

9-6-2017

FS Transcript 2017-09-06

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "FS Transcript 2017-09-06" (2017). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 53.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate/53>

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 Faculty Senate Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, September 6, 2017, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Azad, Baker, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Bujarski, Buck, Carlson, G. Chen, J. Chen, Chitwood, Chomentowski, Creed, Demir, Duffin, Fredericks, Glatz, Grund, Haji-Sheikh, Hanna, Hathaway, Jaekel, Johnson, Johnston-Rodriguez, Krmeneč, Liu, May, McHone-Chase, Millhorn, Montana, Mooney, Moraga, Naples, Nejd, Newman, Novak, Plum, Powell, Rheineck, Riley, Rodgers, Ryu, Saborío, Schatteman, Schraufnagel, Shi, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Song, Staikidis, Surjardi, Than, Thu, Whedbee, Wilson, Zheng

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Briscoe, Chung, Hunt, Konen, Millis, Mogren, Patro, Penrod, Scherer, Stephen, Ward

OTHERS PRESENT: Barsema, Bryan, Coleman, Doederlein, Freeman, Gelman, Groza, Klaper, Torres

OTHERS ABSENT: Andree, Click

I. CALL TO ORDER

L. Saborío: Good afternoon. I'd like to call the meeting to order. For those of you who don't know me, I am not Greg Long. Greg Long retired. He's been spotted in a very loud Hawaiian shirt, I think, over in Geneva looking tan and happy. My name is Linda Saborío, and I'm associate professor of Spanish in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures with a specialization in Mexican and U.S. Latina theater. And this is my first year as Faculty Senate president. And the pronouns that I use are she, her, hers. And in Spanish, *ajá*.

So before we get started, I know I'm probably already rogue at this point, in approving agendas and whatnot. I would like to introduce to you, for those of you who are new: Pat Erickson, administrative assistant to University Council and Faculty Senate [applause]. I can tell you right now, she is the true director of this show, isn't she?

Sitting next to her is Ferald Bryan, and assuming that on the consent agenda you will endorse him, he will be our parliamentarian again for this year. Thank you very much for agreeing to be our parliamentarian. [applause]

And next to him will be Sarah Klaper. She's not here at the moment. She's always running late – several meetings. And she's the university ombudsperson, and she's going to try and keep us legal. So we wish her much luck with that task, right?

So before we begin, can I remind everyone to please use your microphones and state your name when you do. We no longer have our captioner. She's no longer with us due to budget restraints. Yeah, I know, I know, because it kept you all awake, right, you could read what was going on. And

you spaced out for a moment, and you go, wait a minute, go back, and you can read the paragraph. Sorry.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

L. Saborío: So let's move forward here with the adoption of the agenda. Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda? Thank you, Laura Beamer. And a second. Second, we have Therese Arado. Okay, so we have a motion and a second. Any discussion? No. All in favor, say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Opposed? Abstain? None, okay, great, the agenda has been approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 26, 2017 FS MEETING

L. Saborío: And then we have the approval of the minutes of the April 26 meeting. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes. Therese again. Thank you, Therese. And a second? Laura, we've got two players here. Thank you. Any changes to the minutes? No changes, okay. Revisions or corrections? None, okay, all in favor.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Opposed? Abstain? None? Great, minutes have been approved.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

L. Saborío: Consent agenda. These are items that do not require discussion, for those of you who are new this year. But if there is an item on the consent agenda that you would like to remove, you have to make a motion to do so, just to let you know. That being said, would anybody like to remove an item from the consent agenda? George? Remove an item? Are you making a motion to remove? No, you're actually making a motion to approve the consent agenda, fabulous. He's moving us right along here. So we have a motion. Second? Kendall Thu. We don't have any discussion then, so we just say, all in favor?

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Opposed? Abstain? Consent agenda has passed. Thank you, we're moving right along.

- A. Approve the [2017-18 Faculty Senate Standing Committees](#) membership rosters per Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 3 – Page 4
- B. Approve the [faculty members of the 2017-18 UC-Steering Committee](#) per NIU Bylaws Article 2.1.1 – Page 5

- C. Approve LAS-COMM Professor Ferald Bryan to serve as the 2017-18 Faculty Senate parliamentarian per Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 2.2
- D. Approve EDU-KNPE Professor Zachary Wahl-Alexander to serve a two-year term in an at-large faculty seat on the Parking Appeals Committee per committee membership guidelines
- E. Approve HHS-AHCD Professor Hamid Bateni and LAS-FLAL Professor Tharaphi Than to serve on the 2017-18 Ombudsperson Review Committee per NIU Bylaws Article 20.5.1

V. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs Committee – Clanitra Stewart NejdI, Chair – no report
- C. Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession – Laura Beamer, Chair – no report
- D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Keith Millis, Liaison/Spokesperson

L. Saborío: Reports from standing committees. We have Item D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. Keith Millis is out sick. He is sad to have to miss his debut here. Luckily, we have Therese Arado with us, who has done this several years, I think, now, so she is well aware of the procedure. And we're going to need to do a few elections here before we get to our celebrity panel on my left. So, Therese, it's all yours.

T. Arado: We have several elections to hold today. Just want to remind you that there are ballots at every place, but only use the ballot that's at your place if you are a voting member of the Faculty Senate. If you are not sure if you are a voting member, I know Pat had a lovely list up there at one point. Do we still have the list? Okay, so she will put it up. If your name is on that list, you are a voting member.

1. Election of University Council alternates – ballots will be distributed at the FS meeting

T. Arado: The first thing that we are going to do is elect University Council alternates from among the faculty senators. As an alternate, you might be called upon during the year to serve on University Council should a UC member from your college be unable to attend a meeting. The ballots are color-coded, and we are going to distribute them by college. Faculty senators, as well as faculty members of UC who are present today are all eligible to vote for these alternates. When you receive your college ballot, please vote for the number of people noted at the top of your ballot. Once you have voted, leave your ballot at your place, and it will be collected after the meeting adjourns. We have two colleges that we have to vote for so I'm going to do these separately here. The first is the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. If you are from that college, would you raise your hand, please. All right, everybody from Engineering got one?

Okay our other one is from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. If you'd raise your hand from that college. Okay, so everybody from Arts and Sciences also got their ballot? So if you would make your selections on these and leave them at your seat, they will be collected at the end of the meeting.

