

2-1-2017

UC Transcript 2017-02-01

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2017-02-01" (2017). *University Council Archives*. 15.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/15>

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, February 1, 2017, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Baker, Bishop, Block, Bond, Boughton, Briscoe, Carlson, Chakraborty, Chitwood, Chung, Collins, Dannenmaier, Demir, Doederlein, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Freeman, Ghrayeb, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hathaway, Johnson, Kassel, Khoury, Krmeneč, Long, Macdonald, McCord, McHone-Chase, Mogren, Naples, Newman, Olson, Pavkov, Penrod, Rajagopalan, Reynolds, Riley, Russell, Saborío, Scherer, Shin, Staikidis, Tan, Thu, VanderSchee, Wang, Wielert (for Nicholson), Wyzard, Zaucha

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Alarcon, Cibrian, Kreis, LaGioia, Nicholson, Torres, Williams, Wilson

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Coryell, Edghill-Walden, Falkoff, Klaper, Phillips, Pinkelton, Stang, Stoddard

OTHERS ABSENT: Hoffman, Johns, Kaplan

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Good afternoon. Shall we get going. Just as a reminder, if you didn't pick up a clicker and you're due a clicker, go ahead and grab it, because we'll have an amendment today. And while you're grabbing your clickers, one other reminder: To make our captioner's life easier, remember to say your name when you start talking and do one at a time so she can do the captioning more easily, and use the mic. All right here we go. So call to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: Do I have a motion to adopt the agenda? **Arado.** And who was the second? **Doederlein** was the second. Any additions or deletions? Hearing none, all in favor, please say Aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? It passes.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 30, 2016 MEETING

D. Baker: Next is approval of the minutes of the November 30, 2016 meeting. Do I have a motion? **Arado.** Collins is the second, very good. Any edits, additions? All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? The minutes are approved.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: President's announcements. I've got quite a few. It's been a busy few weeks, so let's start. First we have three new board members appointed since we were last here, and one existing board member reappointed. So just briefly, I'll say a few words about them.

The first is a name familiar to us, Dennis Barsema. He and his wife, Stacey, of course, have been particularly big donors to the university with the Barsema School of Business and the Alumni Center. As you probably know, his background was in the high-tech industry. He was the president and CEO of Redback Networks and led that company through large growth and an IPO and was very successful at that. And had 30 years' experience in telecommunications software and optical networking. As you probably know, after that financial success, he decided to try and, as he says, live a meaningful life, once he'd lived a financially successful life. So he's volunteered and taught in our social entrepreneurship program in the College of Business in the last few years and has helped get that on its feet, and has taken students overseas to do social entrepreneurship and micro-financing, very popular programs.

Dennis, of course, is a graduate of NIU as is Eric Wasowicz. Eric also was an entrepreneur and founder of Greenbrier and Russell. That company was very successful and ultimately sold to Fujitsu in 2006. And he too became an instructor in the College of Business and has done a great job there. He graduate from Northern in 1980 and was the university's Distinguished Young Alum in 1999 and is the past chair of the Windy City Chapter of Young Presidents Organization and a current member of the World Presidents Organization. So we've got two experienced and successful business people who also understand the academy and NIU, so I think we're lucky to have them.

The third person is Veronica Herrero. She's the chief program officer for One Million Degrees. Has anybody worked for that organization? So they work to get students through community colleges and particularly students from disadvantaged backgrounds. And so she comes to us with a great deal of strength on inclusion, diversity and access, and student success. She's been the director of 6to16 with the University of Chicago Urban Education Institute and was the deputy officer of student support and engagement at Chicago Public Schools. And she holds a bachelor's degree from Wisconsin and a masters degree from the University of Chicago.

So I think we've got three people that understand the academy and also understand Illinois and what we're trying to do at the university. So I think those are going to turn out to be great additions.

And then Tim Struthers was the fourth trustee. He was filling a partial term of someone who had resigned, Tony Iasco. So he'd been in a year-and-a-half, and now he's been reappointed. For those of you who don't know Tim, he's the president of First National Bank here in town, long-time community member and supporter in the community.

So I think we did well by those trustees.

R. Scherer: Just a question. I'm just curious whether it's known what other candidates were under consideration and whether there was any consideration of community members from outside of the business world.

D. Baker: So, this was done by the Governor's Office.

R. Scherer: No, I understand.

D. Baker: And I don't know who they considered, frankly.

R. Scherer: Yeah, so I was asking if there were others considered. I understand that it would be the Governor's Office.

D. Baker: Yeah, I don't know.

R. Scherer: Thanks.

D. Baker: Any other questions. Okay. Second item, budget. Last week Mike Mann, our legislative liaison and I spent a day in Springfield, met with legislators. It's interesting, the log jam that's been stuck is still stuck, but it's creaking. I've said that before, but you could kind of feel it creaking. There were legislators trying to pull together support for higher ed in particular, not just us. The senate has a suite of bills on both revenue and expense reduction that would be the master grand plan to get us out of the log jam and move everything forward. The plan appears to be to pass those and send them over to the house. They're working through those issues now. There was talk about trying to get that done in the lame duck session, which was two days long, and too short to get anything done, but at least they got it on the table. It has some bipartisan support. Senator Radogno has partnered with Senator Cullerton, Radogno being the minority leader, to help frame this. So at least there's something to look at. There's something to play with, and I think that's good. Another good sign, I sensed, was the governor and the speaker have not come out and bashed the plan. They've both tempered their words, and so there's some hope there that people want to get something done here. My sense is that the rank and file members in both houses want to get something done, and they're just trying to figure out how to get there.

Now you probably saw that Lisa Madison sought some injunctive relief, and my sense is it's fairly complicated, and the general public doesn't really understand what she did and where we're going with that. So I asked our general counsel to write up essentially what the steps are, what's actually been done and what we expect. So let me read you a few excerpts from our general counsel's office.

So Attorney General Lisa Madigan filed a petition of the people of the state of Illinois for leave to intervene, and it was filed last week. And the motion that Capitol Fax and the Trib are reporting on was just an attachment to the position. So they didn't have kind of a full story. So General Counsel says: In a nutshell, the attorney general is asking the court to become an additional defendant on behalf of the people of the state of Illinois in the ACSME AFL/CIO Council 31 et al versus Rauner et al, which is being heard in St. Clair County, which is Belleville, Illinois. This is the case wherein the judge previously entered a preliminary injunction that required the Illinois Comptroller to authorize payment of all state employees' full wages, even though the state had failed to enact

appropriations legislation that supported the wage payments. And that case is pending. And the attorney general is now asking the court to add the people of Illinois as an additional defendant.

So the judge in the case has to do a couple things. First the judge needs to make a decision on the petition, whether to add. And if the petition is granted, then the people of Illinois will be added to the case as an additional defendant, and the attorney general will be authorized to file the motion. And it's unclear how quickly the court will take up that petition. So this motion's not before the court, and that motion would stop payment to employees in the state. So this is kind of the stick of dynamite into the log jam – that if we quit paying the state's employees, then those portions of government that are paid out of that would not be paid and would cease. So that's kind of – remember the sequester that the federal government did, shut down federal government? This is the analog in the state government that would be to really force the question: You've got to get a budget done.

So if filed, the motion will ask the court to dissolve the current preliminary injunction, which requires the comptroller to pay state employee wages, even though there are not appropriations that support the pay. But the attorney general will ask the court to terminate the injunction as of February 28 of this year, giving the general assembly and the governor additional time to enact appropriations legislation before the injunction. So even if this motion is granted by the court, and that's not a given, the state employee pay would not stop until February 28.

Now I sent out a note a few days ago that said that wouldn't affect us, because we're being paid out of different revenue. So we're okay, but other state employees are going to have an issue. So we're going to continue to monitor this and see where it's going. It's kind of complicated, but it's going to force a political question, I think. And that may be the stick of dynamite in the log jam that gets us moving forward.

So any questions on that? Was that clear from your reading of it in the newspapers and stuff? Did you already kind of have that? Not really? Kind of sort of? Okay, well there it is.

There is a budget rally February 8 in Springfield. The provost and I will be going down. Mike Mann and I think some students, are headed down. I saw a note today that the Annuitants Association is taking folks down as well. There will be people from public and private organization down there to support higher education. The privates, of course, are interested in MAP funding, and that's dramatically impacting many of them. So we'll see two-years, four-years, public and private down there. It should be a good day.

