

10-5-2016

UC Transcript 2016-10-05

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2016-10-05" (2016). *University Council Archives*. 12.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/12>

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 5, 2016, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, D. Baker, G. Baker, Bishop, Block, Boughton, Brubaker (for Olson), Carlson, Chakraborty, Chen, Chitwood, Chung, Cibrian, Cuautle, Dannenmaier, Doederlein, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Freeman, Ghrayeb, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hathaway, Hoffman (for Bond), Jemison, Khoury, Kreis, LaGioia, Long, Love-Moore (for Reynolds), Macdonald, McCord, McChone-Chase, Mogren, Naples, Newman, Nicholson, Nobiling, Pavkov, Rajagopalan, Rodgers, Rosenbaum (for Riley), Russell, Saborio, Sto Domingo, Tan, Thu, Torres (for Barth), VanderSchee, Wang, Wilson, Wyzard, Zaucha

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Barth, Bond, Briscoe, Campbell, Kassel, Olson, Penrod, Reynolds, Riley, Staikidis

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Falkoff, Klaper, Martinez, Phillips, Stoddard, Weldy

OTHERS ABSENT: Coryell, Johns, Kaplan

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: It's a beautiful afternoon. We'll call the meeting to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:04 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: This is the adoption of the agenda. Do I have a motion?

D. Boughton: So moved.

G. LaGioia: Second.

D. Baker: Thank you very much. Any editorial changes? Hearing none, all in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed, nay. We have an agenda, thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2016 MEETING

D. Baker: Next is the approval of the minutes from September 7. Do I have a motion for approval?

S. Farrell: So moved.

D. Baker: Thank you, Sean. Second?

J. Love-Moore: Second.

D. Baker: Thank you, Janet. Any editorial changes? Hearing none, all in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: President's Announcements. I thought I'd just say a few words about the budget, and the few words are: There's not a lot that's changed at the state level. We're kind of in a holding pattern, I think, as the elections come up upon us. And, from what I can tell, there's not a lot of work going on on policy issues. There's mostly election work going on as you might suspect. So, vote and vote the way you think will help the state the best, and I'll leave it at that. I don't know what's going to happen after the election. You can see the polls saying it's going to shift a couple seats one way or the other, but I'm not anticipating a seat change in either house and so we'll have to see what the dynamics are.

There are going to be some windows after the election when something might happen, but is probably unlikely to happen, but you never know. So one of those is in the veto session after the elections where they come back and deal with vetoes and maybe some other things. And that's only a few days. Then there's the lame duck session at the beginning of January where it's basically the lame duck legislators who can come in and find a deal and have the cover of their exit to get something done, maybe. Maybe a little bit more opportunity there, but again, there'd have to be, I think, a grand deal as in there'd have to be some agreement on revenue enhancement and overall budget reductions before it impacted us. I don't think there's necessarily going to be a special deal for higher education.

Now having said that, I've had conversations with people in the governor's office and legislators in the last couple of weeks, and there seems to be increased understanding of the impact of higher education, so I think that's good – that they're really starting to see now. Whether they can get out of their own conundrum that they're in as they battle over larger political issues, I don't know. But I do feel like they're really starting to get that. And I think that they're starting to hear from more and more people around the state. So, again, please let your legislator, whoever that may be, wherever you live, know your opinions on these kinds of things. It is amazing, as I walk the halls during the session right before it ended, some legislators said they just hadn't heard much about higher education, was there a problem? And you're kind of – what? So I'm glad I'm here to talk to you about it.

Now something else that you'll hear in the media, and I want to warn you about it, is that some

people will say that we got an 82 percent budget. Has anybody heard that? So, for you mathematicians, here's how they get there. They take our 28 percent budget that we got last year – 29 percent budget we got last year, the fiscal year '16 that ended June 30. And then they add to that the 53 percent budget that we have for this year. And they get an 82 percent budget, But there's this kind of little thing, the denominator, that they forget about. So what happened really was: We had a 29 percent budget last year, 29 percent appropriation. And we have a half-year budget now, a 53 percent budget. So it goes out for half a year. Okay, and we don't know what's going to happen after that. So that's where we're working aggressively in the legislature to get that other half. But it's a little hard to say: You've got an 82 percent budget by taking a 71 percent cut and a 47 percent cut. So, when you hear that, you may want to correct people on what really happened. Now you can say you got an 82 percent budget if you shove all of fiscal year '17 back into '16 and say we have a zero percent budget for '17. You can do that math, although it was allocated in '17 so that's a little hard to do that, but that's the jujitsu you're seeing in some of the press. And that did come up at the Illinois Board of Higher Education last week, and one of the, actually the president of Western Illinois University is on the board now, and he brought it up and said: Your math's a little off. Let's be clear about what really happened. So I appreciated that.

Okay, that's kind of my budget update. So, given that and given the uncertainty for the spring, we're going through reduction scenarios. I think you've probably seen that in my Baker Report and other places. We're asking for a five and 10 percent internal plan, not just on the appropriations, but on the whole budget. And that's how we can get the budget into alignment so we can get through this year and into next year in good shape. So we've had all the vice presidents bring to us their plans at five and 10 percent. Vice President Phillips has met with all of them now, some adjustments are being made, and he and I and the Executive Budget Committee are all going to sit down and go through those in some detail in the next week or two and really figure out where we are. So we've got to make some adjustments because we can't just assume that something magical will happen after January and that we'll get that other half of the budget. So, we have to position ourselves for those scenarios and do the right thing. So that's what we're going to do, that's where we are on the budget.

