

5-3-2017

UC Transcript 2017-05-03

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2017-05-03" (2017). *University Council Archives*. 18.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/18>

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

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, May 3, 2017, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Baker, Bateni (for Chung), Bishop, Block, Bond, Boughton, Carlson, Chakraborty, Chitwood, Chung, Collins, Demir, Doederlein, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Freeman, Haji-Sheikh, Hanley, Hathaway, Johnson, Kassel, Khoury, Kremenec, Long, Macdonald, Martin (for Wilson), McCord, McHone-Chase, Miller, Mogren, Naples, Newman, Nicholson, Olson, Pavkov, Penrod, Pluim, Rajagopalan, Reynolds, Riley, Rosenbaum (for Briscoe), Russell, Saborío, Scherer, Staikidis, Stiggers, Tahernezehadi (for Ghrayeb), Tan, Thu, Torres, Wang, Wyzard, Zaucha

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Alarcon, Briscoe, Dannenmaier, Ghrayeb, Kreris, LaGioia, Shin, Williams, Wilson

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Klaper, Millhorn, Pinkelton, Stoddard, Wesener Michael, Wilson

OTHERS ABSENT: Coryell, Falkoff, Hoffman, Johns, Kaplan

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Welcome to the last University Council meeting of this academic year – yay! I'd like to call the meeting to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:06 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: And first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Do I have a motion?

C. Doederlein: So moved.

D. Baker: Doederlein. Okay, so I have a second?

V. Naples: Second.

D. Baker: Naples, thank you. And by the way, to reward those two for their excellent work in saying their names, when you speak, please say your name so the captioner can get it on record. So any edits to the agenda? Hearing none, all in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

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

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2017 MEETING

D. Baker: One other reminder, if you don't have a clicker and you're a voting member, go get a clicker...Reed. Next order of business, approval of the minutes of the April 5, 2017 meeting. Do I have a motion?

T. Arado: So moved.

D. Baker: Arado. Do I have a second?

S. Farrell: Second.

D. Baker: Second, Farrell. Any additions or deletions, edits. Hearing none, all in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you, we have that.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

D. Baker: Next order of business is we go right into executive session. So I need a motion to go into closed session to have a report from the committee to evaluate the president of the Faculty Senate and executive secretary of the University Council. Do I have a motion?

M. Riley: So moved.

D. Baker: Who is seconding?

L. Saborío: Second.

D. Baker: Thank you, Linda. All right so I think we've got to pass this. All in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you. So nonvoting members, go eat stuff in the hallway.

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

V. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: Did you leave any food? Well you didn't need to be anxious, Greg. We went over the review, and it was very positive. And I'd like to represent the group in front of you and say that we very much appreciate your hard work, not only this year, but the previous year. These are challenging times in a lot of ways. And I think you've shown a lot of grace and maturity working us

through that. I very much appreciate that. You've also done some big things that are going to have a generation of impact. The policy library, redoing bylaws, those are things that are going to allow this university to function more efficiently and effectively for a long time. So I'd like to just say thank you very much. And we have a little presentation. To memorialize it, hermetically sealed, the golden gavel. It says: Greg Long, Ph.D. In recognition of two years of dedicated service to Northern Illinois University. Faculty Senate and University Council. 2015 to 2017. So let's officially [applause]. Do you want to say a few words?

G. Long: I would just say the same thing I said to Faculty Senate, and that is I so much appreciate everyone's efforts during this year. It really has been a very challenging time. And so thank you for this opportunity. I feel it's been very, very interesting, very worthwhile. I won't say fun, but it's been very, very interesting. And would also just say thank you to the staff, as well as faculty, because staff has been incredibly valuable to us as we're getting through these tough times. So thanks, and I'll turn it back over to the president.

D. Baker: Thank you, Greg. A couple other thank yous. The staff that gets us through these meetings, work tirelessly in the shadows all of the time. And we don't often stop and say thank you to them, so thank you to Pat, Ferald, Sarah and Cathy, doing our captioning, thank you very much. Should we give them a round of applause? [applause] Sarah, did you hear that was for you as you walked in.

S. Klaper: Thank you.

D. Baker: You're welcome.

S. Klaper: I like to make a grand entrance.

D. Baker: That was good, nice timing. Okay, president's announcements. I suspect you wonder what's going on with the budget and the legislature and all those. So I wanted to talk to you about a few things. The cabinet met with the Resource, Space and Budget Committee and representatives from APC last week, I guess it was now, and presented to them the work we're doing, our plans on the current \$35 million budget reduction plan that we've got going on. So we're continuing to meet with the trustees. We took feedback from that group, those two groups and incorporated it. And shortly, we'll be out with plans on how to go forward. I think we've managed well throughout the year to try and hold a lot of positions open and kind of buffer ourselves to that when we go through this, it's going to allow us protect the core of the institution and allow us to really help our faculty and staff fulfill the mission of the institution. So I just want to say thank you to all the people who have worked so hard on this to get us to this point.

I wanted to update you on where we are with the legislature. And usually when I give these reports, I talk about the budget. I don't often talk about all the bills that we're tracking and working on, so since this is our last meeting, and the legislature's within about a month of conclusion, we think, I wanted to give you an update on some of the key bills as well as the money bill, or bills.

So, one of the bills that we've been tracking in Senate Bill 888. That bill authorizes nursing, authorizes community colleges to offer baccalaureates in nursing. Dean Block and I don't think

that's a very good idea, and a number of others in the state think that's a pretty bad idea. We think universities ought to do baccalaureates, and community colleges should do their thing. So we've opposed that. However, it's passed the senate higher education committee, but it's still in the senate. We are opposing it, and a lot of other people are too. It does seem to have some head of steam, though, so we'll continue to work hard on that one. We think that we and other baccalaureate-offering institutions can fulfill the needs and even do it on the community colleges campuses, if needed, and certainly online where a lot of the R.N. to B.S.N. students want to be, is online. So we'll see what happens in the next few weeks on that.