Next item, if our state issues weren't enough, we've got federal issues too. So we've probably all watched a lot of TV and read a lot of stuff on the web about the executive order on international travel. And Brad Bond is here somewhere, there he is in the back. So the executive order has caused a lot of questions and concerns, obviously, in higher education. The university, of course, embraces diversity in all of its forms and embraces our students, regardless of where their country of origin is, and we welcome talented faculty, staff and students from around the world. So that isn't changing. Students don't need to worry about their documentation status. We welcome everyone. We've got great resources with the International Affairs Office as well as the campus cultural centers. In specific, the countries affected here are Syria, Iran, Iraq, Somalia, Libya, Sudan and Yemen. And,

Brad, do you want to give us any updates on the impact it's having and how International Programs is dealing with it.

B. Bond: I forgot what you asked me to talk about, now. You asked about the impact. Over the weekend, the International Student Faculty Office sent a message to all international students, hopefully an encouraging message, a message that invited them to bring any questions they might have to that office, particularly about their status, concerns with their visa. That message, as I say, went out to all international students. We do not have any students who are stranded trying to re-enter. We do not, to our knowledge, have any faculty who are stranded trying to re-enter. We have 20 students on a J or F visa who are from the seven named countries. There are an additional 22, I believe, who are permanent residents, also from those seven countries. We have a couple faculty or staff who are permanent residents from those seven countries. I just came back from – some of you may have heard Stephanie Brown from International Student Faculty Office on local public radio, I think it was yesterday. I did not have a chance to catch it, but when I left the office, she was going through another interview with another radio station. So I'm sure that will be on soon.

We've been fielding a lot of questions from some of you, from the departments, some from students. The students have been asking mostly very technical questions about what they can do, what they should do. But there haven't been that many student questions. We've had probably more questions from you all about how to talk to students than we have from actual students. You're welcome to call, talk; we'll be happy to help you through it.

D. Baker: Any questions for Brad? Well, Brad, I appreciate the International Office and the way you've reached out to the students, faculty and staff. If you have any questions on these issues as they emerge – it's been kind of confusing with the executive order and its implementation – I think that office can provide a lot of the answers that you need. And if not, they'll help us figure out where to get the answers. Okay, thanks.

So a related question that existed prior to that is: What's going to happen with our undocumented students. And prior to the holidays, we met with the DREAM Action Committee that faculty, staff and students are working on DACA issues. And we have been working on policies and support systems. And Vernese has been helping to lead that effort. Vernese, can you give us an update on where we are with that?

V. Edghill-Walden: Thank you. So as Dr. Baker said, we have been meeting with students from December until present. We've been working with students and the centers almost daily. I'm trying to understand what additional concerns the students have had. And also working with campus police to ensure our students and our community that the campus police are not going to be in collaboration with ICE, the immigration office, to deport based on immigration status. That has been a huge concern for our students, and part of their request in the petition was that we alleviate the fears of many of our students that felt like they were going to be deported just based on the fact that they were here in school. I will say that the students have always said to us in these conversations that they see NIU and its faculty and staff as a supportive environment, as a place where they feel like they can be successful. But they wanted to go one step further and look at ways that we can do more education around undocumented students, undocumented student issues, provide the additional supports for them as well as expand training. So the responses that you'll see

in the petition were responses that we developed based on ongoing conversations that we've had with DREAM Action, faculty and staff, who have been very concerned about what has been going on in terms of immigration. So we continue to work with them, continue to provide the support, continue to look for funding to help with tuition, and continue to utilize our undocumented student web page in order to attract perspective students who are still could be very interested in attending NIU.

D. Baker: Great. Any specific questions on that? I appreciate the DREAM Action Committee reaching out to us earlier in the fall and appreciate everybody's work that's gone into it, the analysis. There was one specific question about sanctuary campus – have you heard that term? So we've investigated that term and it turns out it doesn't really have any meaning in the law. It was, I think, a reaction, we should make campuses sanctuaries. So what we did was investigate what can campuses legally do. How do we protect our undocumented students and help them to be successful? And those are the things that we've worked with DREAM Action on to identify in that attachment that I sent out in the note a few days ago. So if you want to see that specific set of issues, it was NIU to support students with undocumented citizenship. It came out about two days ago, 1-30-17. If you have any questions, please let us know on that. I think our students are feeling as good as they can feel right now, given what's going on in Washington, DC, but they do feel supported by the university, and we're proud to have them.

Okay, next item. Earlier today we sent out an email – and we is Greg Long, Lisa Freeman and me – sent out a note on questions some people had about using email in this interesting political environment, and what can you use NIU email for relative to political activity. So last year this question came up, and Greg sent you all a note kind of detailing what you can do around political activity. So we added that as an attachment to the note that went out today. And then we followed up with an additional one.

First let me say, we support freedom of expression, and there's broad latitude to speak ??? and challenge research, teach, that's what we do here. But we also have to do it within the state statutory limitations. And so this was to kind of to lay out what's okay and what's not okay under state statutes. So just drawing on the note that went out, you have the first amendment right to advocate for or against any local, state, federal actions. That's your first amendment right. And you can do all that you want on private time. The question is: How much can you do on university time, using university resources? And the answer is you can de minimis kind of work. So if you want to sign a petition online, that de minimis if you spent a few seconds doing that, it's not a big deal. If you start doing a lot of it, then it gets out of the de minimis realm and then you're vulnerable under the ethics statutes. So we sent this note out trying to say, you know, you're safer if you're doing it on your own time with your own computers. If you're doing de minimis stuff at work time, you know, you're at lunch or you're taking a break and you sign a petition online or something, okay. But it needs to be kept at a de minimis level. So we had Jim Guagliardo, our university ethics officer, draw up that, and that was the other attachment in that note. So any questions about Greg's note or Jim's note? Nope? Okay.

Oh, speaking of email, evidently, spam email went out with my name. Did anybody get that today? Yeah, I didn't open it so I don't know what's in it. Does anything happen if you open it? You become president? Excellent. So we sent that to abuse@niu.edu. So if you do get a phish or a spam

or something and you want to let the university know that's floating around, forward it to abuse@niu.edu, and then they'll take care of it. So I don't know what it was. It probably didn't do anything good to your computer, so be careful about that stuff. The other email from us was okay.

B. Coryell: Before we leave that topic.

D. Baker: Oh yes, our vice president for IT.

B. Coryell: So let me just say that any CIO who sat here and watched a whole room full of people say, no I didn't open that phishing email or click on the attachment when you opened it up, would just have a warm glow in his heart, and I certainly do. So thank you all for being excellent protectors of your own identity and our NIU data.

D. Baker: By the way, Brett, are there some hints that when we get something that looks phishy? What are a couple hints about that.

B. Coryell: So there are, I guess, and some of them are easier to show than to tell. But I guess if there were just two things that I could say: One is, if you weren't expecting it, then don't click on it until you just think about that or check it out a little bit. That's the first one, especially with things like: Hey, you have a UPS package waiting or a FedEx delivery waiting for you. That's a very common one and it's trapped a lot of people, not just in general, but here at our university. So if you just weren't expecting that, don't let that busyness lead you into clicking on things. That's the first one.

The second one is – and in this email it was very obvious – it said it was from [president@niu](mailto:president@niu.edu), and then right next to that it said, so-and-so@usc.edu. So what this really is is that someone at USC who had their account compromised by a bad guy who's now sending out phishing emails so he can grab your identity and use that for various purposes. So just check to see, hover over a link and see whether it pops up and says niu.edu, look at that email address, not just the name, but the address. If it says niu.edu, you're good. If it doesn't say what you think it should say, send it to abuse. There's two easy, fast things.

D. Baker: Kendall.

K. Thu: And Brett, I've also been advised that we should all, not only delete the email, but then delete everything in our recycle bin, or our garbage bin. Is that correct?

B. Coryell: That's fine to do. I wouldn't say that it's necessary to protect your computer. As long as you don't open the attachment and click on the thing that's inside of it, then you're probably okay. If you just delete it, you're fine.