When we get down to the New Business section, the provost – well no, that's not the New Business section – the Program Prioritization update, I'm going to ask Provost Freeman to talk about Program Prioritization, as well as the hiring plan this year for faculty, something that we really need to be strategic about. And she's actually done that work, and we'll have some announcements about that.

In our budget planning, we've done some modeling on furloughing, and we've concluded that furloughing doesn't get us much; that, given the restrictions on it, it just doesn't get us much money. So we're going to try and figure out how to do these budget scenarios without furloughing, which is essentially a salary reduction. So, I don't know if that's any solace to anybody, but that's where we are on it.

Enrollment – now one area we can affect our budget is on enrollment. And we did not have a good enrollment this fall. The good news is our retention was up again, thank you. The bad news is our freshman numbers were down significantly, and our transfer numbers were down a little bit. Now I think we can really make some headway. Now in freshmen, the high school graduates coming out

are slightly going down. So that means, if we want more freshmen, we have to execute better. It's a market share, basically, that we need to increase our market share. And our admissions department has been working vigorously on that, but they can't solve the whole problem. So I've formed four task forces to look at enrollment, and their materials are going to be to me this week. One is for freshmen; one is for transfer students; one is for adult learners and online learners; and the other is international. So I think we can make headway in all four of those groups, but we can't put all of our money into the traditional freshman area because the demographics aren't with us, the tide in the state isn't with us, and the competition is tough. So we can make headway, we can do better there, I'm convinced of it, and we're putting the pieces in place, but we've got to look at those other markets. And we've been working the last couple years on the transfer market by working closely with community colleges. We've done some reorganization around that to bring in the liaison relationship into the provost's office. We've hired three recruiters to be on six community college campuses on a half-time basis, every other day kind of thing, based on the feedback of the community colleges. One of the community colleges wants to name us as their preferred provider, as in they're going to channel their students to us. Rockford, as you know, we've started a baccalaureate engineering program in mechanical engineering there, so thank you, Omar, for you and the college doing that. I think that's potentially a model for other community colleges who may have place-bound students who wouldn't come here but have a need in that locale. We're continuing to do 2 + 2 kinds of programs and 3 + 1 programs, etc. So I think we've got great opportunities and great relationships with our community colleges by and large. And the branding survey work that we've been doing there, as we go out and say: What's NIU look like to you? The community college students, they're very positive on us. They have a high regard for us. And I know some of our students here are transfer students. So we get great students, and they have a 90 percent retention rate. How about that?

So we're going to work on all four of those areas, and I think we have great opportunities in all of them. So we need to integrate what we're doing. So we've got our marketing at the top where we're trying to get names and applicants. Then we've got Admissions doing its work in high schools and community colleges and there are communications out with hundreds of thousands of people. And then we need to come down and really get people to enroll. And that's maybe where faculty and staff can really help us. In enrollment management terms, they call that yield rate – that means the percentage of students who apply who ultimately come to school here. We can improve that. We've got areas for improvement. I want to brag on the law college, Eric, who this year greatly increased their yield rate and greatly increased their incoming class. And they did it by a lot of hands-on calling and talking to people about it. And you really upped the enrollment dramatically this year. What was it, a 25 percent increase?

E. Dannenmaier: 23.

D. Baker: 23, I rounded up. If we had a 23 percent increase in our incoming class, we'd be in pretty good shape. But I think they showed us one of the secrets is that personal touch and talking about the amazing programs we have here makes a difference. So thank you, thank you for pitching in and working on that. We'll be back to you with some more specific steps on it.

So any questions on any of that? Okay.

A. [Ombudsperson Annual Report](#) per Bylaws, Article 20.1 – Sarah Klaper – Pages 3-16

D. Baker: Let's move on. The next piece in my President's Announcements is the Ombudspersons's Annual Report per the bylaws, and I'll turn it over to Sarah.

S. Klaper: Hello. Okay, so my sister gave me this little painting, and I think it's funny. So it sits on my desk, and I decided to make it the background because the people who come into my office kind of feel like the world is crumbling around them. And when they get to my office in distress, my job and my office staff's job is to help them breathe again and figure out their plan and how they're going to move forward, no matter what that forward looks like, but to identify their options and help them move forward. So, that's me sitting there with a cup of coffee, and you're welcome to join me at any time.

The Office of the Ombudsperson is about conflict resolution and conflict prevention. That is our entire job in addition to outreach. But part of our outreach is to do more presentations on conflict prevention and management. We work with everybody on campus and associated with campus: faculty, staff, students, alumni, administrators (if you don't consider yourselves staff), families. Sometimes families have trouble figuring out who they can talk to and what they can talk to them about on campus when, you know, their children are adults who attend school here. So we will talk with them and provide them as much information as we can and help them get where they need to go for their students. We also work with community members whenever they happen to walk in the door too.

The main thing about our office is we are a confidential resource on campus. So I don't let anybody know who comes to see me or what we talk about. The only exceptions to that are if it's regarding child abuse or an imminent physical threat. Everything else, including Title IX issues, are confidential. So that is helpful because we're one of the few offices on campus that helps the person who is making accusations or has a concern, but also the person who is being accused. And there aren't a whole lot of places that you can get help on both sides of that coin. Also it's good because people don't want to come to an office to seek assistance and think you're going to pick up the phone and call my boss or call my faculty member. And we're not going to do that. We're going to listen, lay out options on how to handle this situation, and help with the process if necessary. But we will keep that information confidential unless I have permission, for some reason, to break confidentiality.

