

4-5-2017

UC Transcript 2017-04-05

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2017-04-05" (2017). *University Council Archives*. 17.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/17>

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, April 5, 2017, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

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

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bond, Chung, Dannenmaier, Freeman, Hanley, Hernandez, Kreis, LaGioia, Ragagopalan, Thu, Torres, Williams, Wilson

OTHERS PRESENT: Bjerken, Blazey, Bryan, Coryell, Falkoff, Klaper, Miller, Pinkelton, Schwartz, Wesener Michael

OTHERS ABSENT: Hoffman, Johns, Kaplan

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Are you ready? Thanks, everybody, for coming out on another rainy spring day. I'll call us to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: And ask for a motion to adopt the agenda. And I, well I guess we need to have that motion and then there's a potential addition. So, do I have a motion? Who was it? We've got a captioner so she's got to hear you.

T. Martin: Tristan Martin.

D. Baker: And Reed Scherer seconds. Okay, very good. And, Holly, do you have an amendment to add or an addition to the agenda?

H. Nicholson: Yes, I do. I have a report for Operating Staff Council.

D. Baker: So do I have a second to that amendment? All right, Cathy Doederlein seconds it. Okay, any other additions or changes? So we need to vote on the amendment. All in favor of adding the Operating Staff Council report, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? That passes. Are you ready for the question on the agenda? All those in favor of the agenda as amended, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you, we have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2017 MEETING

D. Baker: Approval of the minutes, do I have a motion to approve the minutes?

M. Haji-Sheikh: So moved.

D. Baker: Michael Haji-Sheikh. Do I have a second?

D. Chakraborty: Second.

D. Baker: Okay, any additions, edits? All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: Okay, President's Announcements, here we go. Yesterday I sent out a budget memo. Did you get a chance to read it? Yeah, I'm sorry I had to send it to you, but I felt like this was an important time to send it out. We keep looking at the legislature thinking somebody's going to smack them with a reality stick, and we're going to get a budget. It hasn't happened yet. Now I will say that Mike Mann, my legislative liaison, board liaison, and chief of staff, all three of those in one, was in Springfield yesterday. And by the way, Mike is retiring at the end of May and moving to Colorado where his wife's been for the last year and a half. And we're going to miss him a lot. He's done a great deal job for us in Springfield and on campus as well. But there are rumblings. I mean, I've been optimistic with you. I thought something was going to happen, we were going to get more revenues this spring. I continue to be optimistic. Both sides of the aisles are darn frustrated, and they're getting beaten up, and I think every citizen ought to be talking to them about their concerns about what's happening to the state, not just higher education. So whatever side of the aisle you're on, feel free to exercise your right as a citizen of this state and share your feedback however you feel. But both sides are talking about some additional revenues this year, whether it be operating revenue or MAP money. But they're looking for the sources, and they're trying to figure out how to do it. But that's for '17 and then some additional for '18.

I think something's going to happen, but thinking, hoping that that's going to happen is not a budget plan. And so we've got to pick the most difficult scenario and plan to it. And then, when we get

additional revenue, then we can backtrack and re-look at our options, depending on how much revenue we have. But we need to plan for “we’re not getting any more money this year.” We just have to do that. So that’s why, after consulting with the cabinet and working with our financial staff, we’ve concluded we need to look for \$35 million in the budget, from revenue enhancement and cost reduction. And so that’s what we’re doing. We’ve identified, as I noted in there, about \$20 million on the revenue expense side up front, but that left another \$15 million to go back to each of the divisions. And so we’ve given goals to each of the divisions on that, and they’ve got a couple weeks to come up with more specific plans. They were not across-the-board cuts. There was a wide range, and they were strategically informed by where the unit is, its criticality to the core functions of the institution, and where we thought we could do the least damage while protecting the core. So that’s what we’re doing on those. None of the stuff we’re asking money back for is something that isn’t good. I mean, it’s not a question of good or bad. It’s just a question of what’s most core, and what can we, how do we best protect the core of the institution. So we’re going to continue to do that.

So over the last two years, we’ve reduced the budget by about \$60 million, our spending by \$60 million. And let me just give you the percentages by some of the categories to give you a feel. So back to protecting the core, we’ve only reduced our work force 5.8 percent. That’s not a lot, even though that’s about half, a little over half of our total expense, it’s only been five percent of our reduction. We’ve wanted to protect the people that are doing the mission work of this institution, that are teaching our students, that are advising our students, that are facilitating the research, scholarship and artistry and reaching out into the community. So 5.8 percent there. That’s about \$14 million reduction.

Contractual services, these are things like software packages, licenses, the Oracle package that runs our computing system, things like that. We’ve reduced that by 16.5 percent, \$18 million. We’ve reduced commodity purchases by 21 percent, equipment by 23 percent, or equipment by 42 percent, I’m sorry, commodities by 23 percent, travel by 21 percent, telecommunications by 24 percent. And permanent improvements was the category that got the biggest reduction. That would be, you know, paving parking lots and fixing rooves and that kind of stuff. We cut that by 90 percent. Now you can’t do that forever. At some point, you’ve got to pave the parking lot and fix the roof. But in the short term, that’s the easiest thing to do. It protects our faculty and staff who are doing the good work. And our parking lots get a little more chuck-holed, etc. But at some point, we’ve got to come back, when this budget comes back, and make some investments in those.

So all that adds up to almost \$60,700,000, almost \$61 million over the last two years. It’s a big chunk. Unfortunately, we’ve been cut \$107.5 million in that same time period from the state. So that leaves us a gap, and that’s why we’ve got to go back and ask for this \$35 million from across the institution. Now our hope is that we get additional revenues. We had a half-year stop-gap budget, to remind you, \$48 million appropriated this year. To get back to our 19, or our 2015 budget, we’d need another \$43 million from the state, plus the MAP money, which is \$18 million. So we don’t have that \$43 million, and we don’t have the \$18 million right now. That’s what we’re hoping for in the second half before July 1, the second half of the fiscal year ’17 that we’re in right now. I think we’re going to get some of that. I know we’re not going to get all of it. So we’re working hard to try and figure that out.

All right, so that's why I sent that memo out. I want to thank the faculty and staff for hanging in there. We're doing everything we can politically and financially to make sure you can do your jobs. And we're going to continue to do that. Let me open it up to questions and see what Qs and As we've got.

A. Krmeneč: Perhaps you can tell us what we're doing on the revenue side?

D. Baker: Good question. So on the revenue side, we're going to work very closely with our Foundation. So if we can raise more unrestricted cash from our donors, and we've put a \$5 million goal down for that, we think that's going to help us, help us a lot. So our donors that we've been out meeting with over the last few months are very cognizant of our situation and are leaning forward wanting to know what to do. I think we raised about \$26 million for the university last year. Much of that was restricted for very specific things. So it might be for a piece of equipment or a building or a scholarship for somebody from a neighborhood in Naperville. I'm making that one up, but you know how they get very restricted. That doesn't give us the flexibility to pay bills. And so the Foundation stepped up and said they will raise \$5 million in unrestricted money to help us with that. And they're very optimistic. In fact, my hope is we can raise significantly more. But we've put that in as a realistic goal.

We're also looking at potentially leasing some of our space that's unoccupied in some of our centers around the state. We think that would be a revenue source now for spaces that are under-utilized. Let's not let them just sit there. Let's see if they're rentable to people. So those are some of the examples on the revenue side. Other questions.

E. Mogren: I think I read in your statement or your report that one of the options is, I think, selling real estate. Is that right? Some of the real estate that we have is important for, you know, research projects and things like that. Other real estate that we have, like relationships with like Lorado Taft, have, you know, important academic as well as sort of historical features to them. So I was wondering if you could give us some sense of which of the properties that NIU owns might be potentially considered for sale to make ends meet here.

D. Baker: Yeah, I probably wouldn't comment on that in public because of its impact on those kinds of negotiations and what-not. I would say, rather than sale, I think a more optimistic or realistic avenue would be leasing at this point, which I mentioned before. So if we have buildings with a lot of open space in it that we're not using, let's lease it. Let's let somebody else do it, and we'll get the rents. One other concern we have is that, if you sell assets or a number of asset categories where the money doesn't go back to the university, it goes back to the state. And so you'd have to look very closely at those to see what the restrictions were on it. So probably leasing in the short term for fiscal year '18 looks like a more viable option.

E. Mogren: Thank you.

D. Baker: Michael.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Is it possible for the faculty University Council to get the quarterly financials shared with us too, so we can see what's going on. I mean I think it will help dispelling any open

and be clear and transparent for everybody.

D. Baker: So we don't do a quarterly financial report. But we'll work with our Resource, Space and Budget Committee to go through that and bring them whatever information they want. We'd be happy to share that.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Thank you.

D. Baker: Others?

S. McHone-Chase: You were talking about how many, how much personnel we're down, you said we're only down five percent.

D. Baker: 5.83.

S. McHone-Chase: 5.83 percent?

D. Baker: In two years.

S. McHone-Chase: In two years?

D. Baker: Over two years.

S. McHone-Chase: I know that we have a certain amount of faculty we were planning on hiring for next year. Does that take into account those faculty then? Or how that work out? It just seems that of staff and faculty, we seem so down, I'm just surprised to find out it's only 5.83 percent.

D. Baker: I was too, actually. That's the actual salary reduction or compensation reduction for over the last two years. And I believe it's about 135 people across the 3300 full-time people we have. So it's a pretty small percentage.