D. Baker: Okay, thanks. All right, the last thing in the presidential announcements as I call it up here, I just got the spring term tenth day enrollment numbers. So Monday was the tenth day, and they've been working on the data yesterday and today. So to remind you, this fall we were down 5.5 percent, which was the best among the regionals, but still down 5.5 percent, a significant drop. And so when you're down in the fall, you'll be down in the spring too, right? So that just carries in – and

that's what's happened. We didn't have additional drops. That drop we saw in the fall, 5.5, is the same one we're down in the spring. So comparing this spring to last spring, we're down 5.5 percent. Good news, we did add 806 students for this term, freshmen, transfers and law students. So that's good. And our transfers were up 14.6 percent, so I think part of that is we're out working. We're working harder in the community colleges to get the transfers to come, and we've got more recruiters directly focused on community colleges. And I know many of the faculty are reaching out to their colleagues at other campuses and community colleges to work on transitions and guided pathways and whatnot. So I'm excited about that as a potential growth opportunity for us.

And that, I think, you know, showing that kind of growth in the spring with all the budget uncertainties in the state and the uncertainties about MAP funding, are positive signs for us. So we are really working hard on trying to get what the enrollment professionals call yield rate up. So that means from becoming a prospect, somebody who kind of looks at us, to being an applicant, to actually signing up for classes, to actually showing up. We're trying to increase the percentage of people as they come to finally be with us. And there are a lot of things that we all can do along that regard. So alumni have stepped up, and they are starting to call applicants or admitted students to the university to say, hey I was in music, and I've got this great career going. You ought to come to our music department. Or education or whatever. That's great. Some of us in this room will be asked to make telephone calls to students who are confirmed.

Retention is another huge piece for us. So our retention has been going up for the last three years. We need to continue to do that. It looks like from fall to spring we may be up a little bit again. So the stuff that we started working on three years ago is getting some traction. We need to stay with that. We need to stay with it so our students can stay here and be successful, and then go on to live successful lives and careers. So anything you can do in those regards to help students succeed, excellent.

You know one that we often don't think about as a yield rate or increasing the percentage of people to come is orientation. It looks like in the past students would go to one orientation. I know I'm going to NIU, that's the only place I'm going to orientation. They shop orientations now. They go to multiple schools. I don't know if any of you have kids and you've been to multiple orientations. You kind of get a feel for the vibe of the school. Orientation makes a big difference. So if you're involved in any of those or if you see people wandering around during orientation or your department's asked you to do something, I encourage you to really take that one on and see what you can do. It makes a difference, you know, to put our best foot forward and really show them what a great institution we've got.

So my thanks to all of you who are working on that. We've shown good progress in a number of areas. We've got a lot to do to turn this around, given the challenges of the state, but we're making positive trends. So thanks for everybody working on that.

Okay, that's that long report.

- A. [NIU Print Project](#)
Brett Coryell, Chief Information Officer
[Revised Master Schedule](#)
[DoIT response to phishing email](#)

D. Baker: Let's move on. We've got unfinished business, and I'll turn it over to...oh, we've got Brett. I'm sorry, I jumped right over Brett. Have you been working on printers?

B. Coryell: A little bit.

D. Baker: Okay, give us an update.

B. Coryell: That's a fine idea, sir. Hello everybody, and I suspect that many of you have seen the presentation on printers that I've done recently at any of the various governance committees. I've been at several of them over the last six weeks, and instead of showing you the same presentation over again, I thought I would change things up just a little bit and instead I'm going to recap just a couple of the slides from the original presentation, but then I'd really like to talk to you today about some of the progress that's been made and especially how shared governance and conversations with the Council of Deans has helped shape and influence the direction of the project. I think you'll be pleased to see some of the advice and feedback that we've taken. Maybe more still to do, and so I'm open for that additional feedback, let's talk about that at the end.

The project began a couple of years ago with this business case, and at that time, as many of you may have heard say already, the intent was to slowly go around campus office-by-office over a period of time and explain to each office individually what the benefits of shared printing would be, why you might want to move to that, let them make a decision, and just crawl across campus at an organic pace, however fast each office wanted to move in. That's the course we were on for about a year. We did several early adopter groups, which were primarily among the cabinet. So provost's office, president's office, my whole division went, various other stakeholders. And that was going along fine, but then last summer, of course, the later iteration at that time of our state's financial crisis had the cabinet back in looking for cost savings ideas. And one of the ideas that we put forward, that my division put forward, was to say that, if we accelerate the print project, we can realize the savings we expect to eventually get and realize those savings sooner. And after some discussion, we made that decision to do that, and around September of 2016, my division went in to a re-planning phase to see if we could take what was about two years of remaining work and figure out how to get that done in a couple of months. In December we started doing our first early adopter under the new pace. We've installed a few dozen printers over the course of January, but the real bulk of the work really starts next week and will go through about the end of March. We may have a few stragglers leftover. Because the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is so big, they are just now getting their printer exceptions finalized, and then they will be placed last on the schedule. So if there's any slippage, it will probably mostly be CLAS that's going past the end of March.

My hopes for the project were to offer the campus a way that we could print cheaper, faster, with higher quality to maintain security and privacy, to be able to print from anywhere and to pick it up anywhere that you wanted to, any of 400 different locations, anywhere printers all over campus. The hope was also to include free scanning, free paper, free faxing if we still have to do that, and to

not let the network connection cost to be a barrier because I know that that has been a barrier to some departments in the past. I think all of these things have been achieved. So whatever other detriments there may be, or concerns there may be about the project, the solution that we've come up with and the printers that we're rolling out, do meet all of these goals. And if we can convert half of the printing on campus from individual printers to shared printers, there's a good reason to think that that's worth half a million dollars a year. So far, based on the exceptions that the deans and the vice presidents have granted, we're getting easily more than 50 percent uptake. Before the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences' exceptions come in, the number is running at 15 percent exceptions based on the choices that your areas have made. So I expect to fully realize all of that savings.

Here are things that we've been able to say yes to. I think these are positive changes that the influence of shared governance and the deans and the various other committees that I've talked to have had on the project since its initial inception. The exception policy has been formalized, and it is broad and liberally applied. We have several hundred exceptions that are already approved, and I expect many more to come in from Liberal Arts and Sciences. I hope that's good and welcomed.

Many areas have requested printer locations that are different than the ones that we had suggested. And so your local IT person has worked with your managers or your chairs or your deans to validate those printer locations. And even after turning in changes, we've had changes to the changes. And again, we're able to accommodate all of those, though at this point, if anybody wants a change in the location of where we're going to place a printer, that may end up bumping you back in the schedule because we have so many gears already moving, we have so many printers already in motion right now that I'm willing to take the changes, but that may affect the schedule for you. For some of you, that may be just fine. And if that's the case, just work through your local IT person. Even moving the printer, just a couple of yards, involves no less than three work teams to go out and check the network connection, have physical facilities validate power in the area, to work with the vendor about the location where they drop those printers off. So there are just logistics, and your local IT person is your point of contact with us for that.

We are reconsidering our stance on student employee printing. The campus was split, and I can't make it both ways. We either grant student employees the ability to print against their departmental account or no student employee gets that ability right now. I'll be able to be more flexible about that in the future. The original decision was to allow all students the choice to print. But we're reconsidering that beginning this week for a possible change in implementation so that no student employees are able to print. Instead that possible implementation would take effect in the new beginning of the new fiscal year. The governance process has gotten us to reconsider that stance, and there may be a change. I've heard very vocally from the people who don't like the way it is now. I wonder if I'll hear vocally from people who like the way it is now, once we change it. But that's the method that we're going to go through. We're going to try to get some info on that. Kendall, do you want to jump in?

K. Thu: Does that include graduate assistants?

B. Coryell: Yes it does.

K. Thu: Okay.

B. Coryell: Some people who have said that they're going to bring their own printer in have recognized that, if they do that, they may be working on a machine where they don't have administrative privileges and, therefore, wouldn't be able to install the printer driver on their machine. And so I've worked with the local IT directors all over campus for each individual support group to ask them to allow a temporary removal of administrator privileges to allow people to add their printer drivers if you want to self-install, and to periodically allow you to have that administrative access again so you can keep the printer drivers updated, because I think that's been a positive for anybody who's planning to go down that road.