We're also neutral. I am Switzerland. So I do not take sides. I am not allowed to advocate on behalf of anybody in the institution because I work with everybody. So that would be silly to be taking sides one against another. Sometimes people say: Yeah, but she's not really, really neutral. And I am, really, truly. I frequently talk to people on multiple sides of the same issue, and I do not reveal what one person has said to me about the other person or use that information to help somebody else. It's truly, I go case by case. Also I work under the International Ombudsman Association's Standards of Practice, and that allows me to advocate, but not for an individual, but instead on fair and equitably administered processes. So that's what I do. So, even if I have somebody who's come to me with a concern, a student has come to me with a concern about how somebody has treated

them in their college. Okay, then if I need to, if I feel like it's a bigger issue than just this one student, then I might go to that chair or dean or somebody and talk with them, but not in the context of that student. You know, we've got some systemic issues here and some systemic concerns, and that's how I will bring it forward.

I'm also informal so you can go to the ethics officer, you can go to HR, those are formal places to file a complaint. My office is not a formal place to file a complaint, and I'm not authorized to receive them. But that's good because I'm confidential, I don't want to pass information on to the university. So that's good. But I'll get you to the right place if that's what you need to do.

I'm also independent in that I don't belong to a department or division. I report to the president. I get evaluated by you all, right now. So feel free to fill out that evaluation form that's in your NIU Today.

Okay, so the number of cases: It's kind of been up, but also down a little bit. So complex cases are cases that I consider that I need to make an appointment and meet with somebody to talk with them about. I had 626 of those this past year and that was up by 11 from the previous year. That number is consistent with other institutions of our size, and bigger. University of Iowa, for example, has approximately the same number of cases that go to their ombuds, and that office has one-and-a-half full-time ombuds and an administrative staff person. So our office has me and one grad assistant – last year I had two grad assistants. The grad assistants work with undergrads and sometimes family issues, and everybody else sees me. So one administrative assistant. This past year, I was missing an administrative assistant for five months because my previous admin retired – Karola Smith if anybody knew her while she was here. She retired in December and so for all of second semester I was without an admin. But, regardless, we still saw the same number of people for complex cases.

Our policy cases are also up by 16. The simple referrals are down. The simple referrals are when somebody calls or walks in the office and the person who answers the phone says: Oh, I know where to send you for that and makes a referral to another office or helps them figure out what form they have to fill out or whatever. That's a simple referral. Of course, because we didn't have anybody answering the phone on a consistent basis, we had me when I was in the office, and my grad assistants who would sit at the front desk. But, of course, they also had to go to class. So when the front desk was not staffed and if I had to be out of the office at a meeting or in the office at a meeting, I would have to shut the door, lock the door so nobody would come in to my confidential meeting, or shut it when I was leaving the office because, of course, the door would have to be locked and nobody would be there to answer the phone. So that made the simple referral issue tricky this past semester because we just didn't have the staff to be there consistently. But, by the way, Pat Erickson was a huge help. Thank you, Pat, because she did all of my university paperwork because I am really bad at that. And so she saved our office by doing all of my budget stuff and whatever. So that was a huge help.

Some people talk to me and like: Well, you just see the same three people all the time. It's not true. Those were separate people that we saw, or separate issues – they came back multiple times but on separate issues. So the first time it was an issue with the supervisor. The next time it might have been an issue dealing with a class I'm taking. But sometimes visitors would come back on the same

issue multiple times. And those complex cases are quite time consuming. And so I wanted to give you an idea of how many people we saw multiple times on the same issue. And I'm guessing that 12 is it? One was probably a tenure appeal. But most of them are less frequent than that.

I'm sorry this is a little bit fuzzy. Had an issue with that this year, but the types of visitors we had – the large majority, 43 percent, are students – that's a mix of graduate students and undergraduate students. Faculty and staff – those numbers are both up. So, for SPS, those numbers doubled from last year. And faculty were up by a full third from last year. Operating Staff were down by about six. So, in the beginning of last year, last reporting year, I didn't have a lot of Operating Staff coming to me. I just didn't. And then it seemed like, particularly in Facilities and some other places, there were some changes in leadership so people seemed to be waiting it out to see what would happen. Also there was a new union voted in and it seemed like that was taking people's attention. By the end of spring, though, Operating Staff numbers went right back up again because I think that people got tired of waiting and their frustration levels and unease increased significantly.

All right, trends and concerns. Obviously, the budget. The budget is a huge concern. And I would even label this a crisis because what I see, the people that come into my office, is that people are very frustrated. I don't know if that's even putting it mildly. The people that come to see me are saying: We have great things going on. We did a reorganization. We have re-examined our program. We have changed things up. And we have all these things we want to do. And yet, the State of Illinois is thwarting us because we cannot get anything approved. And it's thwarting people in multiple ways: Projects are not being funded or not being funded fully or sufficiently, according to the people that are coming to see me. Also, students are obviously being deterred from enrolling from their guidance counsellors or the governor's office or whoever it is who is telling them: You really should reconsider anyplace but U of I. That's a problem. That's a huge problem. Also I've heard some reports from some P.I.s that granting bodies are taking a second look at some grant applications from Illinois schools and that is causing some consternation as well.