S. McHone-Chase: So it's not looking forward into the future hires for next year.

D. Baker: No, that's what the realized reduction over the last two years.

S. McHone-Chase: Okay.

D. Baker: And almost all of that has been through attrition. So we look 200 to 300 people a year through normal attrition. So if you think of ten percent out of 3300, that would be 330 people. So we lose 200 to 300 people a year, which is kind of a common attrition rate. And then we've not hired back all of those, obviously. The problem is that people don't always leave in places that are over-staffed. You know, they often leave places where you need people so you have to hire back. It would be hard to argue there aren't a lot of places that need more people, but. You know, one other thing we don't often talk about is we're down 5000-6000 students in the last decade. So we've got to be thinking about what do we need to do or not be doing given that lower level of students here. So that's a longer-term strategic prospect as we go through the Program Prioritization process and

invest and disinvest in various areas. Who else had their hand up? Anybody? Okay, I'm going to work on, based on your questions and a couple others that I've gotten, I'm going to try and work on a frequently asked question page so that we can get that out for people. We're not planning lay-offs of tenured or tenure-track faculty. That's not in the works, nor are furloughs. I'm not a big fan of furloughs. It doesn't address the core issues. If your work force is too big, furloughs don't do anything to affect it. It just makes everybody poorer. So you need to just think what do we really need to do and what's less important and make hard decisions, than hurt everybody with a salary reduction through a furlough. So that's why, at this time anyway, we've taken that off the page. Andy.

A. Krmeneč: One more question on the revenue side. Has there been any consideration maybe to reducing the very high rate of out-of-state student tuition so that we could be more competitive, say, in attracting international students?

D. Baker: Great question. We've examined that fairly closely. So when you look at our costs of educating a student, it's roughly \$14,000 a year plus-or-minus. And our tuition is, what, \$12,000? So, you know, how can you run a university if you're losing \$2,000 a student, and the answer is the state fills the gap with the appropriation. Unfortunately, the appropriation got crunched. So the reason most state schools charge out-of-state tuition is a student from Missouri's not paying taxes that contributes to the state allocation to the operating budget, so they ask the students to pay that amount to cover the full cost. We've gone to a model that's closer to full costing with 1.5 percent, or 150 percent I should say out-of-state tuition. And then there are other scholarship opportunities that get them down closer. But it's an interesting moral, as well as fiscal dilemma. Do you go ahead and charge in-state tuition and ask Illinois taxpayers, or current students, to pay the tuition delta that isn't covered by what they pay. You know, should you ask in-state students and in-state taxpayers to fund that. Now some states have answered that affirmatively, and it's a public policy question. So a legislature might say: We're willing in, let's say, Iowa, to pick a state, to pay the out-of-state portion of Illinois students coming here because we think that's a good human capital strategy. We think if we attract a lot of Illinois students to Iowa to go to school here and they get undergraduate or graduate degrees, that ultimately that's going to fuel our economy. You can make a pretty argument for that as a public policy. So they're investing in out-of-state students thinking that, in the long run, it's going to help the economy of the state and build tax base. Some countries do that. I know, for example, Germany has a great program for, in some cases, free tuition for out-of-country students.

Now relative to international students, we are looking at those kinds of discounts. We've worked a similar kind of discounting system for out-of-state. And we're also looking at room discounts, or room scholarships for our residence halls. So we do have excess capacity in our residence halls because of the reduced number of undergraduate students in the freshman and transfer classes. So if you have those idle assets, could you discount those and make the overall cost to the international student less expensive? And so we're experimenting with that this fall, and I think we've got about 100 of those room scholarships to see if we can use those to reduce the cost for international students to attract them to come here. I thought that was a creative way to think of our assets and better utilize them.

You know, Andy, one other thing that you mentioned. You asked about revenue. The most obvious ones are enrollment. We need to get our enrollment back up. And I've been reporting in our last couple of meetings that it looks like both freshman and transfer numbers are up for the fall. They continue to be up. We don't know if that's going to hold. The yield rate's going to be important. We're going to have to work really hard to make sure we close the deal, and I suspect as the legislative session drags on, that there's going to be more concern by families about what's going on at the state universities. But as of now, we look like we're ahead, so like we're starting to turn the corner, even in these difficult times. So that's good news, I think. My thanks to everybody that's been working so hard on that from our marketing and communications folks on down to individual faculty and staff and units.

Anything else on those?

Unidentified: You mentioned that Program Prioritization might be accelerated, and I was just wondering if you could talk to how that acceleration might play out.

D. Baker: Well, Chris McCord's going to give us a Program Prioritization update. Maybe this is a good segue to that. Let me get my agenda. Chris' report is down a little bit farther. Do you mind holding the question until we get to that? It's item VI. A. So we'll do that. But as we make, as a cabinet and as individual divisional leaders, we're thinking about how we plan to implement these budget reductions. All that information we collected has got to be in people's mind. We've really thought hard as a university about these issues. And so it helps inform those decisions that they're making. And maybe it's something they wouldn't have done this year, but now, with the situation, it may accelerate it. So that's the general tone.

All right if you have other questions, let me know. Send me an email or give me a call. I'd be happy to answer them.

A. Disability Resource Center [update](#) per [resolution](#) approved by University Council on November 30, 2016 – Pages 3-4
Debra Miller, Director, Disability Resource Center

D. Baker: Let's move on then. Disability Resource Center update. And so Debra Miller's got that. Where is she? Oh there she is, hi. This is the speakers' corner over here, isn't it?

D. Miller: Good afternoon. My name is Debra Miller, and I thank you for this opportunity provide an update from the Disability Resource Center. In November of 2016, a resolution was drafted and approved by both Faculty Senate and University Council in support of addressing staffing, equipment and related service delivery needs of the Disability Resource Center. As a result of this effort, and through ongoing and intentional collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, great progress has been realized, which has already been a benefitted to the 900-plus students that we serve.

Two new access consultants have been hired. One started March 1. The second, April 3. They should be fully acclimated to their positions to begin assuming and building caseloads by fall semester 2017, assuring appropriate accommodations for student within a reasonable time.

Student testing room furniture has been replaced. Clocks and desk lamps have been installed. Updated student computers have been ordered and are in the process of being installed as new software is being acquired and uploaded. Three braille writers and two new CCTVs have replaced decades old equipment.

Per for the president's Program Prioritization report, we are hopeful that the proposed adapted materials coordinator position will be approved and, further, centralized closed captioning services for the university will become a reality.

Not yet determined is the relocation of the office and testing center to a full accessible student-centered space with adequate student and handicap parking. Additionally, the request and necessary resources for Wifi have not yet been resolved.

I would take any questions anyone has at this time.

D. Baker: None? Well, thanks, Debra. Appreciate it.

D. Miller: Thank you.

D. Baker: I think those are positive steps for the whole university community. Appreciate your work on that.

B. Discover Initiative
Jerry Blazey, Acting Vice President, Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships

D. Baker: Next, Jerry Blazey is going to talk to us about the Discover Initiative, Jerry?

J. Blazey: Thank you, President Baker, and thank you for having me here this afternoon to describe this initiative. It's a bit of good news, and I'm happy to brief you on it. And it's an opportunity we're pursuing on behalf of our students. And part of the reason I'm here is, not only to describe it to you, but also to get any input or feedback you might have on the initiative.

So as not to bury the lead, I'll just tell you that we are working to build an on-site internship opportunity for our students with Discover Financial Services, Discover, the credit card, not discovery in outer space or anything like that. So this has been in the works for a long, long time. In 2014, President Baker asked Provost Freeman to convene an internal task force to consider options for creating an innovation co-working space for use by and for the NIU community, and that included students, faculty and alumni. The task force felt that developing a centrally located innovation space would promote collaboration amongst campus stakeholders in the context of existing, as well as new, programs. So it's sort of trying to build the ecology of innovation and entrepreneurship. They felt that by transforming an 8000 square foot space on the ground floor of Founders Memorial Library would foster an atmosphere that would encourage the alumni, students and faculty in innovation, collaboration and entrepreneurial activities.

In 2015 an external task force was created to start moving that visioning to reality, and this task

force comprised experts from the faculty, NIU alumni entrepreneurs, and also just friends of the university. And, in fact, it includes two of our newly-appointed board members, Eric Wasowicz and Dennis Barsema. This external task force agreed that a space needed to be created and pushed us to create a functioning space as soon as possible.

So in fall of 2016, the Jobs Plus Program was housed and started hosting events in the space. And Christine Mooney and Eric Wasowicz held some of their idea innovation impact lab courses in that space. And in a nod toward 1871 in downtown Chicago, we then christened the space 71 North, which happens to be the name of the room down on the ground floor.

Last October, there was an opportunity with Discover Financial Services' IT division emerged from conversations between Chairman Nick Karonis of the Computer Science Department, Daniel Rogness, who is one of their external advisors, and Joel Suchomel, who is the VP for digital development at Financial Services, and happens to be an NIU computer science alum. So Joel invited Nick, Daniel and Dean McCord to Discover for discussions about the possibility of creating an on-campus internship lab. And they also met with the Discover Financial CIO, Mr. Glenn Schneider, who also happened to be an NIU alum.