2. Election of Hearing Panel – ballots will be distributed at the FS meeting

T. Arado: Our next item is the Hearing Panel election. The Hearing Panel is used for appeals based on Bylaws Article 7.3 regarding due process for faculty dismissal issues. The ballot is printed on white paper and is already at your place. It contains the names of 34 tenured faculty members selected randomly. Please vote for 20 by placing a checkmark next to those 20 names you wish to vote for. When you've finished, please leave the ballot at your place, and it will be collected after the meeting adjourns. While this list was created from current records, it's possible that one or more people on the list are no longer here. If you see that to be the case, please don't vote for that person and also, if you are aware of it right now, let us know so that we, who are not aware of that, can not vote for that person as well. Okay, so that one will be collected at the end of the meeting as well.

3. By-lot election of Faculty Grievance Panel members

T. Arado: Okay, our next one on the list is the by-lot election of Faculty Grievance Panel members. Per NIU Bylaws Article 11.5.3.1(b), the Faculty Senate is asked to forward the names of 15 members of its faculty constituency to serve as a panel from which a grievance committee can be chosen, should one be needed to review an Article 11 Step III faculty grievance or a student grievance during the academic year. These 15 panel members will be selected by-lot from all University Council and Faculty Senate faculty members who are tenured and not currently serving in an administrative role. I will draw those 15 names at this time.

Doug Boughton, Art and Design
Diane Rodgers, Sociology
Hamid Bateni, Allied Health and Communicative Disorders
Amy Newman, English
Anita Maddali, College of Law
Gleb Sirotkin, Mathematical Sciences
Judith Chitwood, Theatre and Dance
Jon Briscoe, Management
Jie Song, Geographic and Atmospheric Sciences
Andreas Glatz, Physics
Sarah Johnston-Rodriguez, Special and Early Education
Brian May, English
Jim Millhorn, University Libraries
Joseph Stephen, Mathematical Sciences
Jie Chen, Nursing

Okay, that is our 15 for the Grievance Panel members.

4. Election of a Faculty Senate vice president per NIU Bylaws Article 2.2

T. Arado: Our next item on our election list is the election of a Faculty Senate vice president. I'd like to open the floor for nominations at this time.

K. Jaekel: I nominate George Slotsve.

T. Arado: Okay, we have a nomination for George Slotsve. Do I have a second on that nomination?

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

T. Arado: Second from Sarah McHone-Chase. Do I have any other nominations for

J. Novak: I have a question. Could one just briefly tell us what this job is, what they do? Is there anything written about what they do. I think I used to be it, I'm not even sure. Just wondering what the job description is.

T. Arado: One thing I know happens is when we go into Executive Session and the president of the senate has to leave, the vice president takes over for that session.

L. Saborío: Yes, that occurs with the annual evaluation.

T. Arado: If I have no other nominations, I'd like to close the nominations. Since we have only one candidate, we can do this by a voice vote. All those in favor of George Slotsve as the Faculty Senate vice president, say aye.

Members: Aye.

T. Arado: All those opposed? Abstentions.

G. Slotsve: Abstain. [laughter]

T. Arado: Okay, the ayes have it.

5. Selection of one Faculty Senate member to serve as the Faculty Senate President's designee on the 2018 [BOT Professorship Award](#) Selection Committee.

Committee members review approximately 10 applications online, and the committee meets 2-3 times between November and February. The person selected to serve on this committee cannot be a candidate for the award, nor have submitted a nomination for the award. (Dhiman Chakraborty, Jimmie Manning and John Novak have served in previous years.)

T. Arado: Okay the last one on our list is the selection of one faculty volunteer to serve on the Board of Trustees Professorship Award Selection Committee. The assignment includes reviewing approximately ten applications online, and the committee meets two to three times between

November and February. I'd like a volunteer or a nomination to serve on the selection committee this year.

K. Thu: I nominate Ross Powell.

T. Arado: Okay we have a nomination. Can I receive a second for that nomination?

Unidentified: I'll second it.

T. Arado: Okay. Do we have any other nominations for this position? Okay, seeing none, I will close the nominations on this. And again, since we have just one nominee, we can do a voice vote to approve the nominations. All those in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

T. Arado: Opposed? Abstained? Okay, then I think we have a member for our Board of Trustees Professorship Award Selection Committee.

That is the end of my script from Pat, so I will close the elections report.

L. Saborío: Thank you very much, Therese.

E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Sarah McHone-Chase, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

VI. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Welcome Remarks – Acting President Lisa Freeman

L. Saborío: Okay, onto President's Announcements. First we will have Acting President Lisa Freeman. As you are well aware, I hope, Dr. Freeman became acting president of NIU on July 1, and I am proud to state that she is the first female president in the history of this institution [applause]. Dr. Freeman has asked to speak with Faculty Senate at our first meeting today so that she can discuss her role as acting president during this transitional period at NIU. After her talk, I do believe there will be time for a brief Q&A session before the next celebrities are introduced. So on behalf of Faculty Senate, welcome President Freeman, and thank you for being here today.

L. Freeman: Thank you very much, Linda. And I want to start out by thanking all the people in this room for the time that you put in to contribute to shared governance. Selection to some of these grievance panel pools and to some of the committees is not glamorous, but it's actually very important work for an institution that takes shared governance seriously. So thank you very much. And also thank you for inviting me, and for allowing my comments to precede that of our board chair and vice chair.

NIU's faculty are an important group, because it's your commitment to excellence in all aspects of our mission that defines the university. I want to begin by stating the obvious. A lot happened over

the summer, most notably the departure of President Baker, the resignation of the Law dean, and the passage of a state budget after a prolonged impasse. If this was Netflix-NIU, June would have been sweeps month, and no one would have believed that all of those things could have happened on one campus in such a short period of time. But it did.

But it's no longer sweeps month. We're ready to move on, and my focus today isn't going to be on where we've been, but instead on where we're going and the things that have endured at NIU. And as you all know, as well or better than I, the good work that goes on at NIU every day has never stopped. As we all know, NIU's mission is to promote excellence in engagement, in teaching and learning, research and scholarship, creativity and artistry, and outreach and service – a mission that's typical of many public research universities.

And our specific value proposition resides within that mission. NIU is distinguished from competitors by our success using knowledge creation to transform students' lives and to inform society. And this is only possible because our faculty are highly accomplished teachers, scientists, scholars and artists who care deeply about student success, both undergraduate and graduate student success. And because our community is open to providing our students, staff and faculty with new opportunities for teaching, learning, discovery and artistry, and integrating the knowledge that's created.