Also – and I know you're going to hear about the faculty hiring plan but, of course, what I'm talking about is from this past year – that soft hiring freeze that we've been under, not complete hiring freeze, but a soft one, has also been very upsetting to people because we were in Prioritization and Prioritization is going to take care of a lot of issues eventually as far as reorganization, filling in gaps; but we're in the middle of it still, it's a process, and it takes a while to affect everything that's going to happen. And so, in the process, we have people in departments that are still doing the same tasks but are understaffed, significantly understaffed, either with faculty, low on faculty positions, or low on staff or both. And yet they're still doing the same amount of work. And so people are taking on more and more responsibilities and, in many areas of the institution, are not being acknowledged for doing that. And that is one of the very frustrating things – to feel like you're not being heard or seen or the work you're doing is being acknowledged in some way through compensation or through just a "thank you" is incredibly frustrating, especially when you're facing other frustrations.

In fact, as I noted in my report, there was one two-week period in the spring – and I'm not really sure what was going on other than the normal stuff – but I had at least three employees and one student come to me to talk to me about the frustrations in their department and express that they had had to go to their doctors for anti-anxiety medication to deal with this. And that, I think, is

horrifying. You shouldn't have to go on anti-anxiety medication to deal with your academic work or your employment. That is not good. So I just mention that because sometimes I've spoken with supervisors or other people on campus who just kind of pooh-pooh it, that it's really in people's heads, that it's not that big of a deal. And I'm here to say that it is a big deal.

Okay, so multi-tasking, yeah. Also the whole thing of not being heard. We have two new huge unions on campus; and, in my opinion, and from what I've been told, it's because of that whole not being acknowledged – through compensation, but also feeling like they're not being heard. Or I say stuff, I think it matters, but then ultimately nothing happens. And so people got frustrated.

Student Concerns. That whole staffing issue, both with faculty and staff, was pretty big this year. Students are facing, in many areas, increased class sizes, sometimes in classes that are really those core classes where a “best practice” would be to have a smaller class size because it's an area that's highly competitive, it weeds people out, whatever, and we don't want people to be weeded out, we want them to succeed. So, if they could have a smaller class, it would give them a better opportunity for that. And I believe a study came out about class sizes being important, but regardless.

But then also, for graduate students in particular, that's where I see the faculty concerns (being under-facultied and understaffed in offices doing administrative work) that comes up a lot. I don't have enough faculty in my department, tenured faculty in my department, to sit on my committee. We are lacking somebody to do supervision of this clinical experience, or the doctoral students in my department are having to do a lot of faculty roles, what's traditionally been a faculty role, and we're just not equipped to do some of these things that we're being asked to do, or it's just too much on top of our academic work that we're trying to do.

It's been frustrating for the students who have been in my office to try to navigate that. Now on the plus side of that, everyone who are in those departments who are under-facultied and understaffed, knows; and they do whatever they can to make it work and find work-arounds for students and find other people on campus to sit on committees, and to do whatever they need to do to make it happen. And so that has been a huge thing because students will come in and see me and be just at their wit's end and I'll be like: Okay, but have you talked to your program coordinator about this frustration? Have you talked to your chair? And usually the answer is no. Okay, let's go talk to them, or you go talk to them. And usually, nine times out of ten, or more, it gets worked out, it's not a problem as much as it appears to be to the student. But it's that process of going through that frustration to find out the answer.

The main issues. I put that “know the code” up there. Student conduct issues have been huge in my office. And due process, related to that, people concerned about how student conduct has occurred.

Disability accommodation issues. That is students' attempt to get accommodations or having them and having misunderstandings with their faculty members on how to affect those, and working with DRC. Now in the past year, the past eight months, six months, DRC came under new leadership with Deb Miller. I think that's helped significantly. I've worked really well with her and she's worked well with me. It seems like she is working well with students. But again, this is another area that is understaffed, significantly understaffed, based on the number of students that we have with

disabilities.

And then the other concern is faculty and staff unprofessionalism. That is how it's been characterized to me. And the way I interpret it that faculty and staff are frustrated and tired and are kind of at their wit's end. But the problem is that it trickles out to students, and so students end up feeling that and kind of getting the brunt of it sometimes when it's really not their thing. So, I would ask everyone to just keep that in mind. Keep that in mind, because we do experience frustrations in our offices, in our departments. But it should stay with us as opposed to eeking out to our graduate students who we see more as peers and so we say things to them. Reconsider that, because they're paying money to come here and they don't want to hear our frustrations. They just don't want to hear that. It's not helpful to them.

Faculty and staff concerns. Again, unease and frustration. The issue of treatment by supervisors and colleagues was the vast majority of situations that came to me from faculty and staff, and unprofessional behavior, characterized as unprofessional behavior, or poor supervisory skills. Sometimes faculty or staff being told by a supervisor, you should just be happy you have a job, you know, look around at our other sister institutions, they had layoffs and furloughs, you should just be happy to be here. And, while yes, that's true, because we have worked as an institution and our central administration has worked really hard to make sure that we do not go under – yay – so that's really good. But, at the same time, it discounts whatever somebody's concerns are about how they're working in their department. And people have a right to dignity at work, they do, and to be treated okay, and to be treated well, actually, in my book, to not hate coming to work because of the environment of work. It shouldn't be that way. It shouldn't be that way.

The learn-and-lead part is also about mandatory supervisor training. We have supervisors all over campus who get promoted into their positions, and it's because they have a certain set of skills. But it doesn't necessarily mean they have people management skills. And so some supervisor training would be really helpful. Mandatory supervisor training would be incredibly helpful, and I know the councils have brought that up repeatedly for years. I am going to reinforce that.