The next bill is House Bill 230, two-three-zero. That would require that all universities in the state automatically admit the top ten percent of the high school class into the university. Now we pretty much do that anyway so it would really affect us, but we've not supported it. We've actually been neutral on that. So in this, you have two options: oppose, support, and neutral. So we've been neutral on principle that we don't think legislatures should legislate admissions requirements. We think that's our job. So we've said that quietly it wouldn't affect us, and then we've just held a neutral position on that.

A bill that's maybe a little more troubling to us is House Bill 3142. And that has passed the house, and it prohibits criminal background checks for admissions. So it would not allow us to ask an incoming student, an applicant, whether they're a convicted felon. Now we do that and then you can go through a review process, because you may be a convicted felon and it's just fine for you to be here. But there may be cases where we're really concerned about life and safety kinds of issues. So we're opposing that as are other schools and campus police departments from around the state. Now, having said that, this bill has a lot of momentum, and I think the supporters of it don't want convicted felons to be excluded from higher education. They want to be able to rebuild their lives and move forward. And I think we do too, but we want to know that our campus, universities are safe. And so that's why we've opposed it and supported a review process internally when you check that box. Certainly we'd want to know if somebody was going to be dangerous to other students or if they're working with children in Laurie Elish-Piper's college, College of Education, we should know some of those things, right? So anyway, we're working hard on that one. It's currently in the senate criminal law committee after having passed the house. Any questions on any of those so far? Yes. I saw eyebrows going up on that one.

C. Carlson: Dean Block can probably help me on this one, but not having background checks would not allow our students to go into clinical sites, so it would end the program, basically.

D. Baker: So, let me start the answer and let Derryl fix it. This is admission to the university. You can have separate background checks for admissions to programs. So it's a university admission criteria. Is that right, Derryl? Okay. Yeah, if you were going to work with people under age 18, with minors, you'd need to do that background check. Yes.

V. Naples: Does this differ dramatically from the policies about hiring of staff or faculty or other appointments here at the university? And if so, how do they justify that, that they say they have to do a background check on some of the people on campus, but not necessarily on others?

D. Baker: I don't think we require background checks on everybody, do we? Do we? We do, okay,

we do. We have a review, okay. So Lisa confirms you are correct, that we do all those.

M. Haji-Sheikh: The purpose, I think, is because of the prison, is to the school to prison pipeline. They're afraid that too many people are getting tagged as felonies of a minority communities and, therefore, it causes an additional scrutiny for people who have been given felony minor drug minor felony, you know, third level, fourth level felonies, and they can't get into schools. So I think that is why they're doing it. Now we can ask questions, how to best and effectively help them decide how to do it, but I can see the same thing is whether or not a felon is allowed to vote and other things in that same vein. Thank you.

D. Baker: Thank you. There have been proposed amendments to say if it's a violent crime or sex offense or something like that. So far, those have not been adopted into the bill parameters, so it's all felonies right now. Somebody else had their hand up. All right, we'll keep track and work on that one.

The next bill is House Bill 3447. It's a tuition reduction grant bill. So here's the deal: The legislature's worried about increasing tuition, and we are too. And I think they've come to realize that tuition went up over the last dozen years because the legislature cut our budget over the last dozen years, and tuition was raised to balance that. For our university, if you look at the curves, if you add the tuition increase to the reduction in state operating budgets, we are still down in the total amount spent. The bill says that going back to 2002, which was the high-water mark for us, which was \$118 million appropriation that year in non-inflation adjusted dollars, just the actual dollars. If we ever get more than \$118 million in our appropriation, we will have to take half of that additional amount and reduce tuition by that amount. So we would get 50 percent to us and 50 percent to students if we ever get back to \$118 million. Probably not in our careers, but I kind of hope that would happen. That would be excellent. So we've actually pled neutral on this. So why would you plead neutral? Again, we don't like the legislature kind of legislating that kind of decision. We think that we should be working with our students and the needs of the university and decide how to do that. We'll see where that one goes. My sense is that that one, since it's been referred to the house rules committee, is probably not going to come back out of the house rules committee. That's where they go to park them for a while if they're idling. So I think that one may idle on through the end of the session, we'll see.

Another one is in-state aid for undocumented students that passed the house committee, but it was re-referred to the rules committee. That one's disappointing to me. Our undocumented students can't get state aid, can't get MAP grants, for example. And that's a real problem. You know, you may grow up here and go K through 12 in Illinois, and then not be allowed to have MAP money, and I think that's a social mobility problem and a state policy problem. And we've supported that one and testified the last two years strongly in favor of it, but to no avail. So my guess is, since it's now in the house rules committee, it'll stay there. In this budget crisis, I don't think they're going to start spending more money on this category of student.

Okay, House Bill 109 is the lifeline budget bill, \$25 million to us. So let me go back a half a step and remind you where we are. We took a 71 percent operating budget cut last year. We took a 48 percent operating budget cut this year, and we don't have MAP funding. So this year we've lost from the good old days of 2015, when we got \$91 million, we've lost \$43 million in operating this

year and \$18 in MAP money so far. So that's \$61 million, \$68 million last year and \$61 million so far this year. The stop gap is to backfill into '17, this year, this fiscal year that ends June 30, eight weeks away, seven weeks away, some kind of stopgap funding to help us through this.

So the current stopgap that came out of the house for NIU would appropriate approximately \$12 million in operating money and \$13 million in MAP. \$13 million of the \$18 million in MAP and \$12 million of the \$43 million in operating. So it's \$25 million. So when I was asked about this last week when I testified in Springfield, I said that \$25 million is better than zero, but it's a lot less than \$61 million. And we need more than \$61 million. We actually need more than \$91 million because we got cut 71 percent last year, faculty and staff have not had raises, we have all kinds of deferred maintenance, we have places we need to invest. So we need a budget bigger than 2015, not smaller.

I see Christine Wang is here. She, along with Lisa Freeman, Larry Pinkelton and Sarah, Christine Black and Sarah was there. So we testified – anyway, I was going to say at the end, Senator McGuire said that the students had provided the best testimony that they'd heard in the legislature. So that was impressive, so thank you. Congratulations. The four years I've been going to Springfield, I've taken students. And students speak from the heart, and they tell the case. They expect the president to say we need more money. But when students speak from the heart, it's impactful.

