olson, interim dean. You may remember last February Pat Dawson left and Ete was put in. According to the regulations we need to start a search within six months of that appointment, but that would put us probably before the beginning of the fall semester. So we come today to ask to extend that timeline approximately six months so we can get a search going as the fall semester starts. So this is because of that timing we don't want to start a search in the summer and we need to push it out a couple months so you can get back and we can have the search then. So I guess we need to approve that. So I would ask for a motion to approve that extension.

W. Pitney: Move.

J. Hathaway: Second.

D. Baker: Any discussion? Okay, all in favor please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

C. [Temporary Appointment Timeline Waiver](#) request per NIU Bylaws Article 19.5.2.2
Edward Klonoski, Associate Vice Provost – Pages 7-8

D. Baker: Second similar issue with Ed Klonoski, he was put in more than a year ago and with the reorganization in the Provost's Office and trying to figure out with Program Prioritization now what is the role going to be or is there going to be a role and how will it be structured. We've delayed that search and we'd like to start that search in the fall. So again, this asks to push it out until fall semester when people are back and there's been time to consider the feedback and program prioritization for the restructuring of the area. Again, I'd ask for a six month extension on that one. Do I have a motion to

J. Hathaway: Moved.

D. Baker: Second?

J. Novak: Second.

D. Baker: Discussion? All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

D. [Resolution](#) in support of divestment from fossil fuel companies – Pages 9-10

D. Baker: The next is a resolution in support of divestment from fossil fuel companies. Is that something that, do you want to do it?

S. Nissenbaum: There's a group of students and Kishwaukee 350 have been working on this. They brought it before the Student Senate. They brought it before the Faculty Senate, I believe. And they've been meeting with me fairly regularly to help kind of promote this. I think it falls in line with a lot of environmental push we're seeing this semester, Student Association creating both my position as well as now an outstanding committee on environmental affairs. I think they'd better explain the idea behind divestment and they are here. I would like to yield a couple minutes to them to speak.

D. Baker: Okay.

E. Bray: How's it going, everyone. So I'm going to kind of bend down here. How's everyone doing, good? So just for people who don't know, divestment is literally just the opposite of investing. You basically just withdraw your investments in assets, holdings, from fossil fuel based companies. Recently this entire movement has been made within the past five to ten years with about 500 companies representing \$3.4 trillion removing their investments from fossil fuel based companies. We've seen in the past year or two, fossil fuel companies are beginning to lose a lot of their – what's the word I'm looking for – I guess their backing, for lack of a better term. And recently Peabody Energy, which is one of the largest fossil fuel based companies, has been going bankrupt. So this is something that seems to be a national movement where people are getting on board with this. And there are a lot of institutions across the United States that are getting on board with this. And so far, there are actually none in the entire Midwest. We want NIU to be the first. We want NIU to be the first to do this. So as Stuart said, we do have student support, over 700 signatures from students, and we really want this to have support from the University Council so we can go to the Board of Trustees and then finally get the Foundation Board to actually have the endowment withdraw their investing from fossil fuel based companies.

We know this is a big step and will take time, but we're willing to work and, hopefully, see this happen in five to ten years. This is something we want to see happen and we really hope NIU could be the first to do this within the entire Midwest. So, any questions? No. You guys have a good day.

D. Baker: Just one comment, the university's assets are held in short-term financial securities like T-bonds, so there's no investment in energy or any companies.

E. Bray: I was emailing with Dori, she got me in contact with Chief Financial Officer. He said the same thing. But he believes –

D. Baker: That would be that guy over here.

E. Bray: So what I've come to learn is that the NIU Foundation, which controls the endowment, is a separate entity from the actual university and their funds. So we're actually aiming towards the

Foundation and endowment, not the actual sort of university and what they're invested in, am I correct?

D. Baker: The Foundation is a separate 501(c)(3) that's not part of the university.

E. Bray: It's not?

D. Baker: It's a separate 501(c)(3). That's a not for profit tax exempt organization. So the Board of Trustees doesn't have any control over them.

E. Bray: Okay.

P. Liberty Baczek: I'm just curious, Evan, right?

E. Bray: Yes.

P. Liberty-Baczek: Have you done a cost benefit, do you know if this would potentially cost us money and how far down the road?

E. Bray: What we did, we're not really finance-based so what we had to do is actually meet with the student management portfolio.