This summer, the Brookings Institute recognized NIU as a leader among selected public research universities, because of our success at both providing social mobility to students from limited means and producing high-impact research. Essentially, we were recognized for the things that we have always done well.

I know that many of you spent your summer engaging students in your scholarly and artistic activities, and now you're showing your commitment to students outside the classroom that the semester has started. Again it is because of you that NIU can excel in meeting students where they are and offering them an educational experience that includes knowledge creation or creation of works of art, and also the opportunity to see the value of what's created through its application to our community and our region and our engagement agenda.

This commitment of NIU faculty to undergraduate and graduate students – and to all aspects of our mission – is one of the things that makes me very proud to be a Huskie. It's one of the things that attracted me to NIU, and it's one of the things that has kept me at the university.

I came to NIU in 2010. I interviewed for the position of vice president for research and graduate studies in 2009. And at that time, I fell in love with the university, with the staff, the faculty and the students. I fell in love with the interview, and that love has only grown over the course of the past seven years.

As vice president for research and graduate studies, my focus was on supporting and advancing faculty research and artistry and improving graduate education and innovation. At that time, I became aware of the challenges facing our research active faculty and graduate students, and I began the work to alleviate some of the barriers to success, and that work has continued under my successors in that position.

In that role I also learned how to succinctly describe NIU to potential partners who aren't familiar with the university or even with higher ed, a useful skill for an acting president.

When I became the executive vice president and provost in 2014, I developed an in depth understanding of academic and administrative programs and processes – basically, how things work. And I became much more familiar with the student experience. And I tell you this because, as the result of my history at NIU, I'm prepared for the role that I assumed in July, that of acting president. The Board of Trustees, members of the university community, have expressed their support for me and my ability to move NIU forward. I've heard that from many people in this room, and I thank you, because we can't afford to lose momentum waiting for a permanent president to be named. Our work needs to continue. Change will occur. We will acknowledge ongoing challenges and make progress.

So let me talk a little bit about my goals for the acting presidency. First, I want to really reignite Huskie pride. I want to focus the spotlight on the great work that occurs at NIU every day because of our extraordinary faculty and staff and their commitments to all aspects of the university mission. As acting president, I'm going to do everything that I can to get the word out to past, present and future Huskies, and to members of our larger community. And one of the most important things that you can do to help NIU is to choose to be loud and positive voices, telling true stories about our amazing students, faculty, staff and alumni.

I also want to increase transparency. For example, as part of my commitment to transparency, I'll be posting my reimbursed travel and hospitality expenses on the president's web page on a quarterly basis. We're also continuing to work to make the university budget process more transparent. The Executive Budget Committee is outlining a process that will be shared with the Resource, Space and Budget Committee for feedback. And this month I'm happy to say we'll have three finalists on campus for the position of vice president for administration and finance and CFO. They'll be interviewing on campus. There will be an open forum. There will also be a specific meeting with the leaders of our shared governance groups.

Part of transparency is also being able to figure out what the rules are so that you can follow them. And I plan to continue the work done by our shared governance leaders, particularly on the policy library initiative and the associated hires. I'm committed to moving NIU forward so that we can make our practices, policies and procedures more transparent and, therefore, easier to follow.

The group creating an NIU policy that's related to the voluntary product accessibility template, a long-term passion of Greg Long as many of you may remember, are actually testing out the procedures developed for the policy library to see how they function, kind of giving it a test-drive. At the same time, the general counsel and other members of the university leadership team are developing the plan for hiring a policy librarian. As a first step, they're clarifying the relationships between that to-be-hired individual, the ethics officer, and a to-be-hired university-level compliance position that has been recommended strongly by the Board of Trustees.

As many of you know, our search for the new ethics officer wasn't successful, and we believe what we heard from the candidate pool there may help us build a structure that's more effective for supporting the policy librarian and other ethics and compliance issues.

It's also really important that we all work together to continue to strengthen NIU's fiscal position, to enhance our long-term sustainability and to continue to make the university less dependent over time on state appropriations. We must implement the 2017-18 strategic recruitment plan and refine our long-term enrollment management objectives. And we have to do that in ways that respect our mission, our traditions and our core values.

Enrollment management is not the university's mission, but it's an important strategy that supports our mission. And accordingly, recruitment and retention of talented students from diverse backgrounds has to remain an important priority to NIU. Our academic programs and our student experience are outstanding. And we want to increase the number of students who benefit from them. Also we want to do everything we can to support the students who start at NIU through graduation. That is our moral obligation, as well as good business.

We also need to recognize the reality of the fiscal hangover, the leftover effect of 736 days without a state appropriation or MAP funding, and balance that reality with the need to invest in the people, places and things that were neglected during the period when we had no state funding. These include our employees who have gone without raises, our physical spaces that have gone without repairs and our IT infrastructure, which has gone without refresh. My priority is doing something for our employees as a top priority.

But we are not going to be able to do everything we want and need to do right away. We're going to formulate and follow a plan to reverse the damage and restore financial stability to NIU. We do plan to announce an increment program before the end of this month.

It's also a priority to improve town-gown relationships and to improve communications across the university community, both vertically and horizontally. I want to hear your ideas about what might work to make this better. One idea that I'm going to be testing is the State of the University address that's going to include ample time for questions and answers. And that will be held September 20 at 3 p.m.

So I've shared my thoughts, and now I really want to hear directly from you. I'm here to listen as well as to answer questions where I'm able. I will then leave you so that the trustees can get your honest feedback regarding the next presidential search. Thank you. [applause]

L. Saborío: Do we have any questions? Kendall?

K. Thu: Thank you, President Freeman, for all the encouraging words and for sort of turning over a new leaf in where we are as a university. That said, I do want to express a little word of concern about hiring yet another position. I don't think it was this body's intent for the policy library to result in the addition of another administrative position. And so I would ask that you think critically of how that work could be spread among graduate assistants or others. As you know, as faculty,

we've been starving for faculty hires, and so I'm a little concerned that our work in trying to pull together a policy library is going to end up with another administrative hire. Thank you.