And I think the legislators do want to find a solution. And there is talk of even a bigger stopgap than the one here. So you know, there's the grand plan that goes back and creates a solution for the state. In its version now would give \$91 million for us. That seems to be idling in the background. There's some talk about is there something between the \$91 million and the \$25 million for us? Is there a mini grand plan, baby grand plan? That's a bad metaphor. So who knows what's going to happen. You're going to see these waves of hope and despair over the next three or four weeks. I think the solution is always to stay in contact with your legislators and the governor's office, and send your opinions on, whatever side of the issue you may be, on your own time from your own email account.

So that's where we are. We're working hard, and Mike Mann has been down there a lot. We were down there a last week. We were down two weeks before that working in the house. So, please continue to communicate. Legislators don't hear enough from higher education, almost to a person, they will tell you that. So even a voice mail message means something, because they count those up and they pay attention, because not that many people voicemail in. It's chaulky. Okay, any questions on any of those?

All right. Since this is our last meeting and since we don't know what's going to happen in the legislature, we're probably going to have to make additional financial decisions in the coming weeks. The RSB has been empowered to be in action this summer, and so if we get to a point where we need to be doing some of that, we will call the RSB and continue to work with the cabinet, and the Executive Budget Committee. So I thank them for their service over the summer.

Okay, one of the things that's really helped us manage through this year has been Program Prioritization. We've made a number of hires and investments, but we've also had to decide where not to hire and hold positions open, and where to make budget reductions. And we're going to put

out an update on Program Prioritization. We've been working feverishly on that the last few weeks, so I want to thank Lisa as well as Chris McCord and Matt Streb – I see Chris in the back here – who've been helping us work through that and keep track of it. It's an impressive piece of work. You all have been busy. This university has done a lot of stuff, and I think you'll be impressed. I hope you'll take time to go look and see what your colleagues around this university are doing. A lot of transformation's going on, and we'll get that out next week, and get that information in front of you, of all the progress that's been made, as well as places where things are still in progress, and other places where we haven't been able to do anything because there's no money to invest there. But it will be an overview of all of that. Lisa can maybe give you some more details. In fact, I think she's next on our agenda. Any questions on it?

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

D. Baker: All right, there's no consent agenda.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

D. Baker: And so I'll move to unfinished business. And the first thing is Program Prioritization. So anything beyond that, Lisa, you want to add?

L. Freeman: I just want to set expectations appropriately. The report covers nicely the progress that's been made for all of the administrative programs, the work that's come out of the complex conversations. The part that I'm writing to summarize what's been going on with respect to academic programs and the academic reports and action plan focuses largely on what's been going on with faculty hiring and program additions, deletions and modifications. And before Professor Haji-Sheikh has a chance to ask the question, I want to say that we will not have the detailed tally of expenses in this report. We are still committed to getting that to the campus. This is a case of the urgent trumping the important. If you can tell, not just by the bags under my eyes, but the bags under Jeff Reynolds' eyes, between fiscal '18 budget development on our campus, Springfield and an incredibly large number of ridiculous, I'll say, legislative requests that we've had to respond to, we just have not had the human resources to devote to doing the assessment of Program Prioritization and the expense total at the level we really want to communicate it. So we will work on that over the summer and get it out in the fall. This is not an attempt to be opaque. It's just a matter of capacity at this point in time. So, like the president, I urge you to read the report. There's a lot in there. It's very, very good work. It won't be the last you'll hear, but it certainly builds tremendously on what was reported in the fall and (this past fall) and will hope to finish up with our assessment and reports for the coming fall. And I'm happy to take questions.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Since you mentioned my name, mostly it's, my concern isn't how much it's costing right now. My concern is just a general overall transparency, the input and output through the system, okay? Not just the Program Prioritization. You can't, you're making claims that it's fixing things, but there's no financial data that either says it does or it doesn't. So it's mostly from a scientific and engineering standpoint, I like to see numbers. It's what I do for a living, so I'd like to see some numbers eventually. I mean you're asking us to come up with \$35 million cuts as an

institution, but then I hear that Athletics is off the table. So let's figure out what's going on. Let us know. We're very gentle sometimes.

L. Freeman: I would like to reiterate that there is no attempt at opacity. The people in my office work extremely hard, and we have tried very hard to communicate in an upfront way and to run a process with integrity. And if that's not apparent, I apologize. It's not for want of trying.

M. Haji-Sheikh: It wasn't [inaudible] I'm talking judgment.

D. Baker: Dr. Haji-Sheikh, you've again made an assertion that's false, that Athletics is off the table. And I think you need to

M. Haji-Sheikh: I was just talking to FSB [inaudible] so don't attack me for something FSB

D. Baker: Well you're repeating something that's false, and I want to set the record straight, all right?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Go ahead.

D. Baker: I just did.

M. Haji-Sheikh: [inaudible]

D. Baker: Okay. Nothing's off the table. We've looked at all the units. We've made differential recommendations for reductions across all of them, and it's been focused on criteria that were used in the Resources, Space and Budget Committee. We explained to the Resources, Space and Budget Committee that came out of Program Prioritization. I think these are appropriate steps to take to most gracefully deal with these issues, these budget reduction issues that are of unprecedented magnitude. This is not easy to do, but I think so far we've done a pretty good job, and we'll continue to do that.

B. Follow-up on Faculty Senate response to December 22 Baker Report – Greg Long

D. Baker: Next, Greg, you've got a Faculty Senate update.

G. Long: And I would just add a bit of clarification to the disagreement between President Baker and Professor Haji-Sheikh. Relative to following up with the RSB question on Athletics. We did, in fact, as President Baker mentioned, participate in a meeting last Friday afternoon where each of the divisions shared their budget and what they're going to do to save money. One of the outcomes of that meeting was several of the members of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee talked about, you know, might there be ways of looking at Athletics as another avenue to make some cuts. And within the committee, several people contributed and wrote up a number of questions. We pulled together some information, but this has all happened within essentially a week's time. And so in sharing that with Larry Pinkelton, the idea would be that the Resource, Space and Budget Committee will essentially share some information right now with the idea being that this gets continued over the summer and next fall. So there's really not sufficient time to look at this. You'd

also want to have the athletic director, Sean Frazier, to be part of the discussion. And so there's not an attempt to hide anything or postpone it. It's a questions of, given the time frame that we have available to us right now, putting it out there as an issue that will be followed up over the summer and in the fall. So, just some clarification on that.