D. Baker: Why don't you use the mic, we're recording this.

E. Bray: Sorry. We decided to meet with the student management portfolio and so they are out of the finance department. And they control just a small portion of NIU's endowment, just sort of set up like real world practice and everything like that. And so what we wanted to do was present it to them and just sort of get an idea and a feel to see if this would be a viable thing to do. And so through corresponding with Franz Varga and rest of the individuals on the S&P, they said it is something that is viable to happen. What you would have to do is invest in things like mutual bonds, which are a little more conservative. But the next thing you'd have to do is sort of supplement the companies you're divesting from and replace them with companies that have a similar asset margin, meaning like they're kind of like the same financially. So then, over time, green companies, or not even green companies, any companies sort of in different sectors, because we don't want to limit ourselves to green companies. So we want to have a diverse portfolio, but still withdraw from fossil fuel companies. So we found a study from the MSCI that said over a one-to five-year period, companies that did have a divested portfolio versus companies that did not have a divested portfolio I think performed two percent better. That's still a five percent – I mean that's like one- to five-year margin, not that long in the terms of finance. But it's still, I guess, good that it outperformed a non-divested portfolio. So yeah, it's something that is going to take a little while to see a return. But personally in my benefit and then, through me other students, and whose futures are at this university, I think it's for a proper benefit. I understand there's a budget crisis so some of you may be not about interested in this, which I completely understand. But I really think it's something that could be done if you have the correct advising and people looking through this and people that are able to, you know, with the correct background to say, if we divest from this, here are a handful of companies we could suggest to replace that with. From what I've seen, it's possible

and you can make a return from it and not go negative, but it's going to take probably that three- to five-year period. But it's something that can actually be done, though.

H. Nicholson: Have you looked at possible other implications, such as business-to-business relationships we've built that would affect internships or even donor relations, career services, has there been a study in that?

E. Bray: What was the question? I apologize.

H. Nicholson: Have you studied implications on other areas of the university, such as the partnerships we've established with other companies that would funnel internships through or donor relations.

E. Bray: We have not, no.

K. Thu: I'm curious if you have any idea what portion of the total portfolio is invested in energy.

E. Bray: From trying to find it this past semester, I've had trouble actually getting hold of the actual endowment, what we're invested in. We've been able to find the S&P what they're small managed in, but that's public. Through what I have discussed with a few other individuals, it's public, but it's very hard to find, at least for me it's been very hard to find what they're invested in. So that's been a struggle and so I have not yet.

D. Baker: Other questions? And I assume you're focused on the producers of energy rather than the consumers, is that right?

E. Bray: Yes and no. Yes. You should have looked at him, not me.

D. Baker: Okay, otherwise you'd have to disinvest from all business organizations, I suspect.

E. Bray: Okay, there we go, misunderstood your question, sorry about that. Anything else from anybody?

D. Baker: Okay, so, Stuart, is this a motion or what have we got here?

S. Nissenbaum: Yes, let's call it a motion to support their efforts.

D. Baker: Okay, so I would need a second to that.

D. Domke: Second.

D. Baker: Nine and 10 is the resolution if you want to study what you're about to vote on. Is there any further discussion while you're looking at that? Janet.

J. Hathaway: We may need a little more time to look at this. It seems relatively complex. I think we can support it, but I'm not sure what form our support is taking and I just want to make sure –

D. Baker: Janet, are there other particular questions you would have?

J. Hathaway: I think Holly brought up a good question. I just think we're looking at principles and we're looking at budget at the same time, so I don't know. I can't even identify all the principles and all the budget questions myself, but just so we have ample discussion to look at all the angles.

D. Baker: So do I get the sense the room is in favor of controlling global warming, and that we're concerned about fossil fuels being continued to burn and warm the climate? Is that right, Reed, is that going on?

R. Scherer: Yes.

D. Baker: Reed says yes, that's going on. The students have brought us a resolution here, I guess, to make the point that at least the Foundation, in this case, shouldn't be investing in fossil fuels. But some of the questions I've heard are: What are the secondary implications or relationships? And what's the impact on the portfolio? How big is the investment and how big is the impact? I'm just trying to summarize what I'm hearing?

B. Jaffee: I just want to add to your summary that the Faculty Senate did support this.

D. Baker: Thank you. Other comments? Go ahead and use the mics, please.

J. Novak: I'd like to add that the Faculty Senate, it was a two sentence statement as opposed to two pages.

D. Baker: Okay.

G. Chen: This is not a question, but I'm not in the science area and this one is, by scientific, so my question to maybe more of my colleagues from the science area: Is that true global warming, that is caused, that is the only single or major factor? And my second one is not a question. Again, this one is, okay, if we are looking at a diminished supply, now the entire notion or concept of this moment is punishing the supplier. But he is doing nothing from the demand. So when supply or supplier is going down, the price is going to go high, getting down to the demand. If we don't change the demand, I don't think, you know, it's helping anyway globally. Just in my humble opinion. But I may be myopic.