Discover subsequently visited 71 North and immediately decided they wanted to create this internship space in the library. So negotiations are currently in progress with Discover about the internship program, but there are broad outlines for the collaboration already in place. Discover will lease and renovate at least half of that 8000 square foot space to create their lab. And this will be their space. They want it key-coded because they're going to have up to 30 students that they'll hire annually as paid interns to work on Discover tasks associated with web and mobile development.

So Nick sees this opportunity with Discover as, not only a positive step for our students, but a way to kick-start 71 North with some energy, some people in success, so we can broaden out into internship programs with other companies and actually start some programmatic elements around innovation entrepreneurship.

I just want to close by saying that this has been very much a team effort. It's been led by Karinne Bredberg sitting in the back here, who is our assistant director for commercialization and innovation. It's involved College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, mostly through Dean McCord and Chair Karonis. Facilities has been involved as well as the legal department and the Foundation. So we meet weekly. We're pushing this as quickly as we can. Discover is hoping to get this up and running sometime in the fall. So I would be happy to discuss any details or describe the program further if you like. Reed.

R. Scherer: I'm wondering whether, first I've heard of this huge thing, was this a – the agreement – a one-time infusion? Is it an annual renewable? Is it a term thing that may be renewed? Or how does that work out?

J. Blazey: The timing appears to be five years, so at least we'll be signed with Discover for either five or ten years. And they will be paying rent on the space, which we will, hopefully, use – so this is a revenue-generating exercise as well – but we're hoping to use that to build out the rest of 71 North.

D. Baker: Anybody else? Well I think it's a great example of being creative and partnering where it helps our students, helps our departments and faculty, and hopefully helps the company, so we've got a mutually beneficial relationship here over time. So congratulations, Jerry, and everybody that's been working on it. Thanks for bringing it forward. We'll look forward to the final details as you get those put together in the next coming weeks. Great.

- C. [Multi-Factor-Authentication \(MFA\) presentation](#)
Tim Schwartz and Drew Bjerken, Division of Information Technology

D. Baker: All right next, are you all sick of being phished on your computer? Or spammed, or whatever? You know, that does create real security issues. If you hit one of those things incorrectly, it can cause a lot of problems. So today we've got Tim Schwartz and Drew Bjerken here from Division of Information Technology to talk to us about some security issues and multi-factor Authentication that, hopefully, is going to help us overcome these challenges that seem to be growing across the country. So I'll turn it over to you two, thanks.

D. Bjerken: Thank you. All right I guess you have to talk very close to the microphone. I'm Drew Bjerken, I'm the chief information security officer. And this is Tim Schwartz, he's the project manager. We're going to talk to you today about multi-factor authentication. We're going to talk about what multi-factor is, why do we need it, and then the way forward. So when we start talking about multi-factor authentication, the first thing most people are familiar with in the room is something you know, which is your user name and password. So it's a secret that you have. When we start adding to layers of security, and we add a secondary factor authentication, sometimes that may be a biometric thing. So a lot of people have finger print scanners on their phone, for example. That's a concept of biometrics. What we're going to implement is something you have. So we're going to essentially require people to have a secondary phone number so that the system has a means of communicating with you.

What's going to happen is you're going to put your user name and password and password into the system, and it's either going to send you a text message, it will give you a phone call, or it might send you a pop-up message, which will say, "Are you trying to log in at this time?" You hit "yes" or you may put this six-digit code in that comes in the text message, and then it will magically let you into the system, because it will know that only you have that particular device. So that will be your secondary authentication form.

The third form is, it can call your phone and it will be like a recorded message. And it will say, "Are you trying to log in? If so, press 1. If not, press 2." If you disapprove or press 2, it will actually block whoever is attempting to log in to your computer at that particular time. And then it will alert information security and notify us so that we know that we have to go and look at that, because somebody's trying to get in and gain access to your account. And we start talking about, you know, our account and what's in there, you know, that's your PII. That's your privileged identifiable information, your MyNIU, your PeopleSoft. Your credentials are, essentially, your life.

Right now what we're seeing is we're seeing 250 compromised credentials a week. Now, you know, truth in lending, 90 percent of those are our students. But they're part of our eco system so,

when they get compromised, they're on our system, that's where we start to see that influx of extra emails. We have 125,000 black-holed emails currently that are going on since seven days ago when we started mitigating some of those spam emails that are coming across. Some of these are Chase, Bank of America. Normally the NIU, we see the ones that are NIU branded, it says [inaudible] your transcripts or something like that, that's, you know, something that our users will want to click on.

But the outside world, they see our students and, in some cases, our faculty and staff, sending out, you know, phishing emails that have Chase branding on it, trying to get their banking credentials. We take calls all the time where folks have said, "Hey, we got an email, I lost money out of my account, you know, what can I do?" We get police reports. And then we also have had recently ISIS serial killer email. So, and I'm going to circle back to that one just to kind of show you so you guys can kind of understand. It's going to be the sample that I'm going to use so you can kind of see the seriousness and how it catches people off-guard.

Why do we want MFA? It's really the impact. At the end of the day, it's the brand damage it's doing to NIU's brand. You know, we want NIU's name to be out there, but we don't want it to be out there to 600,000 users that are saying, "Why are we getting Chase emails from NIU?" It's just bad business for us.

The second aspect is accessibility. You know, at the end of the day, you know, we don't want other folks that are not supposed to be in our system, in there. And then when we start having so many phishing emails in our actual, you know, email environment, the integrity of our emails start to come in question. I have a picture here, and it shows, it's called the CIA triad – so confidentiality, integrity and accessibility are the three key colors for good information security. You can see that if you're sitting on the chair, everything is great. But if I lose one of those, the system starts to fall apart and you fall on the floor. That's essentially what we're trying to prevent by instituting MFA.

This is the email that I was referring to. You can see on this particular email, up here it's from Serial Killer. This is one of our ZIDs for a student. It went out to, you know, several thousand users. We had calls everywhere from individual people notifying us, to state law enforcement, the FBI, Department of Homeland Security. You can see, when somebody gets this email and it talks about, "Attention, I am very sorry for you. It is a pity how your life is going to end as soon as you don't comply." And it goes on to talk about ISIS and the bombings and various events that they're responsible for. So we have bad guys log in to one of our student accounts, because they got their credentials, and sent this email out to tens of thousands of people. You know, now a lot of folks will see this and they won't be concerned. But there are a lot of folks, when they see this, they get very concerned, and you can imagine that's just negative publicity that we don't want. And then they want to know whether it's legitimate. You know, law enforcement wants to know if it's a legitimate threat, because, at the end of the day, it is a threat of violence. So these are the type of things that we're trying to mitigate.

The bottom line is, you know, last Monday we started instituting MFA for students that were already compromised. So again, if you think back 250 a week of, you know, compromised credentials in our system. Each one of those people are roughly sending out anywhere from 10,000 to 20,000 emails themselves. So you can see in the big picture how we start to get a bad image to the rest of the world.

The other thing is, when we start sending out lots of phishing, people say, “I’m not going to do business with the NIU website,” we start to get blocked in our connectivity. So it starts to affect our students’ ability to do research, or faculty and staff’s ability to do research. HR gets shut down, because they can’t contact the state. It hasn’t happened yet, but, God forbid, you know, they aren’t able to do payroll, for example, because we’re getting on somebody else’s black list for our negative behavior.

We have started testing. We’ve been testing now for about three weeks. We have 400+ users in the system. You know, the entire Division of IT is enrolled in MFA. We’ve got distributed IT that’s also enrolled in MFA. We’ve been sending out daily emails, yes, I understand that, when we send out daily emails when we’re trying to combat, you know, phishing, there’s an oxymoron there in terms of us trying to account for this. But we have to be able to reach the populace and tell them what’s going on and what we’re planning to do so we’re not caught off-guard. I mean it is our means of communication and, if we circle back to the triad, it’s the integrity of our system. We want to be able to send out those emails and know that they’re going to trust that that information is good.

And then starting on the tenth of April, we’re going to be putting it into production. So we will actually have all of our students be brought into the system on 10 April. We’ve got plussed-up areas, so we’re going to have extra support. We’ve got extra folks at the service desk. We’re going to have a kiosk at Holmes Student Center, the Oasis, the Center of Excellence Technology Oasis, Light Court, Barsema Hall, Art Computer Lab, and then the technology support desk in ResTech. So we’ve got extended hours in some of those locations. And then some of them are just kiosks we’ll have folks from, whether it’s the Division of IT or, you know, support from external, helping students answer questions, helping them get set up if they have challenges, you know, for it.

Some of the things we’ve done in preparation. We do have the ability to see how people are connected. So, you know, the last number I had was around 18,000 of our students are using the Outlook, Outlook on the portal. So if you think of it, it’s called OWA, you log in through the Explorer or Chrome, something like that type of browser. You can see there, a good chunk of folks are using, it’s right around 8,000 are using the Outlook mobile app. And then other mobile is really just your native app, whether it’s an iPhone or an Android phone, that native app. And then the list goes on. So you can see where the bulk of our users are in terms of how they’re connecting with the network.