Also as we're going here, the follow up on the Faculty Senate, as I mentioned last month, the Faculty Senate did adopt a resolution to work with the Board of Trustees to participate in President Baker's current review and also to develop policy, I mean, excuse me, to develop policy to codify future faculty, staff and student involvement in presidential evaluations. The board has, is using the firm of Greenwood/Asher & Associates to conduct a 360 review of the president. They're using an outside agency, outside consultants, to control for privacy and confidentiality. And Greenwood/Asher, they are an approved vendor from the Illinois Public Commission. I will say the review has already begun. It began virtually immediately following the last University Council meeting, or Faculty Senate meeting. Individual and group meetings, interviews, have been held with members of the Faculty Senate, University Council, Operating Staff Council, SPS Council and the Student Association. And feedback from these meetings will be used as data points during the discussion of President Baker's evaluation. So I sincerely appreciate the board's willingness to be interested in our opinions and be inclusive in this approach.

Would also say that last week's Faculty Senate agenda included a confidence resolution that had been postponed from the senate's March 29 meeting. This resolution was proposed by Professor Haji-Sheikh and stated, "The Faculty Senate resolves to demonstrate their confidence in Dr. Douglas D. Baker to lead Northern Illinois University as president for the foreseeable future." Shortly after opening, this topic was opened, Professor Linda Saborío, excuse me, moved to table the resolution. The request to table was put to a vote and passed with a vote of 37 to 17. As such, the resolution died. Now this does not preclude the senate from any future resolution should there be a need. But this is how it's resolved at this point. Any questions? Okay.

C. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws [Article 3.6](#) – Page 3
Office of the Executive Secretary – **SECOND READING/ACTION ITEM**

G. Long: So moving on, we have a second reading of the proposed amendment to NIU's Bylaw, Article 3.6. Call your attention to our amendment procedures. A vote on an amendment to bylaws requires the presence of 60 percent plus one of the total voting membership of the University Council. And then to become effective, an amendment must be approved by the greater of: a) the majority of the total voting membership of UC, or two-thirds of the voting members in attendance. So the first part of this, we need to do is, everybody have a clicker that's a voting member of the University Council? If you would, are we ready to take attendance yet? All right, if you would, just click 1 to let us know you're here. All right, so has everyone clicked in that's going to click in at this point? 51? Okay, so we've got 51 people here, so we certainly exceed our 60 percent of the total voting membership of the University Council. So we need to attain two-thirds of, we need to attain 34 votes to have this pass, okay?

So we have a proposed amendment to NIU's Bylaws Article 3.6. May I have a motion to approve?

C. Doederlein: So moved.

G. Long: A second?

T. Martin: Second.

G. Long: Okay, and discussion on this. Again, this is a second reading to bring the bylaw into alignment with current practice and expectations, which require a 12-month commitment of the executive secretary. So to accommodate the 12-month contract, the university budget, University Council budget funds three months of salary and not two. So that's what this amendment is all about. Just providing an extra month of salary for the executive secretary, given that it is a 12-month commitment in terms of time. Any discussion on this.

C. Doederlein: Just discussion, not necessarily specific to whether or not people should vote for this specific bylaw, but just to bring awareness that the Operating Staff and Supportive Professional Staff roles receive no compensation. So just in terms of a parity standpoint, as we're considering moving this to 12 months, just felt a need to mention that the roles of the presidents of both of those councils do not receive any compensation, so something to think about.

G. Long: Thank you. Yes.

A. Krmeneč: I asked this questions last time, I did not receive an answer, and I need to ask it again. If this is a 12-month paid position, it's eligible for vacation. How much vacation? So out of the 12 months, how much time is University Council actually getting. If it's an 11-month position, it is not eligible for vacation.

G. Long: Right, correct. And you're quite right and have mentioned that to Provost Freeman. And that's a discussion with HR. Lisa, do you want to say anything about that? That we would, that there is an inclination to look at that as a 12-month contract with associated vacation time and so forth.

L. Freeman: Greg made me aware of your question, Andy, just yesterday, and I haven't gotten a full clarification from HR. I will say that my initial reaction is that, if it's to be a 12-month position, with the language in the amendment written as a 12-month contract, it would get the vacation that someone who was SPS with rank would be eligible to get under that type of contractual structure. One of the things that's appealing about positioning it as a 12-month contract rather than 9 + 3, irrespective of vacation, is the way that it's reported to the IBHE, because then it's more transparent in terms of the overall compensation, and easier for people to see. So I would say that the way it's worded right now with the 12-month contract, the vacation would be whatever anyone who is SPS with rank is entitled to. And if that's not the will of the body, then the language there needs to be changed.

G. Long: Thank you. Other questions, other discussion. All right, then let's take a vote on this. If you're in favor of the amendment, press 1. If you are not in favor, 2. And if you abstain, 3. Are we ready? Okay, so 1 if yes, 2 if no, 3 abstain.

P. Erickson: The number of attendance went up, so we need 35 votes.

G. Long: The number of attendance went up, so we need 35 votes on this. And it passes.

Yes – 41 votes

No – 5 votes

Abstain – 6 votes

G. Long: And again, just as a perspective, when we were talking last year, we've talked about the bylaws threshold, making changes to the amendments, last year this would not have passed. So that is one of the advantages and compliments that I would give to University Council is the ability to see that we need to be efficient and to have votes that represent the entire group. And I think, again, you know, you still have room for some disagreement here, but we're able to move things forward so, again, thank you for that.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Student Grievance Annual Report per NIU Bylaws [Article 12.6](#) – Greg Long – Page 4
No student grievances were filed during the 2016-17 academic year.