We have extra paper and delivery options. I hadn't originally considered the affected grant-funded printers or the fact that there even would be grant-funded printers, and that came to light through the shared governance process. Grant-funded printers are automatically an exception, though, Research and Innovation Partnerships asks that you contact them if you have a grant-funded printer so they can validate or track that in some way. That I think has been positive. It was a mere oversight on my part, and the shared governance process has brought that to light.

Finally, reporting detail improvements. You are able to see, or your business offices are able to see, on the regular monthly period detail report, every print job, how many pages and what the cost is and which ID it's associated with so that you can track your own printing. You can answer any questions about why it costs so much.

There are cases that we have to be careful about privacy concerns. There are cases where, whether for employees or students, of course, we have the data about what the name of the file is that you printed, but we do not provide that by default on the accounting report. I think in many cases, there needs to be a reason to go look at the name of the file that you print. There's a reasonable expectation of academic freedom and personal privacy, but that data is there if there are valid cases. And all of that has come to light through the shared governance process.

Here are things that we can't do yet. As I just said, I can't really differentiate between student printing preferences such that some departments allow students to print against their departmental account, and some do not. We're hoping to work with the vendor to have better options for that in the next version of the software. But it's just not something that I can do technologically right now. We can't really use PIN codes to print. That's something we've been asked to do. We have a broken business process right now with what happens to student information after they leave a job. So, say a student has a job in the Department of Chemistry. That chemistry department code is associated with them for payroll purposes primarily when they're in the job. When they leave the job, there's no process at the university that removes that association. And that's not an issue until the print project. It was just something that – it was untidy, it should be disassociated with you, but no business process relied on whether it was there or not. Now that student tries to print against that department code when they're no longer employed there, that fails, the print job works, and I lose money. So I think for all the failures that there are, it's broken in a way that does no harm to the departments, but it's something that we're working to fix. We just got an answer for that this morning. I'm going to clean that up on the back end. It should not affect any of you. But it's just this printing project exposes a lot of different items, and I wanted to be transparent about everything that's working and everything that's not working.

I can't yet predict the March schedule with much accuracy. We've just gotten to the place where we feel pretty solid about February. I hope by next week, I'll be able to give a first view into March that I feel pretty solid on, and I'm communicating with the deans on a regular basis, especially so that the faculty will know when we'll be in that building. So they will get weekly updates on the schedule. If this committee would like those updates as well, I'm happy to share with anybody who wants them.

We can't adjust to changes very well right now. There are about 40 people involved in the project and, when we have last minute changes, that's just rough on us because of the number of moving parts, and I mentioned that earlier. I'm happy to accommodate changes, I just won't be able to do that in real time with you. Even if we have a printer and you just want to say slide it down to the next outlet, that may just push us back until the end of the project. It's possible that that could happen, and I want people to be aware of the complexity of the project and the pace with which we're moving, it just doesn't allow me to deviate very well, but not because of a lack of will, it's a lack of ability – skill I guess.

And the last thing is I can't provide the real time cost savings for people. The early adopters that we did – president's office, provost's office, at that time Dr. Weldy's office, my division – we've calculated the cost savings for moving from individual printers to shared printers, and those have been substantial in many cases. But again, moving through and installing several dozen printers every week in ten or 20 buildings every week for the next six weeks, I'm not going to be able to do that immediately, but it is my intent to come back and audit the project to make sure that we're actually realizing the cost savings that we anticipated in the beginning. And I'll report back to this committee around the end of the fiscal year, I think, to let you know that it's done and what the results are, or that I'm not quite done yet and when I will have those to present back to you.

Next steps. I said in some of the governance committees that I would do the things on the left. I think those are mostly done. The things on the right are what I'd like to ask from all of you. Share what you've heard today. I still get misconceptions about printing that come back (I have to walk to another building to pick up my print job. DoIT will steal or deactivate your printer). None of these things are true. When you hear kind of the intent or the information, please share it with your departments, with your colleagues. And if you have any questions, communicate those questions or problems back to me, and I'll get you the right information. And maybe we can change the course of the project if it's something that is going to be a benefit for everybody. Work with your local IT people where you need changes, please. And then finally, spot good exceptions. There are still some areas out there that haven't finalized their exceptions. We have a liberal exception policy. I don't mind having exceptions at all so look for them. Find good ones and grant them wherever you think you need them. And that's all I have. No questions at all? Okay, thank you then.

D. Baker: Thanks, Brett. I think we've been doing – we've had this central printer in my office for quite a few months, and I think we're averaging about \$1100 a month on savings. So it's worked well for us. I've also found we print less than we used to. The cost per page is less and we print less.

B. Coryell: If I remember, the results from the president's office are about a two-thirds decrease in total cost. And then across campus and across the industry, we find that as soon as the printer isn't

within reach and free, printing does go down by about 30 percent.

D. Baker: It may work well with our green initiatives too. How much paper do we use a year?

B. Coryell: The last good estimate that we did was at the end of 2015, the beginning of 2016. And we print 24 million pages a year, which is 3,000 trees worth.

D. Baker: Depending on the tree.

B. Coryell: Average trees.

C. Carlson: How much is our contract with this outside vendor?

B. Coryell: that is a great and fair question that I don't know the answer to. So I will find that out and probably will have an answer by the end of the meeting, but I won't disrupt the rest of it. I'll just send it to Pat and she can include it in the notes.

D. Baker: That was Cathy.

C. Carlson: Yes. Cathy Carlson.

D. Baker: Thanks, Cathy. Any others?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Hi Brett. This is Mike. How many bidders were there on this when the initial bids went out?

B. Coryell: I don't know for sure because the contract is several years old and pre-dates me. I believe the answer was that there were two and that Xerox may have declined to bid. But I will find that answer and I will send it to Pat.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Because I was surprised, because HP has a big anywhere print, Samsung has a big anywhere print, Epson has a big anywhere print. I don't see – when only two bid, I wonder what the parameters were.

B. Coryell: Yes, again, that pre-dates me. I apologize for not being up on that, but I know that the College of Engineering has a very favorable contract with HP for black and white printing only. And that's something that one of my directors is looking at to see whether that can be an evolution of our contract. The first thing we would do with any large contract is to centralize the printing into a number of printers anyway. So this phase we're going through, that would be part of a campus-wide HP contract if they were to be the next winner of the bid. When we rebid that – it's not due to be re-bid – I think it's one of those deals where we have ten successive one-year contracts that auto renew. So Dr. Phillips says that that is, indeed, correct. But many of those contracts that are present in my area, we're not planning to go through to the end of the ten years. I know that several of them we're going to rebid next year. I don't know whether we've decided whether or not to rebid the printing contract next fiscal year or not. I would not be opposed to it in any way. And if we don't do it in fiscal '18, we'll do it in fiscal '19 for sure.

Okay, so I am told that the Gordon Flesch contract is \$975,000 a year.

D. Baker: Purple haze.

B. Coryell: Yes, it's \$975,000 a year.

D. Baker: Virginia.

V. Naples: I have been given a wide variety of the range of prices for cost of an individual, I'm talking black and white print page, and also the cost that would be charged for a color print page. Do you have any updates on what those costs would be?

B. Coryell: You bet. The costs are 5 cents for black and white, and 12 cents for color. That includes the paper. The current prices are between 5 ½ and 8 cents, depending on what deal you struck at some point in the past. And either 25 or 35 cents for color. One of those is the student price, the other one is the faculty and staff price. So 5 ½ cents down to 5, that's only 10 percent cost reduction, but the 5 ½ cents I don't think includes the paper so you get a little bit off of that. The color cost is really coming down, and I'm happy about that. It's either half or a third the cost of what it used to be. So color will become really inexpensive. And I think those numbers, 5 and 12, are cost competitive in the industry.

V. Naples: I just have one question also. Does the contract for the company that has been selected include, and will it continue into the future always to include, both leasing or printers and provision of paper. Or are those possible to be bid separately?

B. Coryell: I think we do – well we do bid the paper separately. I don't know who has won the paper contract, but I know that – I was just shown the board item for the Gordon Flesch contract that says that it was \$975,000. I remember being at the board two years ago and asking for \$750,000 for paper and then last year only \$500,000 for paper because we are printing less as a campus. But I don't remember who that is awarded to. Maybe our CFO will bring that up and tell us who has the paper contract.