L. Freeman: Your concern is duly noted.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well thank you, and thank you for coming to talk to us. In your effort to be more transparent, I would encourage you to take both the expenditures of the president's office and the foundation's expenditures, and make them online also so that everybody can see how their money that they donate and how their money that is coming from the state are being spent. As we know, we've had issues with that in the past, and some of us would like to feel comfortable that, when we donate money to the university, that it's going to things that further the students' experience. Thank you.

L. Freeman: Thank you. I am also a donor to the university.

L. Saborío: Anybody else have a question?

L. Freeman: Well, hopefully, this won't be the last time that I have the opportunity to meet with this group this academic year. Again, thank you for having me. [applause]

L. Saborío: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Freeman, and we look forward to hearing more from you in the upcoming months.

B. Discussion of presidential search process
Board of Trustees Chair Wheeler Coleman
Board of Trustees Vice Chair Dennis Barsema

L. Saborío: Next we have the Board of Trustees chair, Wheeler Coleman, and vice chair, Dennis Barsema, who also would like to meet with us today to discuss the presidential search process. And just as a reminder, we've got the discussion topics for today on the board. So I'm going to go ahead and turn this over.

W. Coleman: Before Dr. Freeman leaves the room, I just want to say, thank you, Dr. Freeman for stepping up and accepting the role as acting president. You had a choice in this matter, and you didn't have to do it. And we appreciate you making a commitment to the university. I also want to publicly state that each and every one of the board members, the Board of Trustees, are behind you 110 percent. We're going to support her. We expect her to perform the duties of president, and we're going to make sure she has all the resources she needs to be successful in that role for as long as she's in that role. So thank you, Dr. Freeman.

L. Freeman: Thank you Chair Coleman.

W. Coleman: Good afternoon. My name is Wheeler Coleman, chair of the Board of Trustees. First of all, I want to thank you for allowing us to be with you today. And I imagine you probably have a ton of questions. Our intent today is to really get input and feedback from you as relates to the presidential search. This is our seventh stakeholders/shared governance meeting that Dennis and I

are having or have had. We received a lot of good input and today we expect to get a lot more input. Essentially what we're looking for is feedback on the characteristics that you would like to see in our next president, feedback as it relates to the process of shared governance in searching for a president. And then the timing of the presidential search. And those are the three key areas that we're seeking input. And each every one of those items are up on the board, so if you want to read specifically the questions at hand.

Before we get to those questions, I'd like to tell you a little something about myself. I was appointed to the Board of Trustees by Gov. Quinn in 2012 to fill out the term of Manny Sanchez. In 2013, Gov. Quinn reappointed me to the board, so I'm in my fifth year as a Board of Trustee member. In July, I took over the chairmanship role.

Thirty-nine years ago, I came to this institution as a CHANCE student, and I am so proud of this institution. And I have made a commitment since leaving this institution that I was going to find a way to give back. So I had 34 years of being an IT expert, going from writing software code to becoming a chief technology officer for a \$56 billion company, managing a \$756 million budget, to becoming a two-time CIO, to establishing my own IT consultant company. And the success that I've had in the business world directly related to the experience that I had here at NIU.

So I had the luxury of going on to the University of Notre Dame and getting my M.B.A. And when it was all said and done, I had a choice. Do I give my time, do I give my commitment, do I give my resources to Notre Dame, or do I give it to NIU? And because of the relationship and because of the impact NIU had on me personally, I give my time, I give my money, I give my talent to NIU. I'm also committed to this university because this is a special place because this is the place where I met my wife.

L. Saborío: Wait a minute, wait a minute, and are you thankful to NIU for being the place where you met your wife?

W. Coleman: I absolutely am.

L. Saborío: Just checking.

D. Barsema: Ask her that.

L. Saborío: Right, you know these transcripts are made public.

W. Coleman: So after 34 years of marriage and counting, NIU has impacted my life in many ways. And so I have to tell you, I came to NIU not fully prepared. I didn't know how to study. I didn't know how to take exams. I wrote more papers in my first semester than I wrote in my four years of college. And because of NIU preparing me, teaching me, people that sat in your seats that impacted me and helped me succeed, I am here today because of that. And so I recognize the role that you play in the success of our students. If it wasn't for people like you, I wouldn't be here. So I want to thank you. And so that's my message, and then we'll let Dennis say a few words, and we'll get started.

D. Barsema: Thank you, Wheeler. Again, thank you for allowing us to be here. Linda, thank you for allowing us to hijack the agenda a bit today. Just a little background on myself. I've been back with the university now since 2000. And I've worn many hats here at NIU. I've been a donor. I was on the foundation board for 16 years. And I was a member of the faculty in the College of Business for ten years as an adjunct. And so the first 28 years of my career I spent in the business world. And so I've seen NIU from many angles. I've played a number of roles here.

I became a trustee at the beginning of this year, at the end of January. And I will tell you it was a tough decision for me to make, because I really love teaching. And as a result of being a trustee, I had to give up teaching, because you're not allowed to hold an appointed position in the university as a trustee from a conflict of interest standpoint. But I felt that this was the next logical step in serving NIU and serving you, serving our students, and serving the NIU community.

So I'm very proud to be on the Board of Trustees. I'm proud to be here today. And of all the trustees, I think I kind of got to see the inner workings of faculty, because for ten years I sat in the same row of offices, big elaborate, beautiful offices, (laughter) as I know you all have. But I've seen the work that you do, and in some cases, I was very fortunate to work side-by-side with some of you in this room. And I know what an outstanding staff of faculty we have here on our campus. As Wheeler said, and I would echo, the faculty here is what draws the students to our campus. Without students, we don't have a university. But without faculty, we don't have one either. So we need both. It's a two-sided coin. So thank you for the work that you do and will continue to do on behalf of NIU. With that, I'll turn it back to Wheeler to guide us.

1. Leadership qualifications
What qualities should we be looking for in a president?

W. Coleman: So, let's go after the second questions that's up on the board. I mean, I'm sorry, let's start from the bottom, question #3, the qualifications or the characteristics that you would like to see in the new president, and don't all speak at once. Yes.

K. Thu: I'd like to see a president who has been a faculty member before. And I say that because of my alma mater, the University of Iowa, recently hired a president who had no higher education experience. He certainly had the business world experience, but he had no higher education experience. I think it's centrally important for the president to have been a faculty member, both as an undergraduate and a graduate teacher to understand what challenges the university faces.