G. Long: Moving on to number VIII. New Business. As executive secretary, I am supposed to give a student grievance annual report per the bylaws. And my report is that there were no student grievances last, this past year. So we're hoping that those, that means that things are being settled at a lower level, that we're mediating things versus the students don't know about it. Nonetheless, from our standpoint, there were no student grievances that came through the office this year. And I turn it back to you for reports.

IX. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

D. Baker: All right, first is the FAC to the IBHE, Paul Stoddard.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. The FAC to the IBHE, for which I am the NIU rep, I think I got all the letters we need in there.

D. Baker: That's good.

P. Stoddard: Met on April 14 at WIU, which is Western Illinois out in Macomb. We got our usual welcome, this time from the WIU president, Jack Thomas, who is also a governor's appointee to the IBHE. He talked about their enrollments. Their freshman enrollment is down only 0.45 percent this year, that's a total of eight students. Their transfers, however, are down a bit more. They are trying to attract more international students. They currently have about 500. They're trying to get 1,000 in there. They visited Gwangju University, whose president is a Western alum. They're following the 15 to completion program where, if you take 15 hours every semester, you should be able to graduate in four years. They reduced their tuition ten percent. They also, on the IBHE front, he says that they're talking about not duplicating efforts among programs across the state. The representative from Chicago State pointed out that most of their students are financially constrained

to remain near home and, thus, would be unable to participate in programs that are only offered elsewhere in Illinois. So maybe penny-wise but pound-foolish.

Moving on, in the afternoon, I guess later in the morning, we had a conversation with State Senator Jil Tracy, who is a Republican state senator from that area. I think the fact that she has an R after her name made her a prime target for many of the people at the meeting. She's an SIU-E and SIU-C graduate, former lieutenant governor candidate, she ran with Kirk Dillard, and she has lots of schools in her district. She started off talking about how the budget situation affects university committees. She soon pivoted to workman's compensation reform echoing the governor's budget, or governor's priorities. She was called on that, and the impression I got as she was being questioned and tried to answer concerns being raised by members of the FAC, is that I think personally she kind of agrees with where the FAC was, which is that, you know, we need to be funding higher ed. We need a budget for the state, regardless of some of the governor's priorities that are not strictly budget-related. However, she, as I'm afraid many of her Republican colleagues are afraid, that retributions might be in store should they not follow the governor's agenda. So it was an interesting conversation that we had.

We also had our normal caucus meetings so, as Northern's representative, I'm in with the four-year publics. These usually turn into a circle of whoa where we all talk about the horrible things that are happening on our campuses due to the budget constraints that we are forced to operate under. Southern Illinois University-Carbondale has run out of unrestricted funds. At Eastern, money is tight; they're discussing program eliminations, but they haven't eliminated anything yet. Governor's State has eliminated 22 programs with more being proposed. So there are a lot of things going on. Even the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign is suffering as they got a mid-year raise, but it was only their first mid-year raise in three years, so they are feeling the pinch like the rest of us are. And that's basically my report.

D. Baker: Any questions for Paul? Do we want to ask our IBHE board member if she has any other insights? Stephanie, do you have anything else?

S. Torres: The only thing that I would add is the board is also against Senate Bill 888, which is the community college offering, the option to offer baccalaureate degrees. Also something interesting, they tried to gather data from the different surrounding states to see where our students are going, at what rates, and to find out if there's a common misconception of it's a lot cheaper to go outside of the state than to stay within our public universities. They found that it's actually more expensive, depending on where you are situation. So they're trying to find out a way how we can market that idea so that students stay within our public universities. And they find that it is actually more, it is a better option for them to stay here. So that was pretty much it.

D. Baker: Paul.

P. Stoddard: One other thing came up since that meeting. I know we've discussed in here the appointment of John Bambenek to the board by the governor. This was not met warmly by the FAC. His nomination has been withdrawn, and he is now being nominated to serve on the Community College Board instead. So we have another opportunity to get someone we feel would be more represented of faculty on the board. And we are still going ahead with the bill to try to increase

representation among faculty on the board, or at least get faculty to nominate the person who ultimately serves in that seat.

D. Baker: Good. Yeah, that was in the news. Good to see, so congratulations on working on that. Stephanie had one more thought on that too.

S. Torres: And I just wanted to add the former trustee here at Northern, she now sits on IBHE with us, Cherilyn Murer. So she's working closely with her.

D. Baker: Yeah, I appreciate Cherilyn Murer, who left our board in December, I guess, or January, joining the IBHE. She has a unique set of experiences having been on our board and chaired our board over a 12-year period. So she really understands kind of how a university governance system works, what the needs of the university are. And I think we need more of that kind of skill set on the IBHE. So it's good to have students with the experience and then somebody that's been on a board like Cherilyn Murer, so congratulations to her and thank her for serving.

S. McHone-Chase: I was wondering if there is any way for us to weigh in on who serves on the IBHE. How do we make our opinions known? Is there any way to do that?

P. Stoddard: The way it had worked in the past is that the FAC would nominate two people, forward those names to the governor, who would pick one of them. This governor chose to ignore those nominations and pick his own person. If there are people who are interested or you would like to nominate, I think the way to go would be to forward that name to me as the FAC rep for Northern, and I would bring that to the attention of the full FAC. And any biographical information you might have to help make the case for that person, I would be happy to forward on to the full FAC as well.

S. McHone-Chase: Thank you.

D. Baker: Anybody else? Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Stephanie.

1. March 17, 2017 [meeting report](#) – Pages 5-7
- 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. Election of 2017-18 Executive Secretary of University Council per
NIU Bylaws [Article 14.5](#) – Page 8

D. Baker: Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, Therese Arado.

T. Arado: All right, good afternoon, everyone. It is time for the election of the 2017-18 executive secretary to the University Council. Our nominee for the office of 2017-18 executive secretary of University Council, who also serves as president of Faculty Senate, is Linda Saborío. I move to accept her nomination, to close the nominations and to approve her election to this position. May I have a second?

S. Farrell: Second.

Unidentified: Second.