D. Baker: So we've got a science question and economic questions. Reed, can you help us?

R. Scherer: Here's a little statistic that may be hard to believe. One gallon of gasoline will be converted into about 2500 kilojoules of energy, enough to move your car about 25 miles or so. The carbon that comes out of that one gallon of gasoline will remain in the atmosphere contributing to, I believe it's, 40 billion times the amount of energy being stored. That one gallon of gasoline will trap the heat equivalent to seven Hiroshima bombs.

D. Baker: So, by implication.

R. Scherer: Yes, it's real.

D. Baker: Global warming and fossil fuels are causally related.

R. Scherer: There are other greenhouse gases that are stronger, like methane and CFCs, but they remain in the atmosphere for a very short period of time, whereas carbon monoxide is a continuing contribution over a very long period of time. Thus, the net effect is extraordinarily high, historically over geologic time, and the atmosphere has already reached the concentration of carbon dioxide that the world has not seen for three million years, during which time there was significantly less ice on the planet.

D. Baker: All right, I think that's the science question unless someone wants to debate that one. Stuart, you had your hand up?

S. Nissenbaum: We should keep in mind that a lot of the stuff is supposed to happen by 2030, 2050, and that's all really implicating my generation's lifetime. So anything we can do now to start making a change will ultimately help our generation and all further generations after us.

D. Baker: I think, there's Denise, potentially with the business or economics answer.

D. Schoenbachler: I want to echo the request to have a little more time to review this. I would want to research what the financial implications are of this divestment strategy. And the second thing is I would also like to research the companies and how much they are investing in R&D and other forms of energy because I think this divestment strategy, while it sounds great on the surface, some of those companies you're divesting in are the ones that are doing a lot of technology research to try to move forward with more sustainable efforts of energy. I would like more time. I echo that comment to not vote today. We just saw this.

R. Scherer: I agree with that as well.

D. Baker: So we have three echos.

R. Scherer: It's worth knowing what you're voting on, the specifics.

D. Baker: Okay.

P. Stoddard: I'm a nonvoting member, so don't listen to me if you don't want to. I would also point out that some of these companies actually engage in promoting what many of us would call pseudo science in regards to global warming, trying to deny it. And as an academic institution whose first goal is finding the truth, I would be very keen on divesting from any companies that were actually actively promoting false ideas about this, regardless of whether they're fossil fuel companies or otherwise.

R. Scherer: I echo that as well.

D. Baker: Wow, we're getting some consensus. Stuart again.

S. Nissenbaum: I'll also kind of echo everything else already said. But I also want to make clear that when we look at the companies that we're divesting from, we also should keep in mind that other opportunities that may come from that, other companies we may be able to invest in. So while we may be going away from fossil fuels, we might be able to start looking at green energy, which could also put more into R&D and everything like that. I don't want us to look so one dimensionally as just taking away, where we could actually build upon this as well.

D. Baker: Patricia?

P. Liberty-Baczek: Point of clarity. Did I hear during this discussion John say that when Faculty Senate saw it, it was a two-paragraphs or two sentences?

J. Novak: It was two sentences.

P. Liberty-Baczek: Now it's a page and a half. I might want to also point out that Operating Staff Council has not seen this. I don't know if there's any other governing bodies, but I'm concerned when it was approved by Faculty Senate, it was two sentences and now it's a page and a half. I think we do need more time to explore this. I think it's a great idea, but I think you presented it one way and then tweaked it after it was approved, and I'm concerned.

D. Baker: Let's keep going around. We'll come back to you. Holly?

H. Nicholson: I wanted to clarify my comments since it's on record that what we're getting from these companies, I don't set aside my morals because we're getting something from these companies, but I just want to understand the implications. And I want to vote understanding those implications as a whole. So I'm not saying that I would vote one way or another because of those, but I would like more time and more study done.

D. Baker: Thank you. Cathy, did you have your hand up?

C. Doederlein: I wanted to offer up another thing to consider in terms of how the resolution, itself, is written and that is that, as I understand it, we as a university don't have any investments in these types of companies, and by requesting a resolution to make sure that we divest, suggests that we do. We might want to tweak that as well and make sure we're actually directing this resolution towards the appropriate people since the Board of Trustees for NIU, I don't believe, would be involved in that matter.

D. Baker: Okay, Virginia?

V. Naples: Thank you. One of the things that I like to hear is people interested in doing high quality research. The question that I would like to ask is: Do we have any idea who might do that? Is there a body, a committee, a group, volunteers, or something like that, that would be willing to look at this question in greater detail and bring those results back to this body and/or to Faculty Senate or Operating Staff Council at a future date?