W. Coleman: We appreciate your comment and just to reflect on that comment for a second, we know that there has been a growing trend to select presidents that don't necessarily have faculty experience. Purdue University, for example, was a good example of that.

K. Thu: I just know it creates so much dissention and tears apart the fabric of the faculty and the students.

W. Coleman: Why is that?

K. Thu: Because people don't see the president as one of their own, somebody that belongs with them. They're from a different culture, so to speak. There's nothing wrong with coming from the business world, but having experience inside higher education, as Trustee Barsema pointed out, I think is critically important, particularly for us as stakeholders in the process, to feel as though we have ownership – or not ownership – but we have a connection with the president.

L. Saborío: And I think that it also has to do with a concern of this person perhaps not understanding the importance of research.

Unidentified: [inaudible]

L. Saborío: Research, scholarship and artistry.

T. Buck: I was thinking it would be nice if the candidate expressed empathy and compassion for the students. In some way they've demonstrated that capacity in their acts. I think if they understand what a student is going through, they'll be more apt to act in their best interest. [inaudible]

W. Coleman: Thank you. Another comment? Michael?

M. Haji-Sheikh: I'd like to add to Kendall's, the additional, I agree with that. And I also would like to see a president that's had both first- and second-line administrative, like chairing, dean-type administrative experience, because that's critical to understand budgeting and how structures inside, and how the interaction between faculty and administration are on a one-on-one kind of basis.

W. Coleman: Excellent, thanks.

V. Naples: What I would like to add to both Michael's and Kendall's comments is that it would be lovely to see a candidate who has a long-term experience with and a commitment to NIU, because we've hired many people who have come from outside, and you gain much better insight, as Dennis Barsema pointed out, by being here and experiencing what's going on, looking at the history of the institution, and how it has worked, what has gone well, and what needs to be improved.

W. Coleman: Did I see a hand in the first row here?

T. Bishop: I think, given the circumstances surrounding higher ed in the state of Illinois, while the previous comments emphasize the need for somebody who has internal understanding, knowledge of who we are, what we do, I think there's also a need for somebody who's quite capable of managing in the external context, representing the interests of this institution to legislators, to the media and others, as well as working with the other leaders of our sister schools throughout the state and perhaps even other educational entities, because the state of Illinois as I think many of you know, we're second worst state in the union in terms of the imbalance of our student exports vs. imports. New Jersey has the distinction of being worse than us. And no other. And I think we have to do something to become a little more competitive when it comes to attracting students over state lines and retaining the students in the state. Some of that is due to the political climate and the economic climate, but I think leadership is needed to overcome that. It's not just an NIU problem, it's a statewide problem, but I think our leadership might be able to contribute to that effort.

W. Coleman: Very good. Thank you.

A. Gelman: Higher education, especially state-funded or state-located, higher education is undergoing tremendous [inaudible]. For instances, the flagship university in South Carolina relies on the state funding only seven percent of its overall budget. We're fortunate enough to have slightly higher, well substantially higher funding. But the trend is down. So whatever happens in the next decade or two, those institutions that have managed to rethink their funding model, and their business model overall, are the ones that are going to thrive. So having somebody at the helm who, on the one hand, as Kendall pointed out [inaudible], but on the other is capable of looking forward towards yet to be developed models, to be a progressive, forward thinker, who can lead an institution toward reimagining and rethinking the state university in the United States.

W. Coleman: Thank you. Another comment?

G. Baker: I think that there has to be a balance with our next president, permanent president, to balance undergraduate as well as graduate education training initiatives, recruitment, retention. I think my concern in the past is that we have seen a lot of emphasis on undergraduate programs, undergraduate recruitment, etc. and that's certainly integral to the business model at hand, but I also personally felt there was a deficit of attention at the graduate level and concerns about recruitment, retention, training initiatives, recognition of graduate student achievement, etc. So I think a leader has to know how to balance both sides of that educational coin, the undergraduate as well as the graduate.

W. Coleman: Thank you.

Unidentified: I wanted to add to actually a few things people have said, predominantly what Alex said that about being able to lead the group forward or lead the institution forward. I think that's very important to be able to be forward-thinking, but they also need to be someone who can get the buy-in from all the constituencies on campus and be doing the movement and creating momentum for the institution, not for any other, whether it be personal, professional goal, but it's moving the institution as a whole and that they are sure to get the buy-in from all the different constituencies. But it's very important, yes, that we're forward-thinking, but to do it in a collective, collaborative way.

W. Coleman: Thank you.

K. Staikidis: I would like to see the search committee focus on a president whose foremost concerns are ethics and honesty, as well as an understanding of the importance of the humanities and the arts for public liberal education.

W. Coleman: Okay, thank you.

R. Moraga: I would like to see a person with proven experience in strategic planning in large institutions.

W. Coleman: Thank you. Yes, in the back.

G. Chen: I would like to see our next president have ability and quality of leading us as a university from viewing us as a regional university to becoming a national, competitive university. I have a dream, but once I spoke out when the former President Baker was holding a Bold Futures workshop. I only made one comment, that when are we going to have a plan to have NIU to become the flagship university in Illinois. I hope the next president can lead us to that dream one day. Thank you.

W. Coleman: I love your dream, by the way. Any other comments? Sure.

S. McHone-Chase: I think we need someone who can express a commitment to shared governance.

W. Coleman: Do you want to elaborate on that?

S. McHone-Chase: Just as far as this body is concerned, for example, somebody who will work with the Faculty Senate or the University Council to help make decisions for the direction of the university. Is that enough?

W. Coleman: Thank you.

J. Hanna: This is maybe piggy-back on the comment before, but I think it's important to have a president who recognizes NIU's role within the region and also appreciates both the opportunities and challenges of its location in DeKalb.

W. Coleman: A lot of great feedback, a lot of good information, so we appreciate it.

2. Process

What aspects of the last presidential search worked well?

What would you like to see changed this time around?

W. Coleman: Let's transition to the process. Let's talk about the process. Can I see a show of hands of anyone that participated in the process four-and-a-half years ago when we selected Dr. Baker?