T. Arado: I have lots of seconds. Is there any discussion? Okay, we are going to vote by secret ballot using our clickers. When the polling opens, we will vote as follows. 1 or A is yes, in favor of Linda Saborío. 2 or B is no. 3 or C is abstain. We're good to go, Pat? Okay. Okay, we're holding at 48. Does anyone need more time, just since we've had different numbers before? Oh, 49. Going once. Okay, it's held long enough, let's close the polling. And congratulations, Linda. And that is the end of my report.

Yes – 42 votes

No – 3 votes

Abstain – 4 votes

D. Baker: Linda, would you like to say a few words?

L. Saborío: Yes. Thank you, and I look forward to working with all of you in this upcoming year, including Michael. He's sitting there ignoring me. Don't ignore me. And I would like to say a big thank you to Greg, though, because over the last few weeks, he has been extremely helpful with my transition into this position. So thank you to Greg too.

D. Baker: All right, thank you. Look forward to working with you.

2. Policy Library update and shared governance [recommendations](#) – Greg Long – Pages 11-12

D. Baker: In fact, speaking of Greg, Policy Library update.

G. Long: In March, I submitted my summary of services as the executive secretary of University Council and Faculty Senate president. And mistakenly, I thought that that report would be appended in the agenda packet for Faculty Senate and University Council, so I wrote it in two parts, Part 1 was basically what I had done, and Part 2 was recommendations. Then I come to find out, oops, made a mistake and that's not going to be in your agenda packet, so I wanted to take advantage of my last meeting as executive secretary and also as an NIU professor to share the second part of my report with you on recommendations. I did the same thing with Faculty Senate last week. And if

you've read the memo, which is on pages 11 and 12 of your agenda packet, it includes a lot of what I covered during last month's presentation about the policy library. And so rather than belabor the necessity of the library, I want to highlight three issues for you.

First, I need to clarify a statement that I've been making for nearly two years. And specifically, I've mentioned the importance of revising the Constitution and Bylaws. As I was driving to work this morning, I realized that this message is a little misleading, because, actually, it's a two-part document and the bylaws. And if you actually look at it, the constitution is well-written. It's comparable to other universities. And so when I talk about the need to revise the Constitution and Bylaws, that really was not being nearly as accurate as I should have been. And I'm sorry, but this is the last time I'll ever have the chance to use this prop, so I'm going to use it one final time for you. This is our Constitution and Bylaws, okay? So about page 3 to page 8, this is 15 pages long, very similar to many other universities. This, however, is our Constitution and Bylaws, 140-some pages of policies and procedures that have no place to be in a university's constitution and bylaws. So I did want to at least clarify that one point that, when I talk about, you know, as you all, as this body moves forward and is thinking about making changes to the Constitution and Bylaws, it's really the idea of focusing on the bylaws and where would they belong better than detailed in the constitution, because, like I say, this is four or five times as lengthy as any other university I've looked at. And we have benchmarked a lot of universities. So definitely trying not to be at all misleading on that.

So when we focused on the bylaws last year, it did result in changing the threshold for amending the bylaws, which was very helpful. And as a next step, we needed to move into the Policy Library in a way that creates the same level of protections that we're finding in the Constitution and Bylaws. So as I mentioned last month, this year we focused really on the Policy Library. Progress continues with website development, collecting and categorizing policies and finalizing the policy management guidelines. We're rapidly approaching the stage where we're going to be able to begin uploading policies. Both University Council grad assistants have been taking training, and they're ready to start that task. So in short, progress continues on that.

The second part I want to mention, though, relates to the management of the Policy Library. We've benchmarked, as I mentioned, a number of other universities across the country who use online policy libraries. And all of those settings, all of those universities, have someone, typically called a policy librarian, to oversee, manage and otherwise facilitate policy review, posting and so on and so forth. At this point, the question of a policy librarian for us is a challenge, because we need someone to manage the Policy Library. If not, the Policy Library's going to die. It's not going to be successful. And I recognize that this represents a request for a new position during a really terrible budget situation, but I believe the return on investment would be worth it, and would also emphasize that the University Council's Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, headed by Therese Arado and Faculty Senate Becqui Hunt, support hiring a policy librarian as do the leaders of shared governance, Holly Nicholson representing the Operating Staff Council as president, Cathy Doederlein as president of SPS Council, Christine Wang, Student Association speaker of the senate, and Giuseppe LaGioia, Student Association president. So when we were pushing this forward, we recognized that this is a terrible time to promote the concept of another position. On the other hand, as an endeavor that has come up from the grassroots, upward, we do have strong support from the other constituencies in shared governance to get this funded and approved. So would encourage the

president to move forward on that.

And finally, as noted in the memo, I strongly support efforts to create a shared governance structure where the Faculty Senate has increased authority over academic and curricular matters, because, as present, at present, the Faculty Senate is largely a curricular, is largely a caucus body with no real authority. And as I mentioned before, in addition to strengthening the Faculty Senate's role, I would also include and encourage greater parity for our staff colleagues on University Council. If you look around the room, we've got a fairly full room here, and our staff colleagues only have four seats in this whole body. So from the standpoint of parity and representation, that's, you know, that's not exactly where I think we should be. And would certainly note and support Cathy Doederlein's comment that, as president of SPS Council and Holly Nicholson as president of SPS Council, yeah, they get, excuse me, of Operating Staff Council, they both gets pats on the back, they get a little bit of release time, but they don't get nearly the level of support that I get in my role as Faculty Senate president. And yes, while I do have a few more responsibilities, they do a tremendous of work outside of work hours, and they're very good role models for the constituencies and give far more than they get. But yeah, they, the staff really do not have the same level of representation and participation that I think should be afforded them in this particular body.

And so that's pretty much it in terms of the update. Like I say, the Policy Library development is moving forward. The policy statement on guidelines is nearly complete, and otherwise it's all going well. Any questions on this? Please.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I just want to, so people understand, the policy librarian would be similar to like a city clerk or like county clerk, somebody keeping track of all the documentation. And since we are essentially public body, I mean that would be something that would be something we ought to think about, having a person doing it.

G. Long: Oh yeah, absolutely.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Because if I'm an outsider, and I'm looking in and want to see what we do from the governance standpoint, boy I wouldn't know where to start or where to tell them to start.