D. Baker: And, Virginia, the question is, the science question or the economics question?

V. Naples: I'm going to say both.

P. Liberty-Baczek: Sounds like a question about homework.

D. Baker: Who else had their hands up?

E. Bray: And to address the two sentence versus this, we've had our resolution probably almost this entire semester. When we brought it to the Student Senate, we had a resolution. For the Faculty Senate, it was brought on late so they didn't have a copy of our resolution. Mitch Irwin presented it so I believe I sent him a copy, I don't think he got it in time. But it was just brought on sort of last-minute comments, so they just, in order to vote on it, they had to create a two-sentence thing so everyone had a general understanding of it. But we've had our resolution for the past entire semester so it's not something we tried to like, I guess, try to change or manipulate on purpose or anything like that.

P. Liberty-Baczek: I appreciate that, Evan, but I'm more disturbed by what you just said than what you said originally – that it was rushed through at the very end. That's concerning as well to me.

E. Bray: I understand.

D. Baker: Dillon and then back.

D. Domke: I kind of agree with the idea potentially to look into it deeper within a committee because it has to do with the finances of the university. I'm going to make a motion to refer this resolution to the Resource, Space and Budget Committee with the fact that chair Mark Riley accepts that motion and is okay with it. I'm graduating from that committee so I don't want to put work on them if I'm not going to be around to help push it through.

D. Baker: Mark, do you have any comment on that?

M. Riley: I hadn't thought about our committee's jurisdiction over this issue. I suppose we could take a look at this issue and gather some more facts on the economic side. You know, if I'm going to comment on the whole issue, it sounds like – my opinion – from what I understand is the science is pretty settled. I don't think, it doesn't sound like we need to research that. But as far as the economic side and the implications of this resolution, yeah, we could certainly take a look at it.

D. Baker: So just to follow up on Catherine Doederlein's comment, the university doesn't own anything in its portfolio for fossil fuels or any companies, we're in T-bills and stuff like that. So, it probably needs to be edited at some point for that. So this is really about a resolution to the Foundation, a separate entity, separate legal entity from the university. So I'm not sure that your committee would be doing analysis for a separate 501(c)(3). You may want to take it to the Foundation.

E. Bray: The way that I understood it is that

D. Baker: Try the mic again.

E. Bray: The way I was told and the way I understood it is that they were separate entities but still correlated and tied together. Since they manage NIU's endowment, they were still tied and they have a correlation with the actual university. They're sort of a transfer of sorts, I guess, like power between the trustees and the board foundation. I guess that's not the fact.

D. Baker: Separate 501(c)(3) with their own board, right, so that may be a governance issue, yes, sorry.

G. Chen: I'm in support of this spirit of moment. But we are doing the right thing. But I just have a thought, you know, maybe for the floor that offering one more dimension for us to think about. Right here what we are trying to do is trying to divestment, doing a divestment of the source of this supply chain. But is this the source? Who is creating the CO emissions, or the means creating the CO emissions. And morally, are we trying to target one out of the entire supply network or supply chain, or we are trying to, I don't have the answer. I'm thinking that maybe we have to review this and to think about it more. All in all we are doing the right thing, but I just want to make sure that in the long run this is the direction to go to.

R. Scherer: I just want to say that actions like this are not entirely, but largely, symbolic. They're not meant to change activities as much as change the conversation and the culture, and to encourage the investment if you're divesting in one technology, I think it's implied that you would be investing in other technologies. And I think that that may be one of the major motivations, is to enhance our investment in alternative energy sources as opposed to carbon-based.

D. Baker: From a parliamentary standpoint, I think I need to go back to Dillon. I thinkn, Dillon, you had an actual proposal on the table, right?

D. Domke: Correct.

D. Baker: Okay, so I needed to ask for a second, and I didn't do that.

B. Jaffee: I'll second.

D. Baker: Okay, so now we need to, is there discussion on the motion to put it in RSB, to refer it to RSB?

S. Nissenbaum: Didn't we establish that it wouldn't make sense for us to do that since it's its own separate body?

D. Baker: Well, maybe, but I think we have to vote on that. We have a motion and a second, so I think we have to come to a resolution on that as a group by voting on that. Yes.

M. Riley: Sounds to me like what we could take a look at in RSB is the economic, or the fiscal, impact at the university level. I don't think we have anything to say about what the Foundation does so I'm not sure which body would make a statement, if any, to the Foundation as to what its policy should be. I'm unclear on that.

D. Baker: Kendall?

K. Thu: I was going to add that I'm not sure what "it" is that's being transferred to committee. What does that entail? I would like to have more clarity on what your committee is being asked to do.

M. Riley: So would I.

D. Baker: Dillon?

K. Thu: I just want to add that the other thing that's going on here is that we all have retirement plans, and those plans are invested in these very same companies. That's where the largest share of it comes from.