Oh, those are just some quotes from some people who have said "thank you" to me or my office. The things that I would like to say – so I just highlighted all the problems, all the problems I see in my office. The things I'd like to see as progress forward, you know, ways to move forward, just keep in mind that we're all in this together. We truly are. And to control what we can. We can't control the General Assembly, and we can't control our budget allocation. We can try to have input into that process, but we can't control. But what we can control are the things in our own offices, our own departments, our own classrooms. Also to impute good motives to other people. Everybody I have worked with at NIU means well. I have really not run into anybody who has had the motive that I'm going to run this place into the ground. No, that is just not it. So, instead of being suspicious when somebody tells you something, try to take it on face value, really, truly, and then ask questions to clarify. But my experience on this campus has been that people are not malicious, in general. So impute good motives. Don't just assume somebody is doing something for bad reasons. Also acknowledge each other. If you don't have the money in your budget to give a raise, or you're not in charge of that, how about just saying "thank you" to people, "I see all the work you're doing, and I sincerely appreciate it." That goes a huge way for people to be seen and understood,

and helps when you have no control over the money.

Does anybody have any questions? All right, well thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

D. Baker: Thank you, Sarah. And I think when we get to the Program Prioritization update, Provost Freeman will have some news on hiring that may affect some of that as well as maybe the training.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. Baker: There's no consent agenda. Let's go to the Unfinished Business, and I'm going to turn it over to Greg for the first two. Greg?

G. Long: Good afternoon. What we need to do, we've got two items of unfinished business but both are action items that require a vote. These are bylaw changes and so the first thing we need to do is determine how many members we have present, all right? So, if you've not done so already, please get a clicker. Give you a moment. All right, so now our first task is to identify how many people we have present. Hopefully, we will not have more than 58 votes because that's the total membership. So, if you would, press 1 or A if you are here. If you are not, don't. Sorry, it's been a long day. So press 1 to show that you're here, please. All right, as a start, we have 50 people. Oh that makes the math easier, that's nice. Okay. Now the other thing, we have a little bit of a cumbersome process to change the bylaws. On the other hand, it's a much, much better process than we had in years past. So quickly to review it, as written up here, we have to have 60% plus one of the membership present to vote on an amendment and we have that, because we have 58 total members, we have 50 people here, yeah, we've certainly exceeded that. And then, in terms of the vote, we have two options. It's the greater of either the majority of University Council, which in this case we would need 30 people or, when you get above, in this case, 45 people, the second part of it kicks in, which is two-thirds of attendance. So with 50 people present, we need two-thirds of 50, right? So are we good on that? Is everybody clear on how we're voting, right? Excellent.

A. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws, [Article 17.1](#), Athletic Board – Pages 17-20 SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

G. Long: Okay. So, now that we've done that, you've got the background on how we're looking at this, the first amendment is a proposal to make some updates to the Athletic Board. I don't see Matt Streb here. I need a motion to open this discussion. I need a motion. Therese Arado. I need a second. Sarah McHone-Chase. Any discussion on this? Matt's not here. I'll just do a quick summary of it. As you notice in the rationale, talks about that the policies haven't been reviewed really in ten years. They're making a few minor changes to bring things in line with what their current practice is. We had our first reading on this last month. As a body, we didn't really have any questions for Matt. I don't know if anything has come up since then, but do open it for any questions or discussion.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I have a questions. One of the things I read through all this and the only question I have is: When the procedures are being set up, you and I discussed this earlier, those procedures will

be reviewed by the, you're saying they will be reviewed by the University Council after they change their internal procedures, because right now you're taking out any of the controls from the higher level and putting it down onto the lower level.

G. Long: How are you seeing that we're changing.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well you're moving from a simple line, top line discussion. Then you're saying the general operating procedures are going to be in the committee, itself. That's why I was wondering. At least that's what it reads.

G. Long: Are you looking at, for example, 17.1.2.3 that says, "The specific responsibilities of the board are articulated in the board's policies and procedures manual."

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yes, it's going to be in the policies and procedures manual.

G. Long: Right. And the thing is that that's nothing, at this point, that's not part of the University Council. That's their document, that's their working document so we don't really have a say over that.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I'm saying that some of these items that we're taking out will be covered in their policies and procedures manual. Therefore, the oversight of that will be strictly within themselves.

G. Long: Okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: And that's the only question I have. I don't know if I'm objecting to it. I'm just asking: Are they going to be more in control of their policies and procedures?

G. Long: Yeah, I don't think there's really much of a change in function. My sense in talking to Matt and looking at this is they're really just operationalizing changes they've already, you know, that they're already doing. It's an update more than anything else.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I know, but the wording is in this part where we have to approve. Now you're moving it out of this part, that's what I'm saying. You're approving to take out most of the wording, essentially, in this section.

G. Long: Okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Okay, and that's so, I want people to realize, you know, these are little changes but they may be bigger changes than you think. I mean, I hope people, you know, all of us read through it to make sure they're comfortable with moving some of these procedures out of the UC.

G. Long: Okay.

D. Baker: So, if I could just comment on that. I think this was making it prescriptive and they want to be more, or less, type of these things. They may want to have different policies and procedures to

actually fulfill what it says in the part not scratched out. So I think they wanted the flexibility, as a committee that's been appointed to do what they need to do.

M. Haji-Sheikh: That's what I was saying. They're taking it out of oversight into their own committee, is what I'm saying. Because consider us as an oversight board.

D. Baker: They already have this oversight. They're just taking out the dictates here that maybe not allow them to get their job done. They want the flexibility to get the job done.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Thank you.

G. Long: Other comments, questions. Okay, seeing none, call a vote on this? If you, use our clickers again, if you support the proposed changes, if you support the motion, press 1. If you do not support it, press 2. And if you abstain, press 3.