The last thing I want to show you is I just kind of want to show you some of the numbers. The most important thing here is the green line. So the green line is actually what we’ve detected and what’s coming out of our environment in terms of spam. So you can see here that usually on the weekends, you know, it dips down because, just like most people, believe it or not, criminals take the day off on Saturdays and Sunday. So, you know, seems ironic, but the reality is, you know, for lack of a better term, they’re not getting their return on their investment. There’s nobody checking email necessarily on the weekends. They want to get it at the top of your email box, so they wait. But you can see at the height of things right here, 600,000 emails going out over the course of, you know, a day and a half. The red line indicates where we started putting some mitigation effects in place. For this room, I’ll share with you, we’re essentially blocking all email that originates and starts in the

country of Nigeria. We have no choice right now, because that's where the bulk of our attacks are. The problem is, and in case anybody wonders, we can do that, but as soon as they change their location – and I can change my IP location in a matter of 30 seconds and come from any country in the world, so can the bad guy. So then we start chasing our tail. If you ever played the Whac-A-Mole game? It becomes how fast can we whack it when the head pops up. And it's just not a sustainable model.

The other thing is that's only blocking the emails from going out into the rest of the world. It doesn't block the actual bad guys from going into the people's accounts. So they're still going into their accounts. They still have access to all their information, whatever they're storing on their OneDrive, their pictures. I mean students store all sorts of stuff, you know, in their email environment. You know, everything from social security cards, pictures of passports. We've seen it all stored there and had issues. So I just kind of wanted to give that overview. But you can see, once we put that block in, the amount of spam coming out of our environment, you know, has almost been cut in half. And that's just because we can't go around, obviously, as an institution, blocking every single country. Otherwise, we'll just be talking to ourselves.

With that, I'll open it up for questions. Right, so the biggest difference, as Brett was saying, was MFA actually blocks them from getting into the actual account. So if their credentials are compromised, so somebody accidentally gives their user name and password to the bad guy. If they don't have their cell phone, the bad guy, they will not be able to get access into their account, which is, you know, 95 percent of our problem.

H. Khoury: Thank you for the work. My question is, are other universities in the area facing similar problems? And what are they doing to minimize all these attacks?

D. Bjerken: Yes, so a couple things. I'm going to add a little extra information. So we've seen an increase in phishing attacks: a) because this is tax season, and this is the best time to get compromised credentials, because bad guys want to file taxes on your behalf and get your tax returns. So there's always an increase at this time; b) other institutions have already instituted MFA across their environment, so, if you think about it, the, you know, sources of good credentials starts to get smaller. So that means I have to go to the watering holes that are good and use those more. There are other institutions that don't have MFA in place. They are facing the exact same challenge that we are. We are not alone in this. I routinely talk to several of my peers about it. I think it was Bowling Green just recently instituted a university-wide password reset, just arbitrarily, because they knew that they had so many compromised accounts, they were doing right around 175 compromised accounts a week, so less than us, and now they're implementing MFA as well. So they took a different solution. They implemented MFA for some of their key systems, and then they're going to do it for email second. The reason why we're doing it the way we are is because in our investigations when we look at it, we don't see the bad guy going in to PeopleSoft when they compromise credentials. So our normal process is, if we see a compromised account, we do a password reset, which locks it. But by then the bad guy's already been in, but they can't get back in, and then we always check to see which factors did they change on the email. Did they put a forwarding address on the email so that they can get all of their emails, you know, forwarded to them? And whether or not they went into PeopleSoft or any other resources across NIU's enterprise. We have no indications that they are doing that. We simply see that they're using us to phish the

outside world.

P. Stoddard: So I'm wondering, what's the target? When are you going to be implementing this? Or is this going to be something every time we log in to our machines in our office we have to work on? Every time we access email from our personal machines. I'm very concerned about, you know, smart classrooms. Is this going to be affected in there? Where are we actually looking at this happening?

D. Bjerken: Yep. So one of the things we're going to do is we're going to implement trusted IPs so the NIU network, if you're authenticated into NIU's network, it's considered a trusted IP, you will not have to MFA from that network. Now if you're on the guest wireless, for example, though, for NIU, you would have to MFA. The other controls that we've put in place, and this is where we're starting. So if you think about it, you know, 1,000+ credentials a month are compromised, as we get this rolled out and as we start to see the effects of it being positive, right now we have it set that you have to MFA once every seven days. And you have a trusted device relationship. So once the system knows your laptop and knows your cell phone, for example, once you MFA on one of those during that seven days, there's that trusted relationship. As we move forward, we may decide that, you know, we can go from seven to 14. We just haven't gotten that far yet. You know, a lot of folks actually implement it where it's at every single day. I felt every single day was too stringent. I thought seven days seemed like a healthy trade-off with the exception of having the trusted IPs and not having to do it while you're on network.

D. Baker: Mark, did you have a question? Michael.

M. Haji-Sheikh: This is IP-based, or are you going to do inside the firewall you going to be using Mac-based identification.

D. Bjerken: It's inside the firewall. It's a trusted IP. So as long as you're coming from something inside our enterprise, it's automatically going to not require you to MFA.

M. Haji-Sheikh: So you're not going to take advantage of the Mac address on this case.

D. Bjerken: Not in this particular case.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Okay.

T. Bishop: You know, as I look at that data, clearly there's correlation between good email and spam, correct?

D. Bjerken: Correct.

T. Bishop: But yet, you know, your mitigation attempt shouldn't drive the volume of good email, correct?

D. Bjerken: It should not.

T. Bishop: So, as I look at that data, are you sure that the mitigation is actually driving the results, or is it just that, you know, there's causal factors driving the volumes of both good and spam email, because the good email is at the lowest level on the entire chart.

D. Bjerken: It's true, but the difference is, we actually can see the emails that are being trying to be attempt to be pushed out of the environment on it. So while this shows the drop in it, for lack of a better terminology, we have a bucket that actually collects all of those bad emails. So I can actually get that count, which is why I can quote the number of 125,000 emails in the last seven days that we've collected.

T. Bishop: I understand that, but again, it's that means that just the volumes seem to be highly correlated. The correlation with the good emails down so also may be the spam emails. And I'm just questioning the interpretation of the data.

B. Coryell: I agree. So it's probably too early to make that as a definitive statement yet. There's a promising correlation and, if you can see, if you're close enough to see the numbers, you know, kind of where we started between just over 600,000 and where we're at today, at just over 100,000, you know, the numbers that Drew quoted could only account for 100,000 of that drop, right? So we'll have to keep an eye on it. Again, this is only this method that we used at the red line is only the temporary method. The multi-factor authentication does stop it for real and for good. So, you know, we can be more definitive about that one.

D. Bjerken: Real quick, the only thing that I wanted to add to that is, as we're watching the bad guys on our network trying to do this, part of the drop is the fact that they're not gaining credentials, because their emails aren't going out. It's like anything else. If I fish at one pond and I get two fish, I go to a second pond and I get five fish, when I plan my third fishing trip, I'm going to go to the second pond, because that was better. We could actually see the bad guys sending out emails to specific accounts saying, "test." So they were trying to see whether or not their emails are going out. So I would expect that they're probably going to try a new technique pretty soon.

R. Scherer: I assume if we're doing work with someone in Nigeria, then we can get trusted emails through.

D. Bjerken: Yes, and our plan isn't to leave the block in Nigeria, you know, forever.

L. Saborío: Will we be able to access our email when traveling abroad?

D. Bjerken: You will be able to access your email traveling abroad. That's the beauty of O365. What it will do, it's kind of a user-based analytics, so it sees where you normally log in from, and then it says, oh, okay, you're traveling, Drew, to Germany. It says you're logging in from Germany. That's weird. And it will say, okay, please do your MFA for your authentication just like you normally would.

L. Saborío: And if you don't have your phone with you?

D. Bjerken: You'll have to have your phone with you to be able to do it. Yep. So there is the

capability where you can have your phone with you and not have to get a text message. So there is an authenticator application. I just didn't want to get everyone confused there. There's an authenticator application you can download on your phone, and it's essentially, it recycles every 30 seconds a specific six-digit number sequence. You just type that number sequence in, and it will automatically let you in. It's like having a, it's called a token.

L. Saborío: That's okay. I don't like checking my email when abroad anyway, so.

Unidentified: I'm just still confused on this graph. When you say, "good email," are these good emails, because I would have thought that the blue line would have become higher than the green line. Does that make sense?

D. Bjerken: It does, but if you think about it, I mean, our good emails are just the amount of business that we're doing as faculty and staff or students. So the only thing driving that is internal to us. There's nothing about what we do for mitigation that drives that number that has any correlation with spam or phishing emails. Does that make sense?

Unidentified: Okay, but I guess, why would our emails have gone down since the red line, the good emails?

D. Bjerken: Well if you look at it, after the red line, our email actually the good emails actually spiked up for that particular one. But right now, it's just slow email. There's just not a lot of people, you know, sending emails back and forth. It could be the students are, you know, doing other things.

Unidentified: Coasting to the end of the semester.

D. Bjerken: Right. We couldn't tell you why there's less email volume.

D. Baker: I will note that anything above zero is not good, right. And so with multi-factor authentication, that green line should go to zero. Chris?

C. McCord: Drew, I have two questions. First of all, to follow up on Reed's, so there will be access, because I have a bank in Nigeria that wants to send me money.

D. Bjerken: Should I call you Prince?

C. McCord: Want to make sure that I can still do that deal. Second question, more seriously, turning on a system like this for students near the end of the semester rather than bringing it up at the start of a new semester, what's the rationale behind that? And is there a down-side risk of disruption in students' access at a moderately critical time in their academics?

D. Bjerken: So, you know, the rationale is really, you know, and I use this term. I spoke here once before. I'm not a doom-and-gloom kind of person, but we are rapidly losing control of the integrity of our email system. I mean, we are pushing out that much, you know, spam and phishing emails, and having that many credentials compromised. You know, 250+ credentials compromised a week.