D. Boughton: I was wondering what's going to happen to the 2500 printers that you collect in various stages of life.

B. Coryell: Yep, outstanding question. The printers that are out there now and that will not end up as exception printers, the first stage is that all of your IT support groups are first trying to re-optimize the printers in your own areas. So for instance, if there's someone who has an old printer that needs to stay – PAUSE – the answer to the paper contract is Lindenmeyr Munroe. So apparently, it was bid to a separate company – So if someone had an old printer and it's an exception and it stays; and someone has a new printer and it was not granted an exception, your local IT people should first be swapping those printers where they're able to so that you have the newest, best, most cost effective fleet that remains. The ones that either aren't swapped out or just remain as surplus – those will come back to my area where I will try to do that same optimization across campus so that between departments or between divisions or colleges, again those printers

that remain are newer, they are higher quality, they're faster, and they're cheaper. The ones that don't get chosen for that end up being surplus.

R. Scherer: What about the inventory of toner cartridges and the like, that go with printers that have already been purchased and are sitting on the shelf?

B. Coryell: There are two types of those toner and ink cartridges. We know from the initial set of inventories that go on that we have lots of ink and toner that's sitting on a shelf that doesn't fit any printer that still remains. When people buy, they tend to be very conscientious with NIU's money, and they try to buy in bulk. But what happens is that a printer dies, they then are conscientious with their purchase again, and they buy the most cost-effective printer, which may not be the same model they used to have. And so they've essentially abandoned in place all of the ink and toner that went with the now-dead printer. So all of those just come out, and we're done with them. There's not much to do really with those, because they don't fit the printers. We can try to re-optimize them across campus, but again, as the printer models march on, a three-year old ink cartridge (if it hasn't dried up), it may not fit anything that's left on campus once we've tried to put the newer, better printers in everybody's hands. The ones that do remain.

R. Scherer: The majority are still having a printer that goes with it, not orphaned ones.

B. Coryell: Exactly so. So the ones that do remain and are applicable, those stay for those who have exception printers. The ones that don't, we'll collect them, see if they can be traded across campus again, and then they would still be surplus. The other thing that I'm seeing is for people who tend to have large stocks of spare toner or ink cartridges, they have granted temporary exceptions in their area so that they can consume the remaining ink or toner cartridges. And, of course, that's a perfectly fine use of an exception. I just saw another one granted in Vernese's area just today. So I would encourage people, if you have a particularly large stock, to go ahead and use those up, leave it as an exception until such time as you consume that all, and then we're free to move forward at that point, I think.

D. Baker: Anybody else?

C. Carlson: Do we have any additional moneys for delivery services from the Print Shop?

B. Coryell: I don't know what you mean by any additional moneys? Like will I charge you? The answer is no.

C. Carlson: We have to supply personnel to pick up all the items now that have to be printed at the Print Shop. So we just have to cover that with our own materials and personnel?

B. Coryell: Let me see if I'm understanding the question correctly. The Print Project that we're doing it right now won't result in any of your prints going out to the Print Shop by HR. What happens is you'll hit Control P, or the little print icon, to print. It'll pop up a box where you put in your ID number. And then that print job, instead of going into a printer that's on your desk, will go to my data center. And it will sit there and wait. And then when you walk up to any printer, any of these cloud printers on campus and swipe your ID, that print job will move from my data center to

the printer that you're standing at, and it will print out right there. So you don't need to go to anywhere to pick up your prints.

C. Carlson: I understand that, but in the past, it has been cheaper for us to print our own tests than to take them to the Print Shop. And now we're required, for tests, quizzes, handouts, all need to go to the Print Shop. So I was wondering what happens, you know, what do we do with that? So that's not part of this project, or I'm confused.

B. Coryell: It's not, so that decision, I'm not sure where that decision comes from, but it's independent of this particular project. I know that the Print Shop used to maintain a person who did daily deliveries to every building on campus to do print deliveries, whereas I don't think that campus mail gets to every location every day. But we've had to cut that function just because of cost cutting. So now I think you should have an option to use campus mail to deliver that. But since I'm not confident of that, then I will check to see whether campus mail is a delivery option. But again, timing could be an issue, and you may need to come pick it up yourself. Let me get more information, and I'll send it to Pat for inclusion with the notes. Is that close enough?

C. Carlson: Security's an issue.

Unidentified: Security, how would that work with security?

B. Coryell: A fair question. I assume, but I don't have direct knowledge, that the mail services are suitable for sending things like paychecks in the mail. Do we distribute those via campus mail? Do we have a statement on the physical security of campus mail? Let me find out.

D. Baker: So your concern would be about not in transit, but when it shows up in an office somewhere where it's delivered?

B. Coryell: Or maybe there are student workers who help deliver the mail who would have an incentive to browse through. Possible.

D. Baker: I'm not sure we have any student workers doing that.

B. Coryell: I don't know.

D. Baker: Good questions.

C. Carlson: We do have student workers in the office that might be accepting the mail.

D. Baker: Okay, good. Anybody else? All right, thank you, Brett.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. [Proposed amendment](#) to NIU Bylaws Article 15.9
Committee on Multicultural Curriculum Transformation – Pages 3-6
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM
[Amendment](#) as approved following discussion

D. Baker: Nothing on consent; we're moving on to unfinished business, and I'll turn it over to Greg.

G. Long: Good afternoon. Our first item of unfinished business is the second reading on a proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws Article 15.9. May I have a motion to discuss?

W. Penrod: So moved.

G. Long: A second?

S. Farrell: Second.

G. Long: All right, all in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Abstain? I'd like to ask NIU chief diversity officer, Dr. Vernese Edghill-Walden, to walk us through this proposed amendment. It is a second reading. We talked it over last month, and she's going to offer a friendly amendment regarding the committee's composition. And that's something that we've already talked about and reviewed. And at this point, I will turn it over to Vernese.

V. Edghill-Walden: Thank you. As Greg has talked about, this is a proposal to amend Article 15.9. We're asking that the committee be restructured and the name of the committee be changed. As you know, this committee has been in place and done tremendous work since the 1990s. It started with the work of putting together a Multicultural Transformation Institute. That institute has really helped to train over 200 faculty and staff. But because we are moving towards aligning our diversity goals with the work that we've been doing, the committee asked that we look at what this committee could be doing more or differently in this area. And so after my arrival, we looked at the diversity task force recommendations, as well as the work that we started with the academic equity gap work that we're doing in each of the colleges, and really felt that the change in the committee would align with the work that we are currently doing. And so what we're asking is that we do two, three things.

One is that we consolidate the Academic Diversity Program Advisory Council with the CMCT Committee and that the new committee be called the Committee on Academic Equity and Inclusive Excellence, which then would allow the committee to realign its role with the plan that we have for diversity and inclusion at NIU.

The second is that we want to be able to not just focus on an institute. We're actually eliminating the institute. And we want to be able to focus on three areas: And one would be the sustained model for the human diversity requirement, which was passed in the fall. Second would be to really look at ways that we can secure opportunities for faculty and students to do more research around diverse topics, which would also help our students be more involved in diverse research. And then the third would be to really align the work that we were doing with the equity gaps with this committee. These are three actual working committees that we currently have on the CMCT. So renaming and restructuring it would allow for us to bring those things in alignment.

The last is, in doing that, we also wanted to make sure that the composition of the committee was reflective of the work that those three goals. So we have added the chief diversity officer, which was not on the original list of the composition. We've also included the director for Asian American certificate, as well as the director for the Disability Resource Center. And we've also added the director for the Center for Southeast Asian Studies, so that all of our academic cultural centers, or academic diversity centers, are fully represented on this committee, when prior it was not.

And then we've added some additional staff. And with the feedback from the Executive Committee and other members of the University Council I've heard from since the first meeting, we've made some additional changes to reflect that the SPS staff member would not need to teach regularly, and that the dean that is represented is the associate dean for curricular. So it's not a curricular dean, it's an associate dean that has the curricular focus.

And then the last piece is we have also gone from four duties of the committee to ten. And those additional ones are reflective of the work around academic equity as well as the work that we are partnering with on OSEEL to increase faculty/student research opportunities. Thank you all for the feedback that we've received, because I was able to incorporate that into this final document.