D. Domke: Just to address that, the "it" was more so referring to the economic impact identifying the different holdings potentially that were there or how the university would be affected financially from the proposed measures in this resolution. I think as we stated, I think it's pretty clear the science aspect of it, we're all in agreement on that. But it sounds like from an economic standpoint we are unsure about how the things being implicated in this resolution would fit into the university. And so I guess simply the economic impact of this resolution is it what I would suggest taking a look at.

D. Baker: The economic impact on the portfolio or on the oil companies?

D. Domke: On the portfolio.

Unidentified: Could I suggest possibly a different route here, which is, rather than getting involved in doing sort of an economic assessment, that the resolution be thought of as what Reed is referring to as a symbolic statement, that in principle we support X, Y, and Z, that kind of thing. And I would encourage the possibility of wordsmithing it in that direction. It would be cleaner and quicker.

D. Baker: We're taking a lot of time on this, aren't we? But global warming is a big deal, too. So where did we just get to?

D. Domke: Are you making that as a motion, because I'll accept that as a friendly amendment to mine if you so choose.

Unidentified: That's fine by me. It's a student resolution, so I want you guys to have ownership over it, right?

S. Nissenbaum: From what it sounds like, the students put it together. I do kind of agree with that symbolic idea. I think it's going to just in general – if we have people supporting this idea, then it will make a statement out of itself.

D. Baker: What I think is on the floor is a resolution with a friendly amendment to refer this to RSB to wordsmith it, to make it symbolic as opposed to a detailed economic analysis. Is that what I heard?

Unidentified: I think you heard that.

D. Baker: Is that what I heard, Dillon?

D. Domke: Yes.

D. Baker: Okay. Are you ready for the vote?

J. Novak: Should we use our clickers?

D. Baker: Do you want to use clickers?

Unidentified: No, not on symbolism.

D. Baker: Not on symbolism? Okay, all in favor of Dillon's amendment, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed?

Unidentified: Nay. I'm not sure what we're voting on or what this has to do with this student amendment.

D. Baker: Well, we just passed it, but let's come back. Dillon, do you want to clarify anything?

D. Domke: Well, I guess we do have an RSB meeting this Friday so I could send somebody in my place because I will not be in attendance to it. So possibly one of the students that wrote it, if it is to be taken up there this Friday.

M. Riley: If this is symbolic, then I'm not sure the RSB needs to do any sort of work on this.

D. Domke: I would agree with that.

M. Riley: So I sort of –

D. Baker: Do we want to unvote?

M. Riley: Well, I don't think we need to. I sort of viewed that amendment as taking it out of RSB's hand, and sort of undoing the RSB part of the motion. Am I wrong?

D. Domke: Not necessarily. I think I was confused, there's a lot going on.

D. Baker: All right, one more shot. What's that, Cathy?

C. Doederlein: Call the previous question.

B. Ferald: There's no question on the floor.

D. Baker: All right. there's no question on the floor. We referred it to committee. Now we can amend or we can come back and pass something to go over the top of that, which would be maybe send it to the students to bring back to us instead of RSB.

L. Freeman: That's what I was going to move – that we suggest RSB automatically return this to the Student Association to draft language regarding the intent of this symbolic measure so that they could refer it to the president to be shared with the Foundation board.

Unidentified: Second.

D. Domke: We accept that as a friendly motion.

D. Baker: Are we feeling better about that? Do we have a second for that?

G. Slotsve: I'll second that.

D. Baker: George wins. Are you ready for any more discussion? Are you tired of the discussion?

T. Bishop: I don't have a problem with it being referred to any one of our committees or the Steering Committee for that matter. In fact, it might be best that the Steering Committee wrestle with this. The students are seeking an endorsement by this body, so I don't think it's an unreasonable request to have some representative of this body articulate what our response is to it. I don't think we're speaking for the students, we're responding to their proposal. Their proposal, as they said, has long been passed by their governance system, and they're asking us to respond to it, to endorse it, or to say something about it, maybe symbolic, as Reed pointed out. So I think that it is appropriate to keep it at the UC level, some standing committee – Steering Committee may be the best – and then articulate a response that captures the sentiment that's been discussed.

D. Baker: George, did you want to say anything about that? No. Any other discussion? We do have a motion and a second.

L. Freeman: I would accept a friendly amendment to say Steering Committee instead of Student Association if I'm allowed to do that from parliamentary procedure.

F. Bryan: Sure.

D. Baker: Ferald said sure. Who was the seconder, George, okay? What did you just say we agree to?

L. Freeman: We would direct the RSB to reflect this symbolic motion back to the UC Steering Committee to draft language indicating the symbolic intent and directing President Baker to share that with the Foundation for us.