W. Coleman: All right, so let me quickly describe the process and then I would love your input on the process.

Many of you have participated in hiring and best practices associated with hiring, and so if there's anything about the process that we did four-and-a-half years ago that you think we should change, we'd love to hear it. First of all, a shared governance search committee was established where we had representatives from all the stakeholders including the alumni group, the foundation group, Board of Trustees, Faculty Senate, etc. I think there were seven total groups that were represented in the presidential search committee. We also selected a firm to do a national search for us, and to help pre-screen some of the candidates and make sure that we had qualified candidates that were presented to the search committee. A list of selection criteria was established. The search committee down-selected the candidates to the top three. From there, we brought each of the candidates and

their significant other or spouse to the Naperville campus, and they met with the different stakeholder groups. And somewhere 30 to 40 minutes that they bounced from room to room to room, interviewing with the different stakeholder groups. After each candidate was interviewed, feedback was provided to the Board of Trustees. From there, the Board of Trustees debated, took into consideration the recommendations that came from each stakeholder group, and a final selection was made.

Now I hope that's true to what you recall about the selection process. That's the process, and that process normally takes about nine months to conduct. Typically, presidential searches, if you're on-cycle, will usually start anywhere from the beginning of the summer through the end of October. So seven, eight, nine months later, a president typically starts with the institution.

So, any concerns about the process that we used last time? Any recommendations for improvements on the process? We're going to start up front.

D. Boughton: I was a stakeholder representative from directors or schools or head of schools, and I took part in the sweep-by interview process where the candidates came and sat with us for, I think it was 10 or 20 minutes. It seemed to me to be rather perfunctory, and it was token, in a sense, I think. We did not get a chance to develop in depth conversations with the candidates and it was very difficult to make a decision. And to me, it would seem to be more appropriate to allow the stakeholders to get to know the candidates better in order to get a sense of depth, and to probe with the questioning a little more. That was my feeling.

Now I do understand the difficulties of timing. We have a vast number of stakeholders in the institution to actually meet the candidates, but it would seem probably better to, if possible, build in more time and more opportunity or even maybe a revisit once the groups have had a chance to discuss further what other questions might be asked that weren't asked the first time. So I think it's important to think about that in terms of how we get to know who the candidates are.

W. Coleman: Good, thank you.

J. Novak: I don't understand at all why these interviews happened in Naperville, the second largest city in Illinois. DeKalb, much smaller, but it's where NIU is. Every campus has an aura, and anybody approaching that campus will have a reaction to it. So a president needs to see where he or she is going to be leading, how she feels or he feels about that place, his or her notions for how things might be changed. I think it needs to happen in DeKalb.

D. Barsema: Just so you know, they all did come to DeKalb to tour the community, the campus, and so forth. But specifically, because this is where I thought you were going to be going, what do you think about the effectiveness of open forums? How effective are they? How useful are they? How can they be improved? Because the thing that we didn't do last time was an open forum. And what we've heard from everybody else – I'm assuming you agree – is that open forums would be the logical thing for us to do. So given that as a base line, what's your feeling on how open forums can be most effectively used. And are there some process changes that we can make to open forums? Or are they working just great the way we do them now?

J. Novak: I haven't attended a lot, but I do think that it is an extension of what I'm saying, because the candidate would get to see who is here, what their main concerns are. Maybe they won't be coming up with the best answers. Maybe the best questions won't be asked. But at least there will be a forum, there will be a meeting of the candidates, the students, the faculty. How could it hurt?

K. Thu: I agree with everything he just said. I felt left out of the last process. A president is the face of the university. We bring in a faculty member as a candidate for a hire in a department, we want to see how they comport themselves in that work setting. A president is the voice of the university. I want to see how they act, how they behave in the place where they're going to work, among the constituents who are supposedly going to, hopefully, support him. So I would like to see the process much more open than the last time, because I felt, and I'm sure others did as well, left out.

L. Saborío: And I think in a way it was a disservice to President Baker, because he showed up on campus, and many said, "Who is this new person and where did he come from and how was he selected?"

W. Coleman: Yes.

A. Krmeneč: As part of that openness, I hope you would encourage that all of the candidates allow their name to be made public. If they're part of this process, if they're serious about this position, then they need to demonstrate to us that openness that they are serious about it.

W. Coleman: Thank you for that comment. Let me talk about the last time the search was conducted. When we down-selected and got it down to the last three candidates, if I'm right, I believe two of the candidates requested that their names remain anonymous. And so we honored that. I have to tell you, though, after Dennis and I have made our rounds, it's been pretty clear that, when we get to the point of down-selecting, that if a candidate is not willing to make his name public, that we may not want to consider him as one of our finalists [applause].

Now I tell you this because, we've got to keep in mind, there are some people that want to protect their reputation, and they also want to protect their current paycheck as they go through this process. And so we're going to work with the search firm and try to figure out how can we do best practice here to help protect the candidate and their name, but at the same time, give the university what they want, and that is some exposure to the candidate before the candidate is hired.

M. Haji-Sheikh: One of the things is that I've grown up in an academic world. I'm second generation. I've never seen a presidential search that didn't have public exposure, basically public presentations until this last time. And that's at least three different universities. So I just live down the road, like a lot of people grew up in DeKalb. I live down the road from at least two presidents of [inaudible] and, when they searched, it was public. I mean if you have pride in yourself and you have no problem saying, "I can be the president of a university," there is no fear from, you should have no fear from your present job either.

W. Coleman: Thank you. Go ahead.

A. Gelman: I can think of at least two states that have sunshine laws that require all the candidates from airport interview level to the finalists, whose names to be made public. I think, though, finding a happy medium at least at the finalist level, in order to be able to do that, I want to piggy-back on what Linda said and that is that the times ahead are challenging. And unless the entire community has a sense of ownership and a buy-in in the process, it is less likely that the next president will have the support they need in order to do the work that they're doing. We don't all have to agree on who that is, but having been heard gives one a sense. It's just like any other kind of vote. If you didn't get a chance to vote, your beef is disenfranchisement, not the actual candidate who was selected.

D. Barsema: So let me ask you a question. When we do the open forums, is a survey mechanism acceptable for you to give feedback to the trustees. If a survey form is created, an online form, of course, that you can then use that to give feedback? Or is there another way that you would prefer to give feedback?

A. Gelman: I, frankly, never met a survey that worked for me, because I always want to check, "other" as an answer. And this is a complicated situation. So if whoever receives the feedback is willing to read sentences with punctuation and a forward developed thought, then that would probably be ideal. I know that's hard.