G. Long: I may have missed it, but I know you were talking about we've added director of the Disability Resource Center, director of the Asian American certificate, and director of Southeast Asian Studies. Did you mention that the suggestion is to delete the vice provost for academic planning and development?

V. Edghill-Walden: Sorry about that. Yes, we did delete those two positions at their request. Because of the composition of the committee and adding me as well as another representative from Academic Affairs, it was not necessary to add two additional members from Academic Affairs. So we changed that composition as well.

G. Long: So that deletes then the vice provost for academic planning and development, and the vice provost for faculty affairs. Just wanted to be sure. Thank you.

V. Edghill-Walden: It also adds Student Affairs. It just makes the composition a lot broader and more inclusive.

G. Long: Great, thank you. Kendall.

K. Thu: So, Vernese, you mention the Asian American certificate, which I don't believe faired very

well in Program Prioritization. And I've had conversations with Judy Ledgerwood, and I think Chris McCord might have been in the loop with that as well. There doesn't seem to be a lot of interest in hosting the Asian American certificate, and there apparently aren't faculty to support it. So I'm wondering whether that's even viable at this point.

V. Edghill-Walden: Well right now we do have a coordinator for that program, and we have been in conversation with that director as well as the Asian American Resource Center to look at ways to support or reevaluate their relationship between the two. This person's involvement in this committee would help us to figure that out.

K. Thu: Just one more question outside the scope of this. If you know of where the home for that certificate might land, we'd like to know what's happening with it.

V. Edghill-Walden: I agree with you, and we're working on that, and would love your input as well. And Chris and I have talked briefly about this. We need to pick that back up again as well. Thank you.

G. Long: Other questions? All right, oh, there in the back, didn't see you.

A. Krmeneč: First of all, let me apologize if what I'm about to ask has already been covered. I was on leave last semester so this is my first ever meeting of University Council. My understanding is that ex officio means "by virtue of the office," and it's not clear to me that all of these members listed here as ex officio have duties that specifically, by virtue, or in the name of their office, that overlap with the duties of this committee. And I don't believe it's University Council's job to create new responsibilities for people on campus. If these are to be new responsibilities, then it has to go through their supervisor and an SPS review and revision of that position description.

G. Long: Vernese, do you want to.

V. Edghill-Walden: Sure, I can speak to the ex officio members. So the ones that we're adding have to do with the work we are already doing in Academic Affairs around the academic equity work. So the two that I'll speak to specifically are the director for Testing and Academic Affairs Research Support, and the representative of the Office of Vice Provost. Both of those positions have been working diligently with us on understanding the data and supporting the colleges on the equity gap data that each of the colleges have been privy to. So that has been part of – this isn't a new responsibility – it's work that they have been doing already. We've just created actual, an alignment with this committee and the work that's been done, or is being done.

G. Long: And if I'm looking at this, it appears that the committee composition as previously constituted and as now being amended is largely similar. So from the standpoint of giving people new tasks that they did not have previously, you're not really adding to people's burdens that weren't already involved in this. Other questions? Okay, let's take this to a vote. Now as a reminder, this is a bylaw change. As such, there are two steps to this. The first is finding out how many people we have here. Pat? Okay, Pat's got up there our Article 22. So the first thing I would like you to do, and Pat tell me when we're ready. So what we'll do is we'll first do a count of how many are here, and we have 59 total members so I've got to verify that we got – and I'm going to

round up – that we have 37 people here to vote. And then once we determine that, then as it says up here, to become effective it's got to be approved by either the majority of the total voting membership of University Council, which is a lower number, or two-thirds of the voting members in attendance. So we'll come up with that figure as soon as we find out who's here, how many we have here. So with that, are we ready to? Okay, if you're here, press 1. And I'm not going to say if you're not here, press 2. I'm not going to say that. No, if you're here, press 1 so we can get a count please. Everybody good? Okay? All right, so we have 44 here so we have satisfied. 45 okay. So we've satisfied the first point, and on the second point, we've got 45 people and now 46. And two-thirds of 46 is 31. All right so we take a vote on this and, you know, if we get 31 people to say yes, it passes. If we don't reach the 31 threshold, then it doesn't pass, right? Are we all okay on that one? Does it make sense? All right, so if you would, if you vote yes in supporting this bylaw change, press 1. If you don't support it, press 2. And if you choose to abstain, press 3, please. Well, we're close enough, let's see where we're at on that.

- 1 – yes – 41 votes
- 2 – no – 3 votes
- 3 – abstain – 1 vote

Guess what – it passes. Good. So, that's, we have that in place. Oh, and you know, just how we talked about last year a lot, the whole voting threshold thing, do you realize that if we were using last year's rules, this would have passed by one vote. So I'm glad that we have changed the threshold for our voting, because this does allow us to function in much more logical and efficient manner. So just to bring that up to your attention, I'm glad that this went.

B. Program Prioritization – Lisa Freeman, Executive Vice President and Provost

G. Long: The next item of unfinished business is our monthly update on Program Prioritization, and I'll turn it over to Provost Freeman.

L. Freeman: Thank you, Greg. As you know, we are in the implementation phase of Program Prioritization. And as part of that implementation, Faculty Senate and University Council are receiving brief monthly updates. So I will keep it brief and hit the highlights, and then be available for questions.

I want to start out by thanking the Faculty Senate for passing a resolution that allowed us and encouraged us to remove password protection from the President's Report and the Academic Action Plan. As you may remember, last spring when the task force reports came out, Faculty Senate asked us to put password protection on. To continue with what we felt was the will of Faculty Senate when we issued the President's Report and the Academic Action Plan, we maintained that password protection. And so it was helpful in the spirit of transparency and decreasing transactions costs of sharing the reports when they were requested, to have the password protection removed. And we were able to do that relatively quickly after the Faculty Senate meeting. So thanks to Jennice and the people in Marketing and Communications for working with us to get that done very rapidly.

I'll start with updates on academic action plans. We have a meeting of the Board of Trustees Committee – Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel – scheduled for February 16. For

those of you familiar with our curricular process, things go through curricular committees. They arise up through the administrative structure. They wind up at the Board of Trustees and go from there to the IBHE. We have a record number of program revisions on the February 16 agenda – 29 in total including all of the requests for new programs, program revisions and program deletions. And a majority of those were either directly or indirectly linked to Program Prioritization recommendations. Many of them are revisions to make minors and emphases that we believe students find attractive, more obvious to students. One of them is a new program that was proposed as a result of Program Prioritization going forward. So that agenda will be posted shortly, and you'll be able to see that. But that is like three times probably what we've every had on an agenda before. So you can see that people are being very mindful of looking at our program portfolio, trying to align our programs with our mission.

I have heard good news from a number of the deans regarding the academic hiring process that's moving forward. As you know, our disciplines tend to hire on different timetables. So for the disciplines where we're in the process of making offers, we're doing very well, attracting extremely highly qualified candidates to NIU. And in other disciplines where we're only at the interview stage, we are interviewing some very attractive candidates and hopefully will be able to make offers to them. So that's moving forward pretty well.

In terms of the administrative task force outcomes, those of you who've read the President's Report know that there were a series of deadlines that were put out there. Those reports are coming in, and we're really starting now to get a sense of what that process looks like. So the president said, this is what I expect. I would like to see a report that results in a suggested action coming to me and having that finalized by X date. In some cases, there's some back-and-forth. In some cases, it's done easily. In some cases, the president said, I would like to see this. Person said fine, and the outcome is already there. In others, there needs to be referral to budget.

So now that we've had a series of these deadlines come, and we have a better understanding of the process, we're working with Marketing and Communications to create a visual that can go on the Program Prioritization website so that it's very easy for people to see: This is what was suggested, this was the due date, this has come in, and this is where we are. We're hoping that we'll be able to get that up in a couple of weeks.

And I think I'll stop there and just ask if there are additional questions. Okay, thank you.

G. Long: Thanks very much.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Report of Faculty Senate discussion regarding [Dec. 22 Baker Report](#) – Pages 7-14
President Baker's [response](#) to Steering Committee questions – Pages 15-22
Michael Haji-Sheikh's [report](#) – Pages 23-34

G. Long: All right, moving on to new business, we have one item: report of Faculty Senate discussion regarding the December 22 Baker Report. And just as a little background, this discussion stems from questions and concerns raised about the December 22 Baker Report titled Correcting

Course – new policies enhance transparency. If you’ve got your agenda packet with you, that starts on page 7. And prior to opening it for discussion, I’d like to provide a little bit of background, information on this, and update you on the Faculty Senate’s response to this thus far.