G. Long: In collaboration with the Student Association.

L. Freeman: In collaboration with the Student Association who I assume are represented on the UC Steering Committee.

D. Baker: In your thinking, are we approving it – would it have to come back here or could it just go through that committee on to the Foundation? So she says, yes, just through the committee on to the Foundation; it wouldn't come back here.

D. Domke: That would be with authority, just looking at it procedurally.

D. Baker: Yes, is that all right? Are we good with that? Are we ready for that vote? All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? [None] Congratulations.

IX. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

D. Baker: Shall we do some reports? The first one is the FAC to the IBHE, Paul Stoddard.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. The FAC to the IBHE met at DePaul on April 15. I will note that the meeting was originally scheduled to be hosted by Chicago State, but they were unable to find the resources to do so. So we had to move the meeting. So this budget thing is hitting us in many different ways.

We got a legislative update. Tom Cross as everybody knows was appointed to be the new chair of the IBHE. One of his first actions was to meet with the leadership of the house and senate to try to get some motion on the budget. Whether that 30 percent was part of that or not, I don't know, but 30 percent is better than zero, but it's a lot less than 100.

We also heard that applications for the FAFSA are down about 14 percent from last year at this time. And MAP applications are down about 10 percent from last year. It's not clear what is driving that, but certainly speculation could rise that uncertainty over the funding situation for higher education in Illinois is driving students away. So even as we move forward, we see the negative effects of the recent impasse.

We had a discussion with David Anderson, executive director of the Association of American Publishers. They are putting together, or have been running, a university dialogue program for the last three years or so in regions around the country. One of these dialogues will be coming to a region near us in the near future. These are about digital material for the classroom, so we are probably moving away from paper textbooks into the digital regime. There are a lot of questions and concerns and opportunities that come up with that. Obviously, we can do a lot more with digital information than just paper and ink, however, there are access issues. If you buy a book, it's yours forever unless you choose to sell it. If you get digital information, a lot of times the companies are only renting it to you for a semester or three- or four-year period while you're in college. So

permanence of the access is an issue. And there's also what's called the digital divide, not everybody has access to the computers, Internet and so forth. Do we necessarily disadvantage students who do not have that access? So these are types of issues that they talk about at these dialogues. I suspect as planning for a local one progresses, I'll have more details for you. But if anybody has thoughts or concerns about that, I would ask you to forward those to me so I can bring those up at the appropriate time.

We had our typical caucus meetings where the four-year publics went around and talked about how bad life is. The next one should be better next time we chat about that. The last one was still pretty depressing. And then after the meeting was over – that meeting was Friday – I think by Monday the governor had appointed a gentleman – I can never remember quite his name – Bombanek, to fill the faculty slot on the IBHE. Typically what happens is the FAC recommends two names to the governor and the governor picks one of those. In this instance, the governor chose to ignore that recommendation and go with his own pick. The FAC is extremely concerned about this. The pick is an instructor at U of I, not tenured or tenure track. He does not hold an advanced degree. He has as his main life, we believe, a computer security business that he runs. And we feel that as such, he really does not understand, nor can he represent, the faculty viewpoint on the IBHE. So the FAC is taking the unprecedented step, in my experience, of actually going around and calling all of its members and asking what are you doing to let your college campuses know, as well as your representatives know, that this is not an acceptable candidate for the position?

The Faculty Senate last week voted to write a letter to the various state senators who serve on the committee that ultimately approves this and express our displeasure with the choice. I don't know if it's something this body wants to take up. I'm very happy that the senate has taken it up already. I've worked with Greg on fashioning a letter to that effect. But I just thought I would report that out and let people know what's going on.

D. Baker: Thank you. Questions or comments about any of that? Okay, thanks for serving on that. It's been, I bet, an educational year, an interesting year, hasn't it?

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

C. Academic Policy Committee, Chris McCord, Chair – no report

D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Mark Riley, Chair – no report

E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Therese Arado, Chair

1. Election of 2016-17 Executive Secretary of University Council per NIU Bylaws [Article 14.5](#) – Page 11

D. Baker: All right, our next is Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, Therese Arado.

T. Arado: Our nominee for the office of 2016-17, executive secretary of University Council who also serves as president of Faculty Senate is Greg Long. I move to accept his nomination, to close the nominations and to approve his election to this position. I need a second.

H. Nicholson: Second.

D. Baker: All right.

T. Arado: Any discussion on this?

D. Baker: While you're thinking about discussing, get a clicker.

T. Arado: Thank you. If you are a voting member, please get a clicker because we will be using them. So when the polling opens, 1 will be a yes in favor of our nominee, Greg Long. 2 will be no, not in favor of our nominee. And 3, is an abstention. Everyone have a clicker? Are we open? We're already voting, so yes, we're open. Okay. Our number, oops, it just jumped up again. Everybody good? We held steady there for a couple seconds. Okay, so then let's close the polling. And we have 41 in favor, four against and two abstain. Greg, welcome aboard again.