That's a lot of bad people in our network doing bad things, you know. And it's a matter of time, I mean, at some point, they may figure out that, oh gosh, I can VP in with those credentials. I can go a lot more places with that user name and credentials than just email. The risk to me is just too great. Is there a risk when we implement something for students this close? It's a new technology, it's going to be something that's, you know, changing the way they access our system. Yes, there is always that risk. What we can tell you is, from testing, if you use the portal to access Outlook, which has all their email functionality, you can Skype through that. If you use Outlook applications that are supported, such as 2016, which is the latest and greatest, all free to our students, or the Outlook mobile app, we've seen no indications of any problems.

D. Baker: The 250, can I just follow up? With the 250 folks you've already done this with, what's the reaction been?

D. Bjerken: You take that.

D. Baker: Maybe I shouldn't have asked that question.

T. Schwartz: Okay, thank you. The reaction to the students, themselves, and how they function? We had a discussion today. When we have compromised accounts, we contact the student, and then we put them into the MFA pool. And we walk them through setting up their credentials and their multi-factor authentication through our service desk. We haven't had – and we are looking currently and I don't have the complete data so I want to be absolutely clear on this – but we don't believe that any of them have called back with any issues of accessing their email. We make sure that they are fully functional by the time that we get them off the phone, but until we go a little bit deeper into the data, which is what we're starting to do right now, the indication is that they're not calling back with any issues.

Unidentified: [inaudible]

T. Schwartz: 250.

Unidentified: [inaudible]

T. Schwartz: In terms of how many were

Unidentified: How many students were compromised?

T. Schwartz: Yeah, now the 250, again I want to make sure that we understand this, that's how many accounts are getting compromised a week. So that's not the total number that we have in MFA. So we actually have a greater amount of accounts that are in MFA. I don't particularly have those numbers right now. It's almost, okay it's almost, yeah it is almost 500 and not all of them students.

D. Baker: Okay good. Let's do a couple more, and then we've got more business.

T. Shibata: My student is from Nigeria, and we are conducting a global health study in Nigeria.

And we are communicating with a local medical doctor as well as the government. It's not spam. It's a real project. So how do we communicate?

D. Bjerken: Yeah, you can, I mean you reach out to me, and we can make sure to see what IPs they're using to make sure those are white-listed. So when I say, I mean most of the IPs we're blocking right now are Legos, Nigeria, and we see those same offending IPs that are usually associated with, say, a coffee house, you know, kind of place, not normally associated with a business.

T. Shibata: Most of the, you know, [inaudible] Internet people in developing country has [inaudible]. Many are associated with spam, right? So how do you identify those email as real or fake?

D. Bjerken: So I mean there are several different ways. One of the easiest ways is really, you've got to remember that most of our students are on campus right now. So, you know, if they log in from DeKalb at 8 a.m. and at midnight they're logging in from Nigeria, they probably haven't flown to Nigeria to log in. So we have analytics that give us that indication.

D. Baker: But to answer his question, his functionality is, you two talk to each other and he'll white-list the IP address.

T. Shibata: Thank you.

D. Bjerken: Yep.

D. Baker: Okay, how's that? Way to cut through it. Anybody else? All right if you have more questions or concerns, where should they go? Drew? Or somewhere else?

D. Bjerken: Nope, they can reach out to me if they have any questions or concerns.

D. Baker: Okay. Thanks. This is something that's behind the curtain for most of us, and we don't know what's going on other than the goofy emails we ignore or send to abuse@niu.edu. If you see that stuff, they should send it to abuse, and they will snag it and get it out of our system. So thanks for that update.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

D. Baker: Okay, no consent agenda. Chris is still at the microphone and will give us a Program Prioritization update. Chris, Lisa Freeman and I, as well as Matt Streb, meet on a regular basis to go over Program Prioritization updates, and Chris is here to help us get an update. Go ahead.

C. McCord: Thank you. As time marches on, I won't walk through the current status of each of the 84 reports that had been sought. We have launched a website that records all of the various status reports that were asked for in the president's November report and the current disposition of those. Many of them will simply say something like, "report due," "report received." They're just a status indicator. But some of them, once we reach a final conclusion, a report has been received, acted on, accepted, etc. and it's essentially reached completion, there'll be a link you can click on that will give you the final disposition of that action item, so that, as things reach completion, you can see what complete status. They're not detailed reports, they're a paragraph, but it's something that indicates where we are on the status of those.

So we are making steady progress, we're steadily moving through action items. And these come in, if you will, two flavors. There are the individual programs within individual units and the various actions that were sought for, say, Building Services or the Parking Services, etc. So there's the status of those. And then there's the, what we've dubbed the "complex conversations," the larger conversations where we've brought together all of the many units involved in tutoring and had them come together. We brought together the various units involved in institutional effectiveness and formed a new institutional effectiveness unit out of those different units.

Many of those projects have now reached, we launched a new evaluation, after the Program Prioritization Task Forces, we launched new investigations of those complex conversations, because the task forces had not been charged with looking at these in their interactions. They'd been charged with looking at programs one at a time. Most, if not all, of those reports have now come in and are now being digested and moved toward implementation. Some, such as institutional effectiveness, they got out the gate very quickly. They very quickly realized what they wanted to do, how they wanted to do it. They've implemented their action steps. They're complete. Others at the other end of the spectrum, such as school connections are deliberately lagged, because we want to get accreditation issues dealt with before we take off on any restructuring issues. Most are in the middle. Reports have been received. They're now moving toward implementation. They're not finalized yet.

But I can say, having sort of been involved in this now fairly aggressively for the last year, it's trite to say this is moving the needle. This is moving a lot of needles. There's a lot of things that are evolving as a result of this, and this has become, you know, there are the specific actions that are emerging out of the specific evaluations. There's also Program Prioritization as a touchstone for the many budget decisions that the institution now has to make. I think President Baker alluded to the current budget reductions that are being allocated out to the divisions are not across the board. The Program Prioritization evaluations played an integral role in informing how those budget allocations would be distributed so that centrality of mission was one of the key factors in evaluating those budget decisions. That flowed directly out of the Program Prioritization evaluations.

Happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

D. Baker: Thanks, Chris.

- B. Follow-up on [Faculty Senate response](#) to December 22 Baker Report –
Pages 5-11 – Greg Long

D. Baker: Okay, I'm going to turn over the next two items to Greg on unfinished business and new business.

G. Long: Thank you. Our first item is a follow-up on the Faculty Senate response to the December 22 Baker Report. President Baker attended last week's March 29 Faculty Senate meeting to talk with us about questions we had developed during the previous meeting. He also engaged in an informal question and answer session following his initial presentation.

When he left the room, the senate addressed general questions to insure a broad-based understanding of issues before considering actions. We then had a brief discussion regarding the implications of potential actions. For example, what are our options as a Faculty Senate? How is NIU's reputation impacted? How do we communicate concerns with the Board of Trustees?

Following these discussions, three resolutions were proposed. One pertaining to a request to the Office of the Executive Inspector General was withdrawn before any discussion. The remaining two resolutions were then discussed.

The first resolution was submitted by Professor Linda Saborío. The final version, after editing during the senate meeting, is included on page 5 of your agenda. It is a request to create and formalize a collaborative process with the Board of Trustees in the evaluation of the university's president. And as background, I would say that, in preparation for this senate meeting, I had already talked with Board of Trustees Chair John Butler regarding possible collaboration in current and future presidential evaluations. His summary and clarifications email regarding our discussions is included on pages 6 and 7 of your agenda packet. He specifically identifies the board's interest in "establishing a process to involve wider participation in presidential evaluation" and indicates that he and Trustees Coleman and Barsema are working to develop a 360 assessment as an initial step in their evaluation of President Baker.

As additional background, I would say one reason to support this concept is shown on pages 8 to 11 of your agenda packet. And this was a handout that was also shared earlier last month with the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. And it basically shows that we've got four governance bylaws applicable to the evaluation of the president in addition to his contract. So, needless to say, the surplus of policies for administrative evaluations is problematic.

When called for a vote, the senate overwhelmingly supported Professor Saborío's resolution to work with the Board of Trustees, with a vote 51 in favor, one opposed and one abstained.

The second resolution was submitted by Professor Michael Haji-Sheikh. It was a resolution of confidence, you know, that's, it's called resolution of confidence and stated that "The Faculty Senate resolves to demonstrate their confidence in Dr. Douglas D. Baker to lead Northern Illinois University as president for the foreseeable future." Given the senate's endorsement of the prior resolution to work with the Board of Trustees, Professor Haji-Sheikh's resolution was postponed for further discussion.

As a point of clarification, I would also like to note that this was not a resolution of no confidence, as was reported in the Northern Star. This was a resolution of confidence. It's different. It's fairly unique, but the information that was reported in the Star, it was not a resolution of no confidence. So I did want to make that clarification.

One other thing I'd like to mention, in terms of moving forward, the Board of Trustees has contracted with the consulting firm of Greenwood and Asher [Greenwood/Asher & Associates] to conduct a 360 evaluation process. And as demonstration of some of the collaboration that we were seeking, the Faculty Senate's resolution has already been forwarded to the consulting firm, and next Tuesday morning, leaders of shared governance, Operating Staff Council, SPS Council, Student Association and Faculty Senate, will be meeting with an executive from the consulting firm to share our ideas, issues of concerns, relative to our respective constituencies. So this is a resolution that, you know, was just passed, but it is something that gives us an opportunity to move forward in a very proactive and positive manner.