So as background, several individuals contacted me to request that the December 22 Baker Report be shared with the Faculty Senate. I shared these concerns with both the Faculty Senate and University Council Steering Committees on Wednesday, January 18. Both steering committees agreed that the first step in responding to this would be to ask President Baker to provide additional clarification and elaboration regarding questions that have been raised. The email request that I wrote and associate questions are included in your agenda packet.

During last week’s senate meeting, both President Baker and Professor Haji-Sheikh walked in documents to share with the senate. Given the importance of the topic and the volume of information to review, the senate decided to postpone further discussion until our next meeting, which is scheduled for February 22. And I didn’t mention this during the meeting, but I will mention it to you now. While we normally have guests in our meetings, I have cleared off the schedule for the next meeting such that we have no additional guests. It provides plenty of time so that no one’s concerned that, you know, it’s brought up at 4:30 or quarter of five, that there is going to be time available to talk about that. And so on February 22, the senate will discuss both documents, President Baker’s document and Professor Haji-Sheikh’s document, and decide what, if any, follow up is warranted.

So I’d now like to open this up for discussion. I would, however, ask that University Council respect the desire of Faculty Senate to lead this discussion and provide feedback to University Council. So while certainly we can have discussion, from my perspective, this comes up and through the Faculty Senate as the primary body to have some say on this as currently posed. So that being the case, I would open it for discussion. Anyone, Kendall.

K. Thu: I just want to concur with Greg. I think this is a Faculty Senate set of discussions that we need to have. And then, once the discussions are finished, a report can come forward before UC. And that can inform discussion at that point. Of course, that doesn’t preclude anybody from speaking up now.

G. Long: Others. Okay, well seeing no further discussion, we will bring this back. I am committed to being transparent in this. I’m committed to facilitating the process so you have my word that, both in Faculty Senate and University Council, we’ll keep you informed and do this in a way that has integrity so we can discuss it in a thoughtful and deliberate manner, okay? All right, with that, then I will turn it back to President Baker to run the rest of the meeting.

D. Baker: Thank you, Greg. And thank you to the senate for allowing me to add those clarifications. I look forward to the further discussion and comments.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

D. Baker: All right, reports, FAC to the IBHE, Paul Stoddard. Paul?

P. Stoddard: Thank you. So the FAC to the IBHE meet January 20 over at UIC.

D. Baker: There's got to be another acronym, keep going.

P. Stoddard: No I think that might be it. As usual, we get a little introduction from the host institution. The trend seems to be going to show how the institutions are benefitting the state. They talk about percentage of graduates who stay in the state and so forth. At UIC, the numbers are 95 percent of graduates are from Illinois, and a lot of them stay in Illinois and the Chicago area. I didn't catch the exact numbers. Another interesting number that they put forth is, according to their calculations, for every dollar of state money spent at UIC or on UIC, \$8 are returned to the state economy by employees, students and alumni. So higher education in Illinois is a very good investment, and I think we should be encouraging people to look beyond the money spent and at the money returned by those institutions, directly and indirectly.

UIC is actually bucking the trend in the state, perhaps at the expense of some of our other schools. They are seeing their enrollments climb. They are currently up to 29,100. And they are also very proud of the fact that there are 62 languages spoken on campus at UIC.

We got a program – what do they call it. They participate in something called Complete College America, the game changes. There are five steps that they take. UIC only followed three of them, involving a first-year writing course and changes in the math program. The first-year writing courses really didn't impress me very much. The things they were doing and the results they got were very expected. Similarly, with the math, you know, the more you put into it, the more you get out of it. But they were looking at coordinating their math sections with common Blackboard sites, written homework, common exams and learning sheets. So it was one course just spread over several different times. And they also found that the sections that participated with active learning work sheets did much better than the straight lecture sections. And they found that requiring attendance also helped performance. So these might be things to consider as we go forward.

The most interesting part of the meeting, in my opinion, at the end, the new IBHE Board chairman, Tom Cross, stopped by to visit with us. He was scheduled for a half hour. He stayed for an hour. He gave a little presentation at first, but he said he was there to hear our questions and so most of the time was, in fact, spent talking with us about things we were interested in. In his initial presentation, he perhaps wasn't quite as optimistic as President Baker on the state of the budget. He doesn't think we'll have a normal budget for the next two-and-a-half years.

D. Baker: Paul, was that before Lisa Madigan's?

P. Stoddard: This would have been a week ago, from before last Friday, so it was before, yes, before Lisa Madigan's nuclear option. So for those of you who don't know, Chairman Cross is a veteran of the Illinois state legislature. He was a Republican representative there for 12 years, rose fairly high up in the leadership. He's not thrilled with either the speaker or the governor in terms of the state of the state. He's concerned about long-term and short-term damage to higher education in Illinois. He would like to see an increase in MAP funding. He says in 2001 we had 100 percent

coverage and that we would need close to \$5 billion to do that this year, and the current budget, he thinks, has about \$2.75 billion, so a little bit over half of what we need for MAP funding.

He was asked by a representative from Northern Illinois University, as it turns out, about changes to higher education that he sees coming. I was sitting next to the Chicago State representative, so I asked about potential mergers (Chicago State is very concerned about their fate). He doesn't see any change in the number of institutions being talked about by the administration, so it doesn't look like they're contemplating closing schools or merging schools at this point.

I also stressed in my question, changes in emphasis that the administration might like to see among the institutes of higher ed, specifically about the diminishing the role of a liberal arts portion of education in favor of a more vocational or job-oriented curriculum. He said he hasn't heard from the administration any talking about abrupt changes from liberal arts to vocational training. I will emphasize the word, abrupt, in there. He says there is concern about preparing students for careers, but not at the expense of liberal arts. So that was encouraging.

He was asked how can we best, as faculty, communicate with legislators. Obviously, legally, according to what was presented earlier. But he quoted former President Clinton in his KISS program, Keep It Simple Stupid. He said what you want to do when you talk to them is emphasize over and over and over again, the five to ten things that your institution does very well. Just keep hitting them over the head with the things we do well so that it becomes very difficult for them not to fund us at the levels we need.

There was a lot of other discussion, which I'll pass over in the interest of relative brevity. He says the most important agenda items for him on the board are to get a budget passed and to remind everyone, public legislatures, etc. about the assets that our higher education institutions offer. So he is a Rauner appointee. I expressed my concern to him afterwards about that. He said, when he was offered the position, he told them that he was nobody's lap boy. So I have guarded optimism that he might, in fact, prove to be a good spokesman and good advocate for higher education in the state, which is obviously what we need at the IBHE.

Oh, and I would also mention, it wasn't part of the meeting, but in respect to the higher education rally down in Springfield that the president mentioned earlier, the FAC is looking for a faculty presence down there. I am considering going down. If anybody is interested in joining me, I would be happy for the company, so let me know. Thank you.

D. Baker: Good. Are you driving a bus?

P. Stoddard: We'll see how many want to go.

D. Baker: I hope we get a good turnout. Relative to the Complete College America, that's a national organization. They've been active for at least, what, ten years maybe now? And some of their research is really quite interesting. They're trying to be data driven on what helps students. Some areas in math, the math emporium work or co-remediation work, seems to be more effective nationally. And one that sometimes shocks people is around the idea of 15 to Finish. Have you heard that phrase? The data seems to indicate that students graduate at a lower rate, the fewer

classes they take. So if you have a student taking nine or 12 credit hours, their odds of graduating go down significantly. And part of our ethos often in advising, well, you know, you're coming in, don't take a full load, you want to have plenty of time. And it turns out from the data, that's exact opposite of what we want students to do. One reason is, if you take 12 or nine credit hours, you're three or six behind graduating in four years. And so every semester you add, greatly increases your expenses and increases the odds that life will happen, and you're not going to finish. Also it turns out 15 credit hours is not that much work. What did you do? You may work 15 hours today, what are you going to do the rest of the week? So 15 hours is pretty manageable. So what they found is if you take 15 or 18, you graduate at a much higher rate. Hawaii went on a big advertising campaign. I don't know if anybody was familiar with that. It was called 15 to Finish. And they have a lot of commuter students at the University of Hawaii. But after this, they had a dramatic increase in their graduation rates just because they got students taking more classes and they got through in a more cost-effective way. And I think the Complete College America research is pretty interesting.