G. Long: Right, right. Thanks, no. Feel very strongly that we need somebody in the position. I think that this will not work if we don't have a dedicated person for the position. So, no, that's my experience in looking at many other universities, it's not something that could be done as just an add-on to someone's calendar, because this is also may have issues related to compliance. This is going to evolve, I suspect. So, yeah, I, I would argue strongly that it needs to be a dedicated position. Eric.

E. Mogren: Where do you envision this librarian being, you know, the position being housed, because already we have, through the Regional History Center, the official curators of the historical and contemporary documents of the university. So is this being, is this position going to be within the library, for example? Or is this going to be

G. Long: No, at this point, as currently discussed within the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, the idea would be to have this position out of the Office of General Counsel, because

it's, these are dealing only with university-wide policies, so nothing at a lower level, and needing to facilitate the overall process.

E. Mogren: Okay, thank you.

G. Long: You bet. Anyone else? Like I say, I very much understand and appreciate the budgetary situation we're in, but I have to say, having spent, at this point, nearly two years looking through our policies and Constitution and Bylaws, and so forth, and looking at what other places have done, if we really want to get up to speed and want to work in a more efficient fashion, this is a project that really does need completion. And completion won't happen, I think, unless the policy librarian gets put in place. Morse.

M. Tan: Just wondering how much would this position cost?

G. Long: And at that point, we have no idea, because it's not yet gotten to HR, and we've, I mean, there's been a rough draft put together, but there's nothing formal on it, and I would not be in a position to say what it would pay. I'm sorry.

M. Tan: [inaudible]

G. Long: It would not be a lawyer, though, just from the standpoint of, I mean, Greg Brady as acting general counsel, had requested it not be a lawyer, because we don't want to create confusion in the Office of General Counsel in terms of them providing legal services per se. So it would be, at this point, discussion's more of a higher-level administrative assistant-type person, somebody who has some Web knowledge and can organize the review cycles and keep track of things. That's kind of what we're looking at right now.

L. Freeman: Greg, can I suggest that, since your group has done a lot of benchmarking, that we look at the qualifications and backgrounds of the people who serve in this role at other universities, and that that be forwarded with HR, along with the expectations for what the role would be like at NIU. And we can then ask HR to actually look at the market and do a reasonable comparison to set salary guidelines.

G. Long: Thank you. Good suggestion. Anyone else?

M. Haji-Sheikh: One more, one more minor point. It could be even looked at like a clerk could be combined with the FOIA office or something where they're have the access to all the documentation that they need to have. I mean if it's going to be supervised by legal eventually anyways at some point.

G. Long: Thank you. Thanks. Anyone else? Any other suggestions? Okay. Well with that, I will turn it back to President Baker.

D. Baker: Thank you, Greg. And the provost and I also support this. If you don't have somebody working on these issues, it's going to go dormant, and all the hard work will go to waste. So I think it's an important position. And there's probably a lot of catch-up too. We have policies that may not

be in alignment with one another, so there's going to be a lot of backlog work to go back and sift through that, rationalize the system.

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

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

D. Baker: Let's see, next I guess we've got the Student Association. Giuseppe LaGioia is not here. Christine, you're up.

C. Wang: Good afternoon everyone. We've had a pretty busy month. It's usually pretty busy in the last month anyway, but just wanted to start off with what we've done on the state level. So on April 11, we held Pizza with Pritchard and Dinner with Demmer. I think we had about 20 students that came out, had some pizza and pretty much argued with the representatives over budgets and access bills and stuff like that. And so, I mean it was good to hear the perspectives of students and also hear from these representatives as well. It's something we're looking forward to continuing in the fall as well as in the spring of next year as well. So it's a very good event, and I think that it should definitely be established as something that is regular no matter who is sitting in those seats, whether it's Rep. Pritchard or Rep. Demmer, I think something that we should pursue as well.

We also had, we traveled down to Governors State University to join in on the Illinois Student Senate Forum. There were a number of senators and representatives there, notably Sen. McGuire, Rep. Davis, Sen. Murphy and Rep. Riley. And schools that were present were: Chicago State University, Northern Illinois University and Governor State University. It was an interesting conversation. There were a number of comments made about the budget situation and how these representatives and senators were trying to establish, you know, some sort of consensus on how to deal with this. One of the most troubling comments was from one particular representative that stated, "I don't feel comfortable representing the opinions of another person," which doesn't make any sense considering how you are a representative. So that was one of the most notable comments that I heard, but overall, it seems like there's no, there's no general plan. And that's really troubling, considering how it's, what I think 22 months now without a budget. There's no one plan even among the same party of how to deal with this and how to tackle this. Every single senator, every single representative has a different idea of how to do it. And I think that they better start learning how their actual position works and know what they're getting into before they make statements like that.

We also had the opportunity to travel down to Springfield and testify in front of the Illinois House Appropriations Committee, as well as the Senate Appropriations Committee. So thank you very much to President Baker for inviting us down. President-elect Rachel Jacob also came down and testified. It was a huge pleasure and really a privilege to be there, a humbling experience. And so it was really something that I hope that these senators and representatives will really take to heart when they consider the budget situation, especially at NIU.

We also went and lobbied on April 26, so we actually stayed overnight. It was a very, very full

house. I think there is a lot of anger down in Springfield towards these representatives and senators as well. And there was a lot of groups down there. There was the Fight for \$15. There was Alzheimer's Association. There were people who were lobbying for the [Student] ACCESS Bill, among other things, as well as higher education. There were a lot of people, very, very angry people, who were trying to contact these representatives and trying to get some sort of answer as to why these social services were not being provided to them.

So we were able to hit on Sen. McGuire, Rep. Moeller, Rep. Guzzardi and Sen. Hastings, among some of the representatives, as well as Rep. Pritchard as well. So I think it was, you know, it's the same old conversation, but I think showing our face has definitely paid off, especially we saw that in the testimony, that they recognized our faces and they gave us a little bit, I think, a little bit of preference, I think, they had recognized our faces, and they had recognized the work that we had done. So I highly encourage everyone to go down there, especially if you're students, whether or not you're associated with the Student Association. And if you're not, come join us. So those are the things that we've done with the state.