Any questions? Okay, excellent.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws [Article 3.6](#) – Page 12
Office of the Executive Secretary

FIRST READING

G. Long: Moving on to number VII New Business, we have a proposed amendment to NIU's Bylaw, Article 3.6. It's on page 12 of your agenda packet, and the rationale is simply: This amendment brings the bylaw into alignment with current practice and expectations of the office of Executive Secretary of University Council, which requires a 12-month commitment. To accommodate the 12-month contract, the University Council budget funds three months of salary, not two.

So this is a bylaw change. It's a first reading. And you'll notice the only change in 3.6.2 is in the very last sentence where we are saying the budget shall fund an addition three, rather than two, months of salary for the executive secretary. This is a first reading so we don't need to take a motion on it. We'll vote on it next session, but do you have any questions or discussion on this? Yes, Andy.

- A. Krmeneč:** What are the larger, indirect implications here in terms of vacation, benefits, etc.?

G. Long: Those things have not yet been worked out, because at this point, the 12th month has been an added for the last two executive secretaries on a, you know, an as-needed basis, if you would. So this is to formalize things, and I'm assuming if it's a 12-month contract, there will be implications for vacation time and so forth, but those have not yet been ascertained. Any other discussion on this? It's reasonable, though, we can come back next month when we're talking about this as a vote and, hopefully, give you a little more information on that? If that's, you know, in terms of a concern of interest? Anything? Okay. Moving on then, yes, we'll bring this, from a new business standpoint,

we'll bring this back for a second reading at our May 5 [3] meeting. Okay.

And then we go to reports from councils, boards and standing committees.

D. Baker: As I transition back, I do want to thank the senate for the opportunity to speak in front of them. I thought we had a good session, and the evaluation process I endorse. I think that's appropriate and in line with what I do with my leadership team on a regular basis, so I think it's good to get that feedback and use it to better manage the institution. So thank you for that input.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

D. Baker: Moving on, we've got our reports from the councils, boards and standing committees. Paul Stoddard, you're up first, FAC to IBHE.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. We met March 17 at South Suburban College. There was not an unusual amount of green there, it being St. Patrick's Day. We got the usual opening remarks from, in this case, SSC President Donald Manning. They talked a little bit about their developmental courses in trying to streamline them so that they take less than 16 weeks to help students, incoming students who are not really college-ready, get ready in a quicker amount of time. They said many of their students are first-generation college students and require a bit more hand-holding to help navigate the bureaucracy of higher education.

The next significant thing, we got a report from our chair that Senate Bill 440, which is to increase faculty representation on the IBHE and to have the faculty select who that representation will be rather than the governor, was passed through the Higher Ed Committee of the senate. The governor's office apparently has decided that the IBHE should be opposed to this particular bill. I don't think that's terribly surprising. But we'll see how that fairs going forward.

We had a discussion with Rep. Chris Welch. He is the chair of the Illinois House Committee on Higher Education. We went around the room and gave what I'd call a gauntlet of whoa. All the members of the FAC explained how the current budget impasse is negatively affecting their institutions and their communities. That took almost half the time we had to discuss things with Rep. Welch. He reported that he had asked IBHE Chair Tom Cross about the disinvestment in Illinois higher education and the fact that Illinois is spending much less these days on higher ed than it has in the past, both in terms of real dollars and percent of budget and so forth. And he talked to him about the positive role of higher education. Chair Cross agreed with him, but got hostile when asked about having conversations with the governor on this issue and defended the governor as being pro-higher education. I just report what was said.

Rep. Welch suggested that it would be good for people to talk with their legislators, call, write, visit Springfield. He noted that April 27 is going to be a Teach Out. There will be a movement to have actually faculty not teach in their classrooms that day, but instead go down to Springfield and teach under the dome of the state house. If you can get your students there, good luck. But otherwise, we will be teaching or just, I think the idea is to teach the legislature about the need for a budget in

higher education.

There is also House Bill 3447, which is the Tuition Reduction Act, which is now out of committee. The idea there, depending on what baseline they choose, is whether it's the 2015 budget or maybe the 2002 budget. But the idea is that any money appropriated to higher education above that baseline, half I believe of all that money must go toward tuition reduction. I'm not quite sure how that gets implemented. I suspect the universities will have some say in how that works. But the idea is, if Northern, I suppose, were to get an extra, oh I don't know, \$35 million, \$17.5 million of that would go toward reducing tuition that our students would be paying coming in. This is something that the FAC, the IBHE and others have been in favor of. And I think, ideally, the students would probably be in favor of it as well.

So those were I think most of the highlights. Our next meeting will be a week from Friday.

D. Baker: Questions? All right, 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 Policy Library – [Presentation](#) and discussion

D. Baker: Next is Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, Therese Arado. Is she not here? You're doing it? Is Holly doing it? Who's doing it?

T. Arado: I'm actually going to defer to Greg and Holly for the update on this since they have been the ones who have been working diligently on what we're going to hear today.

G. Long: Okay, thanks, and I promise I won't make this presentation too long, but I can't stand to sit down and make a presentation so I'm sorry about that. There we go. Great. Just want, we have talked about throughout the end of last year as well as this year the idea of a policy library. So wanted to bring it to your attention in terms of what we have accomplished and how we went about doing this working with the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. So, next slide.

Okay, where this started is last year when I became Faculty Senate president and executive secretary of University Council, had the great pleasure and opportunity to read through all of our shared governance materials. And if you haven't done that, I'd recommend it, particularly if you need to fall asleep. But the thing is, we found is that when you look at our various governance documents, the Board of Trustees Regulations and Bylaws, our Constitution and Bylaws, the APPM, Business Procedure Manual, you find that there are, you know, some concerns there. So

what we've done is we've begun to look at this. Next slide.

From a university standpoint, this is the draft version of how we are working to define a university policy. As a statement of principles and associated conduct in the governance and management of its affairs consistent with the university's purpose and mission. As such, university policies must be abided by. University policies additionally promote operational efficiencies, reduce institutional risk and establish requirements for compliance. From our standpoint, in terms of the problems with this, is that, as you look at across the documents, there are a number of redundancies and contradictory information that, when we looked at, when we were talking about President Baker's evaluation, how can we have a system that has, you know, in our governance documents, four procedures in addition to his contract that all spell out how to do an evaluation of the president, and they don't all agree, and they certainly don't specify the scope, nature and level of participation of various constituencies. So we have, like I say, lots of redundant and contradictory information. If you're going to find information, any of you who have been in a role where you have to look for where's the policy, where's the procedure, oftentimes it's really challenging. I'm blessed to have Pat Erickson as the UC Faculty Senate executive, I mean administrative assistant, because she's very, very familiar. But if left to my own devices, as I've talked to other chairs or other people around campus, if you are in a position to try and find policies, it's really a challenge. And depending on where you look, you may find one version. And depending on where you look, otherwise, you may find another version. And then so if there's no clear organization access, think about the bottom part. There is no process for managing policies.

And let me give you an example of just how silly this is. There are policies out there that still exist that are on paper. In our office, we facilitate the grievance process if it gets to a certain stage, and we did have a grievance process within my time here that was based on a policy that had never been sunsetted, never been withdrawn. It was paper-based, and you know what it was from? It was from a time when clerical staff were given a monetary bonus from going to typewriters to word processing, and that was still within our area of [inaudible] policies that the university has. So you can appreciate why we might want to consolidate things and realize that some things perhaps ought not to be.

In terms of giving you a little background, I do want to mention the hierarchy of policies and also who makes policies on campus. Next.

One of the challenges, and this is something we've talked with other groups about is the hierarchy of policy making, so that in this particular figure indicating that, obviously, federal policies are at the top, going down to state. The Board of Trustees is in charge of the university. Then you have university-wide policies. But I would note here that university-wide policies govern the entire system and override campus, college and departmental policies. Bring it down the next level. Non-university-wide policies – that means that colleges and divisions can make their own policies. They just need to be in alignment with university-wide policies. And then you move down to departmental policies. So this hierarchy is presented just as an image to show that the higher up you are on the hierarchy, the more authority you have. So anything that's lower on the figure here is subsumed within the higher levels. Any questions about that?

Okay, according to our Constitution and Bylaws, there are three officially recognized policy-

making bodies for the university. You've got the Board of Trustees, and they are the ultimate jurisdictional body. They have oversight responsibilities for the entire campus. You have the president who is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the university. And then you have the University Council, and we have responsibility for the academic and educational decisions of the university as reported in our constitution. Next.

So, all this being said, thought about this in terms of how do we organize this. And one way of organizing this is something that many other universities have done too. We're not, we're not cutting edge here. There are others who have done this before, but when you look at other universities, it's like what a cool idea to put things together, because if you have a policy library, you have a centralized location for things. So it's an online site and the things that are on that site take precedent over anything that's written. So that's your centralized location. And it gives you an opportunity to look at what's current, what's past and then even what we're proposing. Next.

Now, one of the challenge, and this is probably what's taken us the most time working with Rules, Governance and Elections, this current academic year is so how does this all work, because it's all well and good to say we're going to organize policies and create this database, but you still need to talk about how are they managed so that we don't have situations where you've got a policy that's in place to move secretarial staff from typewriters to word processing, right? That's, we need some mechanism to deal with that.