And then you also mentioned the \$8 to \$1 ration – a buck in at UIC gets you eight bucks out. I think our ratio is \$1 to \$9. So we're ten percent, well one over eight percent better. 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 – report

D. Baker: All right next, Resource, Space and Budget Committee, Sarah McHone-Chase.

S. McHone-Chase: Hello. This is brief. The only thing that I'm working on right now is finishing up the annual budget report. I've gotten a second draft done, and so I think we'll probably, as a committee, finish working on that probably at the end of this week. So I'll probably have a final draft of that out pretty soon. Does that go to the larger UC then after? Faculty Senate – okay. So that will be shortly complete, I think. And that's really all I have now.

D. Baker: Great, any questions?

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

D. Baker: All right, Rules, Governance and Elections, Therese Arado.

T. Arado: Good afternoon. The Policy Library is with the Rules, Governance and Elections, the committee is working on in earnest. There has been great progress on the tentatively named Policy on Policies. I know people don't like that name; it will probably change eventually. It will actually provide guidance for newly created policies, format, template, review, update, you know, all the things going in to that making great progress on creating that document. And then also the Policy Library and the categories for which all of our documents will be falling in to. Calls have been put

out to different areas asking them to submit, actually to Greg Long's office, documents so that we're able to categorize them appropriately, to make them as accessible as possible. And then working with IT to ultimately make it as searchable as possible and cross-referenceable as possible, even though that's not a word. So progress is going on that.

D. Baker: Thanks. Any questions, comments? Really an important piece. It's important for us to have those searchable policies that are easy to get to, so thank you for that work.

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

G. Student Association – report
Giuseppe LaGioia, President
Christine Wang, Speaker of the Senate

D. Baker: Okay, next, I don't see Giuseppe. Christine, are you going to wear both hats today?

C. Wang: Hello everyone. So this is Giuseppe's report. He just wants to talk about the #OneLoveNIU campaign, which is a campaign promoting diversity and inclusion among students and to make sure that they feel welcome on campus regardless of their race, gender, sexuality, gender identification, religious faith or even legal status in the United States. So they had a successful lunch during the MLK week, and there is a next event on the week of the 14th, which will be a surprise. So I think I know what it is, and I think you'll all be pleasantly surprised.

On the senate side, there's a lot that we've done internally. We had a senate workshop which was very successful, thanks to Sarah Klaper and Judy Santacaterina. We also have a few things that we sent out as well. We sent out a statement on the executive order that was signed by President Trump, and we wrote one in support of Dr. Baker's campus update yesterday, which was very well received by the students, I'm happy to say.

And then internally, we've also been re-working our bylaws, prepping for the spring elections as well. And we also have something called Pizza with Pritchard, which we've done every single semester, which is really great. We have another one scheduled for February 28. It would be great if we could see some faculty there as well, just so we can see a lot more support. We also called it Dinner with Demmer because we didn't want to leave Rep. Demmer out of the title, a lot of alliteration going on.

We're also bringing senators and students down to the rally on February 8, as was mentioned so, hopefully, there will be a good number of students there. And then finally today there is actually something going on in about 20 minutes, which is the City of DeKalb is hosting 85 students at O'Leary's. They're also sending out a bus to pick them up at 5. And they are going to give them the bus tour to help connect the students to the city of DeKalb and visa versa. I think it will be interesting, there's going to be a lot of discussions on how to improve on the city of DeKalb and the relationship with NIU as well. And other than that, I will be attending the IBHE SAC meeting on Friday with Stephanie Torres, who is our representative as well. Any questions?

D. Baker: Anybody? Okay, great. Thanks. Look forward to seeing you February 8 in Springfield.

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

D. Baker: Okay, the next report is from Operating Staff. Holly's not here, so Mary Wyzard.

M. Wyzard: Yes, this is mainly a reminder because the email just went out. But we are in the process of doing the 2017 Operating Staff Outstanding Service Award. The deadline for that is 4:30 Friday, Feb. 17, and it needs to be mailed to the Outstanding Service Award Committee.

D. Baker: How would they find you at that committee? Is there a specific email?

M. Wyzard: It's not, it has to be mailed.

D. Baker: Paper mailed?

M. Wyzard: Paper mailed.

D. Baker: Wow.

M. Wyzard: I know. I know.

Unidentified: I'll tell Brett.

D. Baker: That means you've got to print it, though, right?

M. Wyzard: Just because there's letters involved.

D. Baker: Very good. Thank you. All right, any questions? I hope people do make a lot of nominations. Thanks for doing that.

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

D. Baker: Let's see, Supportive Professional Staff, Cathy Doederlein.

C. Doederlein: Sure thing. So we wrapped up our nomination process at the end of 2016. And I just want to thank everyone. We had 18 nominees for our Supportive Professional Staff Presidential Service Award. So those have been selected. I don't even know, though, yet who's been chosen. It goes first to the president for his nod, and then it's brought to the council next week. So that award ceremony is April 12 in the Duke Ellington Ballroom. So for those of you that might be interested in attending and supporting those SPS award recipients, we'd appreciate it.

Did also want to note that the SPS survey – we do a survey of our constituency – that's going to be going out in about a week from now. We're just awaiting final approval of the email message that goes with it. And that is electronic, though we do make a paper option for accessibility purposes.

And then one last thing – was just wanting to make a note of appreciation to the message that did go

out last week in response to the attorney general's motion or filing, because I know there was a lot of tension, at least within the SPS ranks, about what that might mean for us. And so the quick response from the university and the reassurance of where we stand now was much appreciated, so thank you.

D. Baker: Good, thank you, appreciate it. Any questions for Cathy?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: Any comments from the floor? Virginia.

V. Naples: I would just like to go back to your initial comments. You were talking about the percentage of students that we have lost in the fall and that it continued in the spring. If I recall correctly in the fall, the ten-day census was 19,015. Do you have an actual number of how many students are enrolled this spring.

D. Baker: I didn't have that on the report I got on my phone as I walked in the door. We can get that out for you, though.

V. Naples: Thank you. I think everyone would appreciate that information.

D. Baker: And the comparisons we make are from this last fall to the preceding. And then this spring is compared to last spring. So we're down the same five percent in each of those. No additive, but, okay. Not five more.

Okay, anything else? Dean.

P. Kassel: If you follow me to Altgeld Hall to Room 315, you will find a wonderful performance artist from Guatemala who made her way from Central America up to here now, sponsored by Jo Burke in the Art Museum, followed by a number of art exhibits associated with this visit. She'll be here for a while and a number of other [off mic]. I encourage you to come by [off mic] this is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

D. Baker: Thank you for mentioning that. We had a great opening for the Pick Museum's exhibit on Guatemala, and then also there's a parallel show in the Art Museum in Altgeld Hall, and I would encourage all of you to go see. Pretty amazing stuff, and the stories from that turbulent time in the early '80s when revolution was going on and, frankly, genocide was going on. And seeing those stories and the pictures are amazing. Anybody want to say more?

K. Staikidis: The two painters in the NIU Art Museum were my Maya mentors, and so this is a tremendous honor to bring them here. They're going to be talking about their work, translated in the School of Art. I'll be giving a talk in the Center for Latino Studies on pedagogy outside of a European model for teaching. And so we have a series of presentations and lectures with the culmination on the 23rd, which is going to be the closing reception with a performance piece by a young Guatemalan, the daughter of one of the painters who's really going to be talking about oral history. Please come to as many presentations as you can.

D. Baker: I think this is particularly timely given the debate we're having about immigration in the country right now and to see the refugees who were coming from Guatemala during this horrible time, and seeing the parallels with the refugees coming out of many of the countries we noted earlier today, is really quite shocking. So, if you haven't had a chance to go over to the Pick Museum in Cole Hall, go see it. And then go see the art show. And then follow Paul out the door after I have a motion to adjourn.

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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Do I have such motion? Derryl? Kendall's the second. Any discussion. All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Adios.

Meeting adjourned at 4:46 p.m.