P. Erickson: And we're having a little technical difficulty so could they wait for a moment.

G. Long: Yes, if you could wait for just a moment.

Unidentified: I think you're still taking the answers from the first ballot. Press the square.

P. Erickson: Oh, thank you. Thank you, everybody.

G. Long: Crowd source the computer work.

P. Erickson: Okay, there we go.

G. Long: All right, so back to the original. If you support this amendment, press 1. If you do not support it, press 2. If you abstain, press 3. So please go ahead and cast your vote. All right, we've got 50 responses?

P. Erickson: Yes.

G. Long: We need to have 34 people.

P. Erickson: 33.

G. Long: Well, 33.5, so

P. Erickson: 33.3?

G. Long: Oh, okay, I'll trust Pat. And it passed. All right, very good.

Yes – 38

No – 2

Abstain - 10

- B. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws, [Article 15.3.1.3\(B\)](#),
Academic Planning Council – Pages 21-22
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

G. Long: All right, so now we move on to the second item of business, which is a proposed amendment to Article 15.3.1.3(B), and it has to do with the membership of the Academic Planning Council. Carolinda Douglass is here if we have any questions on that as representing that council. We do need a motion to begin discussion on this.

S. Farrell: So moved.

G. Long: Okay, Sean Farrell. Second?

H. Nicholson: Second.

G. Long: Holly Nicholson, okay. Discussion. Oh, just as a quick reminder, what you note if you look at the rationale on page 21, basically the vice president for research and innovation partnerships is an ex officio member and the dean of the Graduate School is not. They used to be the same person. That's now been separated, and the dean of the Graduate School has not yet been officially added back to the committee. So this is just a clean-up from that standpoint. Is that accurate, Carolinda? Okay. Any discussion on this? Okay, seeing none, let's call the vote. Again, if you support this motion, press 1. If you do not support it, press 2. And if you abstain, press 3, please. So go ahead and cast your vote. There we go. All right, wow this is stunning. Even in the past, we've always had more people just abstain or say no, so nearly unanimous. This passed as well. So, with that, I will turn it back to President Baker.

Yes – 49

No – 0

Abstain - 1

D. Baker: Thank you, I think those are both good clean-ups.

- C. Program Prioritization update – Lisa Freeman, Provost

D. Baker: Next on the agenda is Item C, Program Prioritization update, and I know you've given those frequently and, Lisa, thanks for giving us the latest update.

L. Freeman: Good afternoon everybody. When I was at Faculty Senate last week, and I think the last time I was at University Council, I indicated that there are a lot of conversations going on behind the scenes, and one that concluded yesterday with the communication of the authorization for faculty searches was the one about how we link the results of Program Prioritization – and when I say that I mean both the recommendations that came out of the task forces, and the responses that were put forward in the action plan – to the hiring of tenured faculty. And, you know, Program

Prioritization from the get-go was a process that was really designed to align the budget with the university mission, and that really means making sure that our core mission of teaching and research and artistry and outreach and engagement is where we invest dollars. And so we developed academic hiring guidelines in collaboration with the colleges where the Program Prioritization outcomes were very much embedded in one of the criteria. And then the colleges were also able to consider other things that were inherent in Program Prioritization but that might have changed in the time since the narratives and data were originally collected, so things like academic excellence, enrollment, compliance, accreditation. The colleges submitted lists where they listed positions as high, medium, or low priority. Coming out of the academic colleges were requests for 124 searches. That was 103 new searches and 21 searches that they sought to continue because they were previously approved or they were recurring from last year or they were guaranteed because of the departure of a faculty member who didn't gain tenure. And I'm pleased to announce that, after conferring with the provost's staff, confirming some of the accreditation data, talking to Vice President Phillips and to President Baker about the importance of faculty to our programs and to the student experience, that we've authorized 59 faculty searches to be performed in fiscal '17 for hires in fiscal '18. That was communicated to the deans yesterday afternoon. I know many, but not all, of the deans have shared that with their senates and college councils, and I think that's a significant accomplishment coming out of the Program Prioritization process. And we'll continue to update you as more information and more evidence of the process continuing to be institutionalized becomes available. And with that, I'll stop and am happy to take questions.

D. Baker: Thank you, Lisa, for your work in analyzing all those and working with the deans. I know these are critical hires, and you've thought about them hard so I appreciate the prioritization work.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of [Proposed University Holidays for 2017](#) – Page 23 – **ACTION ITEM**

D. Baker: New Business, Approval of Proposed University Holidays – wow, let's do something fun! Page 23 is the proposed university holiday calendar for 2017. Would someone like to make a motion to approve holidays?

J. Love-Moore: So moved.

D. Baker: You're going out on a limb, aren't you! Who was next, Virginia?

V. Naples: I'll second it happily.

D. Baker: Any discussion? We don't want to fight about holidays?

G. Long: Could we ask for some clarification on like a floating holiday vs. an administrative holiday? Would you mind describing how that works, please?

L. Freeman: I didn't ask him to ask that, but enough people told me this might come up that I'm actually prepared to answer it. So, there is no usage of benefits associated with either holidays or

floating holidays or administrative closures. There is a separate type of closure called a scheduled closure where the university would provide extra time off beyond what's on this approved list and, in that case, there can be benefits usage mandated. But we have no plans to do that on the 2016, or 2017, schedule. In the past when that's been done, it's really been done at the request of employees because of just the way the calendar falls, when there's an odd day when it's assumed that no one will show up for work anyway. And that's not what the calendar looked like this year. So there's no use of vacation time or compensatory time for any of the days that are listed here, and we have no plans to institute a scheduled closure that would be associated with that type of benefit usage.