So as part of this process, we have had a number of conversations with, initially with Jerry Blakemore, and now it's Greg Brady from the Office of General Counsel. Shared governance leaders have had a year and a half of discussion on this topic, as well, because creating a policy, it's, you know, they oftentimes refer to it as a policy on policies, which is kind of weird. We're referring to it as a policy on managing policies, POMP. I kind of like that better anyway. But the idea with this is, if you get these management guidelines, it helps you to identify who can, who has the authority to establish policy; how do we determine if a policy is necessary; who writes it; who approves it; who's responsible for the maintenance, distribution and review; who determines how and how often the policy is reviewed; when a new policy is necessarily recommended. And then the other idea is where is it going to be located and managed.

So we have spent quite, quite, quite a few hours over the past year talking about these issues, writing drafts of what a policy on managing policies might look like, getting feedback from the membership and others. So we've been moving along on this process on a very regular basis. Next.

To give you a quick idea of generally where we're at and kind of the process of how things are moving through here, I'll go through each of these. The policy guidelines, that's what we're talking about, we were just talking about, those eight questions of who has the authority; who does it; who drafts it; so on and so forth. We just talked to Greg Brady yesterday. He expects that that initial draft will be done, I believe, very, very soon, within the next couple of weeks. We've been, like I say, it has probably in its about fifth or sixth iteration at this point, because we've had a lot of back-and-forth, both with the members of the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, as well as other people on campus, to get feedback on this.

Policy submission template – right now policies are submitted in whatever format you kind of feel

like, right? And if you're looking for consistency, that doesn't make sense. So in a moment, I'm going to turn it over to Holly, and she'll show you the template that we're proposing to use for all future policy submissions, and also the policies that we currently have, they're not going to be changed. So please don't any of you get worried about, "Oh, this is a, you know, re-write." No, no, no. Right now the whole goal is organize policies and move them up to the library. But then you're going to have this issue of, you know, we've got to periodically review things. And so as they are periodically reviewed, they will then be put in to the new policy template so we will have consistency going forward.

So right now we're, like I say, we've got the template already designed. The university-wide policies, in terms of gathering them, we've got all the things that are the basic organic governance documents, the APPM, the Constitution and Bylaws and so forth. We've been reaching out to all the divisions across campus to get them to send us their university-wide policies, and that's an ongoing process. We don't yet have them. We will have a more complete presentation on the policy library in our May 5 [3] meeting, and I expect to be able to go through and show you a number of, you know, like the policies that are posted there to look at.

All right, so the review, summarize and reorganize policies, that's marked across all three time periods because, again, our goal right now is simply organizing, identifying if there are conflicts. But it's not to re-write things. That would stop the process, because if I were you, I wouldn't trust me, you know. You need to get them together and then let's look at them and see what needs to be re-written, where things are contradictory or redundant. You know, let's use our intellect to go over those things and then make decisions on how we correct them.

The website structure and design, Holly will give you an intro on that in just a moment. We've made some very good progress on that. Once we've got the guidelines approved, the website structure finished, we'll be able to start populating the library. As we move forward, certainly all future policies will want to be put on a policy submission template so they're consistent going forward. Reconcile and identify discrepancies, that's an ongoing process. And also this idea that, you're going to have to periodically review policies. Even this idea of a policy on managing policies? Yeah, we're putting it forward now, but in three or four years, it needs to be reviewed again. I mean, that's, that's the thing with all of our policies, that we need to set this up in a way that allows us to keep current. Next.

So just as a final update here, we've already got those documents, gone through them, separated them out. They're categorized into groups for the policy library. We're still working to identify policies that aren't in the basic core governance documents. Next.

So I mentioned this policy on managing policies. Give you a quick update on that, because it answers the who, when, how, responsibility, review cycle, those questions I was mentioning. To do this, we will have to have a policy librarian, all right? And it is a new position, it would be something, and I will say that all shared governance leaders and our constituencies and our councils have supported this concept of, you know, if you're going to organize things and have a policy library, you can't just have it sit there. You need to have it be actively managed. And so, while the position has not yet been funded, a position description has been originated and is over in HR, waiting Professor Baker, President Baker, excuse me, President Baker's approval and financial

approval for that. But the idea would be you have to have someone in the position to manage all this. It can't just happen, and it's not something that can just be assigned to someone as an extra responsibility. This is going to be a big task, particularly for the first few years. It's going to be a particularly big task.

So we want a policy librarian and then, as oversight, because part of this, as I've mentioned too, early on, if you were with us last year, this originated from a desire to kind of consolidate and say, you know, we've got all these policies in our bylaws, you know, half of our bylaws are actually policies and procedures, they're not actually bylaws. And so how does this get reviewed? And we propose a policy library committee. And the thing that I think is important when we think about this committee is that it has equal representation of administration and constituencies. The, right now it's being proposed, and again these are still proposed, it's not yet been formally endorsed, but that you'd have four administrators including the provost, the CFO, head of HR and the vice president of whatever particular division we're dealing with. Office of General Counsel would also be present from a consulting basis, they're not a decision-maker in that. But on the other side of this, you would have the executive secretary of University Council. You'd have the presidents of the Operating Staff Council, SPS Council and Student Association involved, as well as the chair of the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. So what we're talking about is a policy committee that has essentially, equal representation of constituencies with administration, because I think need to have that level of oversight, protection, support, whatever the right word for that is. Okay.

And I wanted to show you this. This hangs in Greg Brady's office. And if you're on the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, you likely saw this in one of our most recent meetings because it's a difficult thing to think about. How do we talk about this, because if policies exist everywhere, and we have no mechanism for how policies are reviewed and so on and so forth, we've got to come up with this on our own. And we've looked at, like I say, we've looked at lots of other universities. We've benchmarked other universities as far as how they do these things, and so basically, again, we'll make this fancy, but I thought you might appreciate just from the standpoint of this was kind of our visualization and this hangs in Greg Brady's office right now, because he's working on it and, like I say, hopefully, we'll get it done oh within a week or so, a week or two. But you'd have the board, you've got the president and University Council. And the PLC would be the Policy Library Committee. Then the idea of, you know, for any policy, you'd have a proponent or sponsor. And remember it could be the president, it could be a vice president, it could be University Council. The one thing that would be different now that we don't have in the past, is that any policy that would be proposed, there'd be an opportunity to have a comment period on it. So it would be posted on the website, people could review it. People could comment on it. So that's where right in the middle you see 30-day comment. You've got the policy librarian and then you've got the two arrows down just from the idea that we were looking at it from both the administrative side and the academic side.

Now certainly by next month, I can give you much more narrative to go along with that, but I did want to show you that just as an idea that we are proposing this in a way that is inclusive and that does create a policy library that does have some authority to, you know, work within the system. Next.

So, I want to turn it over to Holly, because it's all well and good to talk about this, but I have to say,

after having talked about it for a year, you know, I was really thrilled to see when Holly came up with it, and here's what the homepage might look like, and here's what the policy template might look like. So for that, I'll turn it over to Holly.

H. Nicholson: Thank you. I've been working with Division of IT to work on this website, and they asked that we have a mock-up of several of the pages before they started working on some of the functionality. So the idea is that this is going to be a very dynamic website. This homepage, you would access all of the policy categories, very graphic representation of all of them. On the side, the area recently added, recently updated and recently withdrawn would automatically populate. And then at the very bottom we have a proposed category where you would have the ability to comment. I'm sorry, I zoomed way out so I wouldn't make you all dizzy with scrolling, but it will be bigger.

But here's your opportunity to submit comments on a policy upload, any supporting documentation you would need. And then we've mocked up two possibilities for the policies. In some cases, we will be porting over, let me see if I can zoom this back in, we'll be porting over actual policies, and they will live in the policy library. So you can see this submission template here with original source, responsible division, adoption date, office, last updated, contact person, the next review date and the policy category it belongs in. And that would also auto-populate all of those categories you saw on the homepage. And then underneath that you would have the text of the policy.

The other option, and this would be a stop-gap until the next review of the policy came up, and that would be just to link to the policy where it currently lives or to a pdf. So I know some policies are in different forms. I'm hearing of some that are actually in Blackboard or behind other password-protected areas. And so this template would allow us to link to those policies. You've still got the original source and all the information on top that you need, but the actual text of the policy would not be here.

On the left, you would see all of the policy categories. At the time, and again each landing page would populate automatically with those policies. And since it was helpful, because some of them will have more than one category, so. This here will link to both an A to Z index and a search. So you could look up alphabetically, but also we'll have a really great search feature on this.

Then we'll explain here about policies, the policy management, the POMP, the policy on managing policies. And the policy resources will be over here, and that will include how to submit a policy and, you know, just explain the hierarchy that we've created with the policy committee.

And so now that these pages are mocked up, Division of IT is going to take this and run with the functionality. So next month we'll probably have some more populated pages, you know, add some more policies in here, and you can see how they will auto-populate.

D. Baker: Doug.

D. Boughton: I have a question, a couple questions. Number one is, how deep down will this policy pool go? Will it go all the way down to the program site? And I guess related to that question is, will a policy still be a policy if it doesn't appear in the policy library?

G. Long: The first question is that we're only looking at university-wide policies. So while certainly a college could take it down to, you know, and modify it for their own use or whatever, what we're talking about right now is the university-level policies. So it wouldn't be something that's just unique to VP&A or another college.