We've also done some things with the city. We were, we had the opportunity to present in front of the DeKalb City Council on April 24 with the [S.A.] director of governmental affairs, Caleb Tomaszewski. We talked about five themes or planks that we had discovered during that O'leary's discussion, which was: communication, street sidewalk lighting, downtown transportation, weekend activities, and a sense of community. So from what I've heard is that the City Council appreciated our work and thought that it was very concise and clear. And they're definitely going to move forward with the action plans that we talked about as well.

And finally, just wrapping up some of the more internal things that we had. We've had a couple of ceremonies, events. One Culture NIU was the first week of April, and that was a huge success. We had Green Week, I think it was the third week. And NIU Cares Day. So I just wanted to say a special thank you to Liz McKee from SILD and also the department, because they did such a wonderful job. And thank you to those of you who did also participate. It was great to see our community and our university coming together.

We also had our Student Choice Awards on April 27, and then we had our final meeting on Saturday, or on Sunday, excuse me, as well as our banquet. I want to also give a shout out to a couple people. Our graduate staff, who is Kayla Sorenson and Morgan Morris. They are graduating this May. We'll be sad to see them go. We also awarded Senator of the Year, so he's actually sitting right here, Tristan Martin. So he's done a really great job for the university as a senator, so please give him a round of applause [applause]. And we also awarded our Committee of the Year, which was our Public Affairs Committee. They did a lot in promoting culture and diversity throughout the university as well.

Other than that, we've appointed new directors for the cabinet. I figured I might give a little bit of Giuseppe's report as well. So he actually, excuse me, the president-elect actually selected her cabinet, and so actually right here is sitting our new director of academic affairs. So I think it will be a good year next year, and I'm really looking forward to working with them. So thank you so much.

D. Baker: Any questions for Christine? Nope? Well thanks for your great work and your testimony.

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

D. Baker: Next we've got Holly Nicholson from Operating Staff Council.

H. Nicholson: Just very quickly, I wanted to mention that our elections are beginning either Friday or Monday, depending on when I send the email. So please encourage any staff that you know to vote in our elections. With the increased opportunities that we've been given to have input, which we really appreciate, it's more important than ever that staff be involved in choosing the people who get to represent them. It is all electronic this year, so if you do know staff who don't have access to a computer, if you can encourage them to try to find that. They can contact me if they're having trouble finding a place to do their electronic voting. So that's all, thank you.

D. Baker: Great, anything for Holly?

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

D. Baker: Cathy Doederlein from SPS.

C. Doederlein: Thank you. Just a couple of heads-up. We are doing our student appreciation event, which we've done now every spring and so passing out cookies in MLK Commons. Today 850 cookies went in under two-and-a-half hours, so it was a success, and we're back out there tomorrow with as many cookies and, hopefully, as much interest.

Definitely looking forward, the Operating Staff Council and Supportive Professional Staff Council, as well as APAC are getting the opportunity to meet with the president and folks from Admissions and Marketing to come up with some brainstorming strategies on ways that staff specifically can impact recruitment and retention. There's obviously things we're already doing, but we're excited to engage in that conversation and appreciate that opportunity.

As I mentioned previously, we did complete our SPS survey and we're just finalizing the reporting from that. And I will definitely then be passing it along and sharing it. And hopefully at the beginning of next year, can kind of share more detailed results with this council.

And then just really want to thank Greg Long for his support of both Operating Staff and Supportive Professional Staff. He's taken some real time in his role to learn more about the challenges that staff face. And while still advocating for faculty, which we agree is really the core of an academic institution as it should be, we appreciate that he's definitely acknowledged our role on this campus as well. So thank you to him. And good luck in your retirement.

D. Baker: Holly?

H. Nicholson: Can I second that. Well said, Cathy. Thank you for thinking of that.

D. Baker: And Greg acknowledged the staff at the awards ceremony the other day.

G. Long: And I would say there was an award ceremony and, for anyone in here who is faculty, I didn't mean to dis us. When I said that historically we've always thought of faculty as the heart of the institution, heart of the university. And I've said that I subscribed to that belief for a lot of years, until the last couple of years. And in this particular role, where I've gotten much greater understanding and sensitivity to the competence and the time and the dedication that staff put in. And so, yeah, no, I absolutely believe that, you know, between faculty and staff, we're the heart and soul of the university. Not really going to say much about where the administrators are, but from the standpoint of looking at and valuing staff, I think that it is very important that we look at ourselves as collaborators and as supporting of one another, because we do not want to turn against one another in these difficult times. So yeah, I have definitely gained a new appreciation for our colleagues who are staff members, and they definitely put in the same amount of time oftentimes that we do, you know, where it's not reimbursed, lots of evening hours, lots of weekend hours. I've talked to people at nights and so forth. So no, this is something that staff, unless, again, I've had the opportunity to be in this position for two years and now I see, I have a much better understanding, because before, you know, they were nice helpers, right. Well that's very patronizing, and it's arrogant. But having now the experience, it's like oh, now I get it in a different way. And so just to say that, while I'm leaving, I would encourage certainly that renewed sense of working together in collaboration as a university rather than as constituency groups, may be the best suggestion for moving forward.

D. Baker: That's kind of a nice closing note.

X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: Not to cut off, but are there any other comments from the floor?

XI. INFORMATION ITEMS

D. Baker: Two other things then on the way out. I point you at Item Q, VI. Q., which is the meeting schedule for next year so you can get that on your calendar. And then tonight there's going to be another Diversity Dialogue, Diversity Dialogues Reimagined. It will be in Altgeld Hall auditorium at 6. This is an interesting one, bringing together co-sponsored by Greeks as well as some Black students who have come together to have a dialogue around some of these critical issues of race. So encourage all of you to go to that at 6 o'clock in Altgeld auditorium.

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- C. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council

- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- Q. [2017-18 Meeting Schedule](#) – Page 13

XII. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Anything else for the good of the order? Do I have a motion to adjourn? Thanks for a great year. All in favor.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? All right, see if there's any more food out there. Thank you, Greg.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.