D. Baker: Other questions? Shall we vote? All those in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? All right, we didn't even need the clickers for that one.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

D. Baker: Let's go on to our reports. Reports From Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. The first is the FAC to the IBHE. Paul?

P. Stoddard: Thank you. We met Sept. 9 at Northeastern University – Northeastern Illinois University – not to be confused with the one in Boston where my niece is. We had a panel discussion with their provost, their president of the Faculty Senate, and their faculty union president, as well, discussing the effect of the budget on higher education in Illinois, and specifically at NEIU. That discussion went pretty much as you might imagine.

A couple of things that they mentioned that I thought were of interest: They are stressing the fact that 85 percent of their alumni still live in Illinois and are, therefore, making a positive impact on the state, its culture, its economy, and so forth. So I thought that was an interesting lobbying point to try to make with our legislators, as well.

They did have to resort to furloughs last year. They were able to keep sabbaticals and various awards and so forth, but the furloughs they feel have hurt faculty retention and recruitment, not surprising. Also, when we were discussing lobbying efforts and so forth, some representative from Northern kept mentioning how the students seem to get more of the legislators' ears than we, as faculty, do. But it was pointed out that the legislators don't always pay that much attention to the students either because students don't have a good record of voting. And somebody suggested that, whenever you talk to a legislator, you should always end the conversation with two words which are, "I vote." That seems to register with them more so. So just some things to consider when we talk about how we communicate with our friends in Springfield.

Other than that, the ongoing saga of the faculty seat on the IBHE continues. Marie Donovan, the chair of the FAC, had suggested a compromise whereby Mr. Bombanek would be appointed to the

governor's other open seat on the board and he would then take one of our recommendations. He decided that was not necessary, that he was perfectly happy with Mr. Bombanek as it was. And so the FAC has begun discussing pushing legislation to change how that seat is filled and to actually parallel the language that covers the students' representation on the IBHE. Students actually get two seats on the board and the governor does not get to appoint them. So we were talking about introducing something along those lines.

And finally, one of the ongoing concerns has been education for our veterans, and sometimes that presents unique challenges. There will be two faculty workshops – one February 7 at DePaul and one February 9 at ISU – on how to better serve veterans in higher education. Those are free workshops. If anybody is interested in participating in those, please let me know and I'll be happy to pass your name on to the FAC and see if we can't get involved with that as well.

D. Baker: Any questions for Paul? So it is true that about 85 percent of our alums are in the state, we've got what, oh I guess it's a little bit less than that. We've got about 140,000 that live in Chicagoland, so it's a significant number. And voting does matter. In terms of student representation, we do have, there's two students on the IBHE. One is in the room today. It's Stephanie Torres. Stephanie, would you introduce yourself and tell us a little bit about your background.

S. Torres: So I can see everyone in the face. My name is Stephanie Torres. I'm actually a transfer student from College of DuPage. During my time there, I was very involved. And I always thought of NIU as a choice coming from community college. During my time there, I sat on the Illinois Community College Board as a student representative, and now I currently sit on the Board of Higher Education, again as one of the two students. I'm the traditional student. There's a non-traditional student. Thank you for allowing me to address all of you. And just to let you know, we've talked about enrollment being down, and we're losing our students to Iowa and our neighboring states, Indiana. So I think it's important to understand that at NIU we are ambassadors. And we want to demonstrate that this is an option, and these are the resources that we can provide to these students. We should not be losing our students to our neighboring states. Thank you.

D. Baker: Thank you, Stephanie. Question.

C. Carlson: Has anything been said about community colleges granting four-year degrees?

P. Stoddard: I believe that's come up briefly, but we haven't had any real substantive discussions about that. The FAC might be a good place to do it since there is a large community college contingent on that board, as well as the four-year publics and the privates. So in discussing where that falls into the spectrum of higher education, that actually might be a good place. If you have specific concerns or things you would like to address, please forward those to me, and I'll be happy to try to get those on the agenda at a future meeting.

D. Baker: Thanks. Oh, Stephanie?

S. Torres: If I can provide some insight, at the Community College Board meeting, I think it was

one of the few last ones, there was a white paper being drafted by the President's Council in regards to baccalaureate degrees being offered, however, it was only for nursing students.

C. Carlson: Right.

D. Baker: It's kind of nice to have Stephanie here, isn't it. Great insights, thank you. Anybody else? All right, great. Thank you.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Cathy Doederlein, Greg Long, Holly Nicholson,
Rebecca Shortridge, Kendall Thu, Leanne VandeCreek

C. Academic Policy Committee – no report

D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – no report

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

1. NIU Bylaws [Article 17.4](#), University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees –
Page 24

D. Baker: The next report is from the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. Theresa?

T. Arado: Good afternoon, everyone. I just wanted to give an update on what the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee has been up to. After last meeting, I had mentioned the work we're doing in looking into how to make the information, the Constitution and Bylaws and everything, more accessible. To that end, we have been looking at the best practices for a policy library, so a place where all these things would be easily accessible by everybody. And the committee has been looking at some benchmark IPEDS institutions for comparisons to see what they have. The General Counsel's office is actually involved in developing policy management guidelines because, once we have a policy library, we definitely need to have guidelines on it. That's going to be reviewed by the RGE in the near future. There's also a meeting scheduled later this week to provide the university administration with an update on how things are going.