Yes – 41

No – 4

Abstain – 2

D. Baker: Congratulations.

T. Arado: That's all I have.

D. Baker: Do you have an acceptance speech?

G. Long: I'll do it.

D. Baker: Okay, thank you.

F. University Affairs Committee – Linda Saborio, Chair – no report

G. Student Association – report
Giuseppe Lagioia, Student Association
Dillon Domke, Speaker of the Senate

D. Baker: All right, moving on, Student Association. Giuseppe LaGioia is not here. Dillon, are you doing it?

D. Domke: Uh-huh. We're beginning to transition in the Student Association. Most of the directors for next year's academic year were just approved. As you guys all know already, Christine and Giuseppe will be taking over the two spots as president and speaker. And you know, we're continuing to do a few things. This week Christine will actually be leading a talk with someone from the governor's office. I would like to turn it over to her for a second to speak about that.

C. Wang: So tomorrow in the Heritage Room here at the HSC from 3:30 to 5:30, we will be having someone from the Secretary of Education's Office, Niketa Brar, who I had a lunch with three or four weeks ago. She has expressed an interest in meeting with us again, with students, to talk about issues facing us now especially with higher education in Illinois.

And she has a rich history of working with students, for students, addressing socio-economic inequities within secondary education. And to have her come and talk to us so frankly was a great experience. So when she reached out to us again, I said why don't we have a meeting with students so that we can talk about this in greater scope than the small lunch that we had with a number of students. She was happy to do so. And I think that tomorrow will be a great conversation for students to have with someone who is so close to the governor's office. She does report to the Secretary of Education but the Secretary of Education reports to the governor, himself. So that will be a great way for students to talk and, you know, discuss a lot of these issues, to alleviate any kind of concerns they might have or bring up those concerns to Niketa Brar. If you have any students you think would be interested, send them our way. If you would like to attend, send them as well. 3:30 to 5:30 in the Heritage Room tomorrow. So thank you.

D. Domke: Really, that's it for the Student Association for this year. All our students have finals coming up. I want to take a moment to say thank you to everyone for this year. It's been great. I came on University Council at the end of my freshman year. I've been serving on this body for a long time as a student. And I appreciate all of which everyone in this room does for the university, especially the faculty. You guys are the ones who are teaching the students, and we absolutely appreciate everything that you guys do for the students. And we realize that – and everyone else, not just the faculty, there's everyone from janitors to deans – you help students in any way that you can. And I know that this year has been a struggle for all of us, financially and morally and whatever way. But you know, I've had a great time serving with all of you, and I just ask all of you to just keep doing the great jobs that you've been doing.

D. Baker: Thank you, Dillon. And thank you for three-plus years of service and your leadership in a lot of roles. I appreciated working with you in Springfield in particular. You've made an impact down there, and I think you've really heightened the perception of many legislators about the wisdom that students have and the perspective they bring to the table. And the fact that Niketa Brar is coming back, she's the higher education policy person for the Governor for the Secretary of Education, Purvis. She was here along with somebody from Department of Commerce and Economic Development to look at our P-20 system network that the university has. We're trying to look vertically from birth to career, all the pieces that fit together and affect each other along that continuum and the social context that they sit in. Our P-20 network is doing a lot of important work around that. So she was intrigued by what the students had to say about where they were in that and what the impact of number of state policies are. She's here to look for policy questions and answers. So it's important work for them to do. And, Christine, thanks for organizing students to go talk to her. I think it will be impactful. Appreciate you doing that and appreciate Niketa coming out.

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

D. Baker: All right, Operating staff Council, Holly.

H. Nicholson: I'm impressed and grateful for the great collaboration that we've had this year between the councils and with the administration as well. SPSC and OSC jointly sponsored an employee compensation policy for those who earn degrees at NIU, as well as policy on university service that's intended to boost participation in shared governance. Council leadership all worked together with Provost Freeman and many other leaders on campus to create a more equitable environment for staff including support for shared governance leadership and a personnel advisor pilot program for operating staff. And we're positioning Operating Staff Council for future collaboration, and one way we've done that is to create an Employee Morale Committee that is intended to work with other councils and departments to work on the campus climate. And I want to say thank you to Greg and President Baker for your leadership on University Council this year and, though this year was challenging on many fronts, we were still able to get great work done.