D. Barsema: No, clearly, you have to allow for the written word.

A. Gelman: Well I would say maybe you could save time by only allowing written word. Most of us teach so we have an idea that you have greater participation in the testing process from a student if they have to express themselves, rather than find a pigeon hole into which their ideas could be placed.

W. Coleman: Anybody else want to comment on that?

H. Bateni: I just wanted to make a comment, and I remember in the last search, Faculty Senate was asked for leadership qualifications. And Faculty Senate came up with a very long list of qualifications that they would be interested to see in a president. And today you also asked for the same question. What I have always been interested in is to see the weight of these values. I doubt if you can find any president that has all those values. Now I think that the main question is: Which one is prioritized over the other one? And Board of Trustees having the ultimate decision on this, I would suggest to share that information with the faculty, which one of these qualifications has been put as #1, and which one is #2? And perhaps that can also provide a pattern for faculty to decide when they want to provide feedback to the Board of Trustees – they can actually evaluate each of those qualifications separately and report it to the Board of Trustees.

W. Coleman: Thank you. Is there another comment on process?

K. Thu: I love my friend, Alex Gelman in Theatre, who's our bed-mate in Grant Towers. But surveys do serve a purpose, and I think you can do surveys. And that will allow faculty and others to allow written comments, qualitative comments. So they could come in a form, or, if you would

like, we can just email you directly with our thoughts. That's kind a of a strange idea, but I think you can have a combination of tools that will give you a bigger picture of what's going on.

W. Coleman: So how do we avoid a popularity contest?

K. Thu: Well, I trust my colleagues in this room. They know what they're doing. And that's what I say to my faculty in our department. I don't think the members of this Faculty Senate are going to be involved in a popularity contest – and quite the opposite – they are the most astute critical thinkers on this campus. So I don't think that's going to be a problem.

A. Gelman: I would actually say that some degree of popularity may be helpful to a new president [laughter].

W. Coleman: Any other comments on process? Yes.

A. Krmeneč: I want to go back to a very subtle point that Lisa raised while she was here. The university has suffered significant damage over the last six months by nature of some administrative changes, and what led to those specific changes. I am asking, just a question at this point, whether the board has begun to consider contract language changes that would help us avoid those kinds of black eyes in the future?

W. Coleman: So, since that's a change in our contract, and I'd like to answer that question. But before we do, let's get through this, and then I'd like to circle back and answer that question. Because I think an answer to that question is going to lead to more questions. So any other process changes?

3. Timing

When would you like to see us convene the presidential search?
What considerations should we factor in as it relates to timing?

W. Coleman: What about timing? We could start a search in the next 30 days, or we can start a search in the next 300 days. What's your reaction? Or some portion thereof. What's your reaction to that? What's your thought about that?

K. Thu: I hate to speak so much, but I feel as though we're in good hands with Lisa in the interim. And it's better to take a little more time to do it right and make sure that it's properly vetted with constituents. I don't feel a need to hasten the process, at least personally. There are political considerations. Are we going to get a budget next year? There's two more years on the governor's term. That could be a consideration, as well. So, for me, a two-year window seems reasonable, but don't delay it too long.

W. Coleman: Anybody else?

V. Naples: One of the things that I think will be paramount throughout this process, regardless of what we do, is that the public, the greater constituency, is surrounding NIU perceives that we're moving ahead in a good direction, because regardless of what we actually do, the fate of the

university is going to depend on what the public ultimately thinks of what we did, who we are, and what we are planning to do in the future.

W. Coleman: Any other comments about the timing?

D. Barsema: Do I take by your silence that most people tend to agree with the comments that Kendall made? Or are there dissenting views that, “no, let’s get going now and have a new president on board – or have a permanent president on board – by July 1 of 2018.

M. Haji-Sheikh: You’ll be in shock, I agree with Kendall on this one.

K. Thu: It happens, Michael, it happens.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I know. But really, if we’re going to really try to do things right this time and fix some of the things we didn’t do right last time, it’s going to take the board sometime to rehash it through what they did. There are new members of the board that didn’t have any previous experience with this, and you also need to have on staff a permanent general counsel before you start doing this search, I think. And that’s going to take you some time.

J. Millhorn: I think there is a sense of urgency. I’ve never seen an institution have more interim positions in my experience. It’s unimaginable, and it’s not really sustainable at this point. And we need to get some of these positions filled. And in order to do that, we need to have a president.

W. Coleman: Thank you. Any other comments?

C. Mooney: To be honest, I wasn’t here for Lisa’s talk. I wasn’t able to make it until 3:30, but my one concern about waiting, similar to what was just said, but I wonder if we also delay us being in a holding pattern until we can make some significant changes that I think do still need to be made, given that we were told last week that we are in crisis from the provost. That would be my concern with waiting.

W. Coleman: Very good.

D. Barsema: I would make a comment, the one thing Lisa stressed very strongly is that we will not be waiting. And the Board of Trustees is firmly behind the need to continue to move at rapid pace to repair the reputation and just continue to move our agenda forward as a university. She and you and the Board of Trustees, we have a lot of great ideas and great things we want to go do, and no one is going to sit on their hands waiting for the permanent president to show up. Things will continue to move forward at as fast of a pace that we can while at the same time insuring that we do it the right way as well.

W. Coleman: Any other comments about timing? If none, I’d like to go back to the comment that was raised about the president’s contract and correcting some of the errors or, I guess, shortfalls of the contract, itself. I have to tell you, the board is concerned about the perception of the contract and the contract weakness associated with it. The board also recognized there are some adjustments that need to be made to the contracts. Quite frankly, we believe, and I personally believe we’ve got to

find a way to put some standards in place for, not just for hiring of the president, but for other individuals that have long-term contracts. We're beginning to see some creative compensation models put in place where there's a pay-for-performance kind of compensation, where the base salary is somewhat less than maybe the current market, but the upside is, if the university performs, then the president receives some form of bonus. So we've seen, I think, two or three new contracts for presidents in the state of Illinois that were just implemented. So we'll look at that for certain.

There are some other things that we're going to take a closer look at. We've probably got a list of four or five items that we want to take a closer look at and find ways to put a competitive contract on the table. One thing we don't want to do is compromise the talent or talent pool or the selection by not putting a competitive contract offer on the table. And so we're going to have to balance it. How do we protect the university as much as we can, but at the same time, how do we put a contract on the table that's attractive to candidates and get them in the door? Did that answer your question.