And then the other topic that's currently under review by the committee is the process by which the faculty are selected for the UAC to the Board of Trustees. That was a question brought up at the last meeting. The current process is set out in the NIU bylaws, and that process was followed this year, in previous years, in appointing the faculty members. But the committee understands that, in selecting the faculty member part of that committee, because the other three are the heads of certain organizations or bodies, that this is something that we could look at with an eye toward faculty input in selecting the faculty members who will serve on the committee. So we are in the process of looking at that and seeing what could be done to make that part of the appointment for the UAC to the BOT involve more faculty input in making that decision. And so I will get back to you later this year on that. But it is something we talked about and understand that concern and are going to look into to see how the process can be improved.

I don't know if I can answer questions, but I'm happy to try.

D. Baker: Great. Thanks. Thanks for your work on the policy library. It would be nice to have one place for us to all go with.

T. Arado: That's the idea.

D. Baker: Real searchable library. All right, great, good work.

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

G. Student Association – Giuseppe LaGioia, President – report

D. Baker: Next is the Student Association. Giuseppe, do you want to start us?

G. LaGioia: Hello everyone. I'm sorry I couldn't come to the last meeting. I had an exam during this time. But my name is Giuseppe LaGioia. I'm the Student Association president. Just kind of a little bit of an update on what the Student Association has been doing. We just finished our anti-hazing week a couple of weeks ago. We had a few different programs and speakers going on, so that was really a good turn-out for things.

Kind of some things coming up: We've been talking to the City of DeKalb on various committees and things like that, trying to get students a little bit more engaged with the city. They're actually meeting tonight at 5:00 kind of regarding the finances, how everything's going to go down. So I'll keep you guys in the loop on that, with students giving their perspective on what they'd like to see in the city. They've been reaching out to me, and I've been working with them for quite a while on this, so the ball is starting to get rolling on that.

The Student Association has also been working on issues regarding diversity. We've been meeting with Dr. Vernese Edghill-Walden pretty often on some of the issues regarding on-campus and addressing those and promoting diversity as much as we can. I'm sure you're all aware of the freedom of speech policy. A little bit on that: It's just allowing campus to be a little bit more open of an area where you can express your views and opinions and be safe about it as well.

Another thing that I've been doing is I've been working pretty closely with Huskie Athletics, trying to get students to come to a little bit more events. Some more on that to come. That's pretty much all I've got.

D. Baker: Great. And, Christine, are you going to have a report too?

C. Wang: I do have a lot to report on, actually. Since our last meeting, the senate has actually been in session. Thanks to the special election, we finally do have quorum. We do have about 29 senators now, which is wonderful. But I do want to also thank Dr. Baker and Dr. Weldy for coming out and also serving as one of the workshop speakers for the senate when they were introduced. We have a

group of very new senators this year, really great group of kids, and I'm really, really excited to see what's going on this year.

In regards to what we have been doing, actually this past Sunday we passed a resolution to support the human diversity baccalaureate requirement. Dr. Vernese Edghill-Walden actually came and spoke to us about it, and we decided to also pass a resolution to support that, show support from the Student Association, as well.

Other things that we've been working on – we've been setting up meetings with Rep. Pritchard. I actually have a meeting with him, I think next week, to talk about the budget crisis, what he plans to do, what is going to happen after the election, all sorts of things like that. We also have an event called Pizza With Pritchard, which will be taking place on October 24. I believe Rep. Demmer is also invited so, basically what they're going to do is, they're going to have frank discussions with students to talk about what it's like to be a representative, any kind of issues that they might have with the Illinois representatives, which I think they might have a couple.

We also are putting a couple things into place right now, these are some very rough plans. But right now we are thinking about holding a rally sometime in the first [week] of November to support the budget and to basically urge representatives to pass and support a budget and support higher education. We have focused a lot on MAP grants but, at this point, we also need to focus on the entire budget. We are bleeding out, as we all know. It's going to take more than just a band-aid to fix us now. So that's essentially what we've been doing state-wide.

There's also a city tour that I'm giving personally to City of DeKalb administrators, which will be really fun, I think.

I also just want to add on that Stephanie Torres is actually a senator, which is wonderful. I'm glad to have her on. She's also serving as our legislative director. So she did give me a couple things to say. She served on IBHE SAC and attended that on Sept. 27. You're free to jump in and say anything if you want. But essentially, there's a tuition-free Illinois campaign on October 7 at UIC, which was put up by Will Guzzardi, who is a representative. And then there's also a MAP grant postcard campaign that is being launched, as well, where students can write to the legislators and urge them to support higher education and MAP grants. So, if there's anything else you'd like to add, I turn it over to you. Otherwise, that's it for my report.

D. Baker: Anything else, Stephanie?

S. Torres: We're good. Are there any questions?

C. Wang: Are there any questions for us?

B. Hoffman: I'm just wondering if you're involved in voter registration campaigns for students?

C. Wang: Yes.

G. LaGioia: The director of governmental affairs, his name is Caleb, he's been doing some different voter registration events. I know he had two within the last semester so far, and there should be more to come. So definitely be on the look-out for those. We have them posted on our Facebook page, as well.

D. Baker: Other questions? Well, thanks to the executive and legislative branches of the student government. I appreciate your work. Those are all positive steps forward. Thank you. Have fun with your pizza party.

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

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Cathy Doederlein, President – no report

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: I think that concludes, we don't have Operating or Supportive Professional Staff reports today, do we? Okay, very good. Well, the next item then is comments from the floor. Are there any comments from the floor?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion to go outside into the nice weather. Do I have a motion?

G. LaGioia: Motion, so moved.

Unidentified: Second.

D. Baker: All in favor.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Adios, thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:11 p.m.