D. Baker: Thank you, Holly. Any comments for Holly? All right, thank you.

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Steve Builta, President – report

D. Baker: Supportive Professional Staff Council, Steve.

S. Builta: Like to echo Holly's statement of shared governance. In my short time as SPS President. I have been impressed by the way they have worked together. We have been able to get a lot done. I appreciate those efforts. I'd also like to make a statement to the folks that participated in the whole program prioritization process. Having had an opportunity to look at those reports, they were clearly very thoughtfully done and, regardless of whether you agree or disagree with some of the statements that were made in them, they were thoughtful, very well done reports. And the amount of work was pretty clear in those. In addition, talk a little bit about the SPS Council Award Ceremony that happened on the 14th. We do one every year as a way for us to recognize folks that have done some extraordinary things throughout the year. At that event, we recognized 19 individuals with certificates of recognition for their accomplishments at the university. And we awarded a number of awards for individuals who had done truly outstanding service, not only to the council but also to the university as a whole. SPS Council made their Service Award to Kathy Smith, Director of Payroll, Human Resource Services. The SPS Award for Advocacy went to Deborah Miller, Director of the Disability Resource Center. The SPS Council Award for Cultural Competency went to Greg Ross, Residential Program Coordinator in Foreign Language and Literature. The SPS Council Award for Excellence in Supervision was issued to Jason Rhode, Director of Faculty Development. The Award for Institutional Advancement was given to Anissa Kuhar, Marketing Manager in the Division of Outreach. Award for Partnership in Collaboration, which is the only award that can actually be given to groups of people and folks who are not normally part of the SPS Council, was actually given to the College of Education Student Services team. In addition, there were four council awards that were actually made by the president. The four individuals received Presidential Awards for Excellence: Greg Barker, Director of Testing Services; Melissa Burlingame, Governmental Studies; William McCoy, Director of BELIEF Initiative in College of Business; and Mark McGowan, Editorial Associate in Institutional Association. A fantastic year. I look forward to next year.

D. Baker: Thanks, Steve. It was a great ceremony. Thanks for putting it together. Really appreciated it. And it was great to recognize all those amazing people. Any comments for Steve?

X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: Comments from the floor?

B. Hoffman: Beatrix Hoffman from the Department of History. I've taught here at NIU for almost 20 years. Some of you know me. I'm not a member of the UC. I'm here today representing the United Faculty Alliance of NIU and, as you probably know, at least from the paper, if not by other means, the United Faculty Alliance filed a petition to create a faculty union here at NIU. And I would like to just spend a couple minutes giving you an update on what happens next if that's okay.

Just a little bit of background: The NIU faculty, working with the Illinois Federation of Teachers, we formed an organizing committee in the spring of 2015. And since then we've had many hundreds of, if not thousands of, discussions with our colleagues about their wish for greater faculty voice at NIU. In addition to the IFT, we've affiliated with the UPI, instructors union at Northern and the AAUP, American Association of University Professors. And last week we reached majority support, when over half the faculty signed union cards. On Thursday, April 28, organizers took those cards to the offices of Illinois State Labor Relations Board and filed a petition to unionize. And that began the process that I'm about to describe.

It shouldn't take too long. A little technical, so please bear with me. I'm learning about this myself too as we go along. So this process is called certification. Between 7 and 14 days after we filed a Petition, the employer, NIU, shall provide the board a list of all employees, including examples of their signatures for comparison if the board requests this. Within 21 days after receipt of the petition, the parties served shall file a written response, and the certification will take place between 30 and a maximum of 120 days after the petition was filed. Also upon notification of the petition, the employer shall post a notice on bulletin boards and other conspicuous places informing faculty that the petition has been filed, so we should be seeing those notices soon if we haven't already.

And we wanted just to come here today to let you know about this process and also to ask faculty to get involved if you already haven't been. If you want even more information, we do have a website and a Facebook page that you should please check out. Search United Faculty Alliance. Also, myself and other UFA members, who would like to identify themselves, would be happy to meet with you individually to tell you more about the union. I'm happy to stick around after the meeting today if anybody wants to speak with me further. So thank you so much for your attention. I look forward to working with everybody.

D. Baker: Any other comments? I've got one announcement. Tonight at 6:30, 6:30 to 8:30, there's a tribute concert for Black Lives Matter. And this is a student-led concert it will be an homage to the performing artists, civic leaders, activists that have shaped African-American history. If you're interested in that, in Altgeld Hall, free admission, 6:30 to 8:30.

Okay, anything else? Comments from you, Greg, on a year well done?

G. Long: Appreciate it.

XI. 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. [2016-17 Meeting Schedule](#) – Page 12

XII. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: All right, and immediately following this we've got a reception in the University Suite. on the second floor at the other end of the building. So if you all want to come down for some punch and cookies, or whatever we got going, the University suite. Thank you for a very good year. Go Huskies!

Meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m.