A. Krmeneč: Yes. I'm wondering if this body doesn't have a role to play in this also. And I would ask perhaps the Steering Committee or whomever of the Faculty Senate give some thought to delayed tenure for administrators, making it part of a package, but a part of the package that they earn through demonstration of commitment to the university, commitment to the ideals of this university.

W. Coleman: I made note of your comment. That's in the area that I definitely would like to talk to the search firm about and make sure that we're not doing – if we did something like a deferred tenure program – that we wouldn't run away some talented candidates.

D. Barsema: One thing I would add is that you have to be a little bit careful when you talk about – because there's a lot of talk going on right now about the heads of universities in doing a pay-for-performance sort of a model and some percentage of their total compensation is tied into performance. And I know we've got some compensation experts in the room. You have to be very careful to insure that you're tying it into the desired performance that you're looking for.

For example, one year when I was with AT&T, they came out with a performance compensation package where they paid the salespeople 100 percent on the booking of an order. Well, guess what, we had a tremendous backlog at the end of the year, and none of the backlog was shipping. And all of the executives at AT&T scratched their head and go, "why do we have such a big backlog, and it's not shipping?" And I sat in a meeting one time, and I said, "well that's because you paid the sales reps to submit orders and that's what they did. You never said that they had to ship the order." And so they built up this huge backlog and lo and behold, a good percentage of the backlog was bad orders.

So you've got to be very careful when you tie performance to compensation and make sure that you're compensating on the right behavior of what you're looking for. It can be done, and I think it's something that we want to take an aggressive look at from a compensation standpoint, because I am a believer in paying for performance, but it's got to be done right.

T. Bishop: In response to the notion of delayed tenure, the difficulty I see with that, especially for departmental entities that have some pretty clear criteria that are used in making promotional

decisions, the performance of the president in office are not going to add to the body of knowledge that qualifies him or her for a decision of tenure, granting of tenure. It is essentially based on their performance, scholars and teachers, and perhaps to a small extent, particularly full professor, on their service to either their profession or to this entity. So I think this idea of delayed tenure really is not necessarily a good solution to our concerns about whether their performance meets our expectations.

W. Coleman: Thank you.

D. Barsema: Yeah, I agree.

M. Haji-Sheikh: One of the things you run into, problem with the tenure issue, is that: Say it's a perfectly wonderful president, everything's great. And they go five years and they want to go back to teaching. Now you have a department that's going to have to, without any additional boost to the income from the university, have to absorb somebody for \$225,000 or \$300,000 on the yearly basis. And a lot of times, it ends up squeezing the department. It happens on a regular basis. So whatever you do about tenure, make sure that somehow gets figured into the structure that the receiving department will get the money to cover that person. Because I can imagine, for example, last person Management would have had to come up with \$225,000, and where would that come in the budget process? That's an important from your aspect, because you're the ones who are going to be telling us, you know, putting the money in the pot. And we're not the ones. I've seen this happen multiple times where the president comes to the department, and the department just basically gets sucked dry.

W. Coleman: All right, thank you.

A. Gelman: Yeah, I agree with Terry about not delaying the tenure process. Frankly, I think we would want the president to be concerned about the university and not their own well-being, as much as possible. And I have seen administrator at lower levels, such as department chairs, who come in without tenure, and their focus is on continuing their research and their teaching, and not on the well-being of the department. Self-interest is one of our stronger engines.

W. Coleman: You know, today tenured is the best practice that's offered for most presidents, and I personally believe that we've got to find a way to stay with best practices. And if it's changing industry-wide, then by all means, we need to pursue it. But if it's not, and that's what it's going to take to get a president in the door, then we need to follow those best practices. But we will take a look at this, by the way.

K. Thu: I'll just add briefly that, as much as a lot of us don't like large salaries or large golden parachutes, getting somebody into the state of Illinois, given the state budget situation, given the political situation here, means that we can't low-ball this, in my view. We've got to be competitive if we want to get the talent in the door, and I say that with some trepidation.

W. Coleman: Thank you for your comment, by the way. All right, any other comments related to contract? If not, Linda, thank you for allowing us to come today. We've got a lot of great information. We got good feedback. We appreciate all of you, and thank you for your input. We

will keep you posted on the decisions that the board will make. We anticipate that we will come public with at least a road map on what we're going to do by the end of the month. And so hopefully, we'll make that information available to you at that time. Thank you, everybody.

D. Barsema: Thank you for your time.

L. Saborío: Thank you. [applause] Thank you very much. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

VII. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – no report
- B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Barbara Andree, Cathy Doederlein, Alex Gelman,
Mark Riley, Linda Saborío, Kendall Thu

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- A. United Faculty Alliance update

L. Saborío: Okay, we're going to keep moving here since it is 4:30. We don't have any items for Faculty Senate consideration, unfinished business or new business, and no reports from advisory committees. So we now go to comments and questions from the floor, and I would like to know if the United Faculty Alliance has an update for us? And if so, who would be giving us that update? Would that be you, Virginia?

V. Naples: That would probably be me as the president of the United Faculty Alliance, and thank you for asking. We are in the process of doing a variety of different things. One of the items is that we have had several bargaining sessions, and because there has been a change in the personnel on the part of the administration, that is taking a bit of a hiatus, and we thought that that was reasonable for us to be collaborative and cooperative in the sense that we give the administration the appropriate time to regroup so that the bargaining can move forward in a smooth manner.

We also have a series of events and informational events for members. And, of course, we're always looking for and encouraging people to become members and participate in your faculty union so that we can all move forward together and improve work situations and all kinds of things that everybody wants for the good of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

If anybody has any questions, please contact any of the executive board of the union or department representatives. Do talk to all of these people. We are actively seeking as much input and participation from our eligible faculty members as we can receive. Does anybody have any questions or comments? If not, thank you, and let's have a wonderful start to a great new semester.

L. Saborío: Thank you.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- C. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
- Q. [2017-18 Meeting Schedule](#) – Page 6

L. Saborío: And Pat has asked that I call everyone's attention to the meeting schedule on page 6 of your packets. There it is, yes. When do we meet again – Faculty Senate – October 4, yes.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

L. Saborío: So, if there are no more comments, anybody want to ...

J. Novak: I move to close.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Second.

L. Saborío: You ready to close? No more comments about the process, presidential search, anybody want to say anything now that the Board of Trustees members have left? Okay.

Motion to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.