D. Boughton: I mean this is a problem that we've confronted in our program is that we have so many policies that it's really hard to keep track of it, and they get diffused. This would be a great place to locate them if there was an opportunity for individual programs to be able to lodge their policies so everybody could find them easily.

G. Long: Oh, and there's no reason that individual programs couldn't do that once we have the model established. It's just a question at this point of getting the model established so that it works for us.

G. Long: Other questions or comments about this? Okay, let me show you the final, oh, Sarah.

S. McHone-Chase: Actually, I'm interested in knowing the answer to the second part of his question about whether a policy is still a policy if it's not in?

G. Long: Okay, say that again, I'm sorry.

S. McHone-Chase: The second part of his question was whether a policy is still a policy if it's not in the policy library.

G. Long: Okay, yes, so when the policy on managing policies document is finalized, part of that does say, at least at this point, that policies will only be official if they're on the policy library, because if you don't have, if you don't have the impetus to get things there, then how do we keep from having policies that exist on paper that are stuck in somebody's office that we don't look at. So there will be a transition period here. I mean, I grant you that this is not something that's going to happen overnight, but a number of other universities have done this. Again, we've benchmarked, not only the website design and the topics and so on that we're trying to put forward. But, yeah, it will take us time to get to where we're able to identify and put things correctly.

S. McHone-Chase: Thank you.

G. Long: Sure, absolutely. All right, and then the last slide for you is just, you know, we're completing the management document as I mentioned. The collection review of policies I expect will be an ongoing issue. It's hard to nudge people along in that regard, but we're continuing to move and collect them. As I mentioned before, we certainly need to identify and address inconsistencies across policies. Again, that's not our first move, though. Remember, we're simply organizing right now and posting. But that does give us the opportunity to see where the inconsistencies are. Identifying a policy librarian and a policy library committee. Implement the policy template and submission process. And then initiate a review cycle, because, again, as I mentioned, particularly everything that's being put up there now will have a review cycle of, at this point, we're anticipating staggered over a three-year period so that all the policies that would be initially posted over the next three to four years would be re-written so they would be in the new

policy template. And then every policy that's going to come out heretofore following up will be submitted using the policy template so that, you know, hopefully, within three to four years: a) you could find any policy you want and it would be in a consistent format and a centralized digital location. So I mean that's the overall goal of this project. So just wanted to let you know. We've talked about it a lot, but, hopefully, by seeing some examples here, it makes it a little more real and I can promise you that by next month, you'll be able to, we'll be able to click some of the links and show you a few policies and make it even a bit more functional. I can't give you an exact timeline for when this will actually be posted online. My goal is certainly I'd like to get it done before July 1. So we'll try and get it done within this fiscal year. Any questions? Cool, all right.

D. Baker: Well thanks to Greg Long, Greg Brady, Holly, Pat, everybody else that's been working on this. It's a big lift, something we obviously need, and, boy, wouldn't it be nice if we could click and find what we needed in rapid fashion, accurate fashion. So thank you a lot for putting this together.

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

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

D. Baker: The next is a report from our students, and it looks Giuseppe and Christine are on here, and I don't see Giuseppe. Christine Wang?

C. Wang: So we've been pretty busy in the last month, and we'll be even busier in April. Last month we had our Day Without Women event, that was really successful. We had a march. We had a couple of speakers, and I wanted to give a quick thank you to Dr. Molly Swick, Dr. Walden and Judy Santacaterina for coming out and giving some very powerful speeches and performances in the rally that came before that. It was really effective and actually brought a couple tears to my eyes. It felt good having all that support.

We also held a couple of things towards the end of the month. We had the mayoral candidates: forum and wanted to thank the candidates who came, who was Jerry Smith, John Rey, Misty Haji-Sheikh, as well as Alderman Finucane and Snow. And I also want to congratulate our new mayor, Jerry Smith and also commend the service that John Rey has also given to the city as well.

We also had a couple of other events. We had the Coming Out of the Shadows event on the 29th.

And then our elections took place on March 28 and 29. I want to recognize our newly-elected executives. So our new president is actually going to be Rachel Jacob. She is currently serving as our vice president, so she's one of the most qualified women I've ever known, and I'm really happy to see that she's also going to be the first woman president in 20 years. So that is amazing.

And our vice president will be Khiree Cross. He's president of BMI. Nathan Hayes will be our treasurer. And our current president, Giuseppe LaGioia, will be our new student trustee. So they ran a great campaign, and I'm very happy to see that we'll have a very qualified executive board this

year, or for the next year.

I also want to recognize Kayla Sorensen. She is our chairwoman of the Board of Elections. She conducted the elections with such, you know, fairness, such neutrality. And she really took on a lot of duties that she didn't have to do, but she did anyway to insure that this election ran smoothly. Obviously, we did have a bump in the road, but that was through no fault of the Board of Elections or the students involved. So our special election ends today at 6 p.m., and we'll know who our senate will be for the next year. And yeah, so that was really a wonderful election this year. It ran much smoother. We had 1600 people who voted. That is almost double the number that we had last year. So I'm very happy to see that our elections are becoming a little more popular. People are getting more engaged. That means our percentage is up, as well, because, obviously, we have less, a smaller number of students, but also higher voter turn-out, so that means our percentage has gone up as well for that.

We have an event this week, and it's going on right now actually, #OneCultureNIU that was put up by our Public Affairs Committee. And that is featuring a lot of students from different advocacy groups for under-represented students as well as a lot of stories from these student groups as well.

We also have a couple lobby days coming up. Actually today was one of them, and I was supposed to attend. Unfortunately, due to some academic obligations, I could not go. But Stephanie Torres did attend, and I think she's driving back right now. She tried to meet with a bunch of people, most notably, she almost got in to see Speaker Madigan, almost. But, surprise, surprise, he cancelled on her. So she was able to meet, however, with Senator Connelly and tried to pull off Rep. Demmer and Rep. Pritchard off the floor as well as Chapa Lavia and Rep. Ives. So I'll be waiting to hear back from her and how it went. And we'll be going down on the 26th as well. Young Invincibles was happy enough, was very happy to actually sponsor us for this trip, so they'll be sponsoring the cost of gas for that as we don't really have much money in the Student Association budget to sponsor lobby trips like we did before. So after explaining that situation, they were very happy to sponsor us for that.

I'm also happy to announce that we had our speaker nominations on this Sunday. I was nominated again and am running unopposed, so this Sunday will be official. I think this will be the first time in 20 years that there will be two females at the head of the Student Association, so that's another wonderful thing, so. I'm very humbled to have this opportunity again.

But moving on, we have a couple more things. We have Pizza with Pritchard and Dinner with Demmer, so if you want to come out and see our representatives, you can come see them. I'll also be driving down to Governors State University to have a student senate forum. There's eight universities who are going down there as well as a couple representatives and senators.

We'll have Green Week on the week of the 16th, Student Choice Awards on the 27th, and our last meeting will take place on the 30th. And we'll have a banquet and some awards to honor our seniors, maybe some superlatives, like who's most likely to fall asleep in our meetings. I already know who that is. And we will also have the city council, I'm actually, we'll also be presenting at city council for DeKalb, kind of presenting on the O'Leary's results and the action plans that will result from that. That will be taking place on April 24.

So we have a very busy month ahead of us, but what else is new.

D. Baker: Any questions for Christine? Thank you for your leadership and congratulations. And Greg has a couple of updates from Giuseppe. Greg?

G. Long: The, you had mentioned the executive cabinet elections were held last week, and the transition process is beginning, right? And Greek Week events include a blood drive today? And you're going to do stroll on Friday. Okay, those are the only two additions.

D. Baker: Okay, great.

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

D. Baker: All right, moving on, Holly, as amended.

H. Nicholson: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to make some award announcements. We awarded our Operating Staff Dependent Scholarship to three students: Jenee Carlson, Kaitlin Allen and Donald Giebel. And we really want to congratulate them. We had so many outstanding students, and thanks to Academic Works, we were able to review 20 applications, and it was a very hard decision.

We also have our Outstanding Service Award winners for Operating Staff. They are: Nancy Brown from Building Services, Jay Monteiro from Visual and Performing Arts, Lisa [Leslie] Pergament-Nenia from Jerry Johns Literacy Clinic and Lynn Retherford from the School of Music. So big congratulations to them.

And election season is upon us, and we'll have a call for candidates very soon. So if you know operating staff who would like to get involved with our council, please encourage them to join. We have some fantastic, we have a fantastic council, and we're looking for even more talented people.

D. Baker: Any questions for Holly? Thank you.

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

D. Baker: Cathy Doederlein from SPS Council.

C. Doederlein: Sure thing. Pretty similar report, actually. Our awards ceremony is next Wednesday, April 12, downstairs in the ballroom, starting at 2 with refreshments and then 2:30 for the program. Really encourage you to attend and support the folks who are being honored that day. And since it's next Wednesday, you now know that you don't have to hear from me talking about awards anymore this year, so you're welcome.

And then we did put out our call for nominations and received responses back. And our election is actually going on right now. So encourage SPS that you work with to go in and vote for constituents to represent them, and we'll have the results out within probably about a month.

D. Baker: Great. Any questions for Cathy?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: All right, any comments or questions 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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Hearing none, do I have a motion to adjourn?

Unidentified: So moved.

D. Baker: Second? Aye?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Goodbye.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.