GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Minutes of the April 10, 2017 Full Board Meeting

Patrick Ormsby, Chair

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Board Chair Patrick Ormsby called the Governors State University Board of Trustees meeting for Monday, April 10, 2017 to order at 8:35 am. Roll call was taken and Trustees Bruce N. Friefeld, Anibal Taboas, Carney Barr, Cornelius Griggs, and Student Trustee Yolanda Pitts attended. Trustee Lorraine Tyson attended via conference call. Trustee Masah Renwick was absent.

Also in attendance: Elaine P. Maimon, President; Deborah E. Bordelon, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Barbara Winicki, Faculty Senate President; Sheryl Jones-Harper, Civil Service Senate President; Justin Smith, Student Senate President; Sondra Estep, UPI 4100 Chapter President; Kimberly Lambert-Thomas, Vice President for Administration and Finance; Will Davis, Vice President for Development and CEO of the GSU Foundation; Alexis Kennedy, General Counsel; Aurelio Valente, Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students; Maureen Kelly, Director of Governmental and Community Relations; Keisha Dyson, Assistant Vice President for Marketing and Communications; Penny Perdue, Executive Assistant to the President; Andrae Marak, Interim Dean, College of Arts and Sciences; Jun Zhao, Interim Dean, College of Business; Beth Cada, Dean, College of Health and Human Services; Colleen Sexton, Associate Provost; Ann Vendrely, Associate Provost; Randi Schneider, Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management; James McGee, Director of Public Safety; Villalyn Baluga, Interim Associate Vice President for Finance; Tracy Sullivan, Assistant Vice President for Procurement; Betsy Joseph, Director, Auxiliary Services and University Housing; Sandra Zurawski, Director of Budget and Financial Planning; David Rhea, Faculty, College of Arts and Sciences; and faculty members Patrick Santoro, David Green, Rebecca Wocjik, Kim Boland-Prom, and Rashidah Muhammad.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Chair Ormsby made the following remarks: Good morning and thank you all for attending this special Board meeting. Before I begin my remarks, pursuant to the Board's Bylaws, I want to report that the Executive Committee met on March 24 and approved Resolution 17-24, a contract with Cypress Envirosystems, for the purchase and installation of 250 wireless pneumatic thermostats.

Today's subject matter will not be easy or pleasant. We will take a deep look into the University's finances, the good and the not so good. The situation we have been experiencing over the last two years is unprecedented and disheartening. GSU's forward momentum is being threatened by the State's inability to pass a balanced budget. As a Board, we will deal with the situation responsibly and directly, with a straightforward, honest assessment of our finances, past, current, and future. To meet our responsibilities to the institution and our students this must include discussion of possible future cost cutting measures. The necessity of further cuts is apparent; however, that does not mean we act on them lightly or without the understanding of their impact on the University and its faculty, staff, and students. We are simply doing what we must as the fiscal managers of this institution. Before we begin our study session, we will hear reports from our three senate presidents and Dr. Maimon. We will also hear from Dr. David Rhea, the current chair of the Academic Program Elimination Review Committee (APERC).

SENATE REPORTS

Dr. Barbara Winicki, Faculty Senate President

Dr. Winicki made the following remarks: Good morning and thank you for this time to report on Faculty Senate activities and concerns. The Faculty Senate met on March 30 and a proposed policy on faculty and chair searches was discussed. It is expected the proposed policy will be returned for approval with revisions at the April 20 Senate meeting. The Educational Policies Committee (EPC), which is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, and Associate Provost Colleen Sexton have redesigned the Policy Handbook webpage to show groupings of policies rather than simply a numerical list.

The process of filling AY2017-2018 vacancies on the Faculty Senate and committees has begun. The Unit A faculty census, which is based on the sabbatical list, showed a loss of one senator from CAS and one senator from CHHS. The nomination forms are due in the Provost's Office at 5:00 pm on April 18. For any vacancy with more than a single acceptable nomination, elections will be conducted. The results will be announced before or during the May Faculty Senate meeting.

As you might expect, our concerns are centered on program eliminations. During its Executive Committee meeting on March 2 and the full Faculty Senate meeting on March 30, there were discussions about the rationale for the program eliminations approved by the Board of Trustees. Many senators doubt the assertion that the elimination of these programs will result in any significant savings. In fact, the Board members have not been given the cost analysis regarding the March 3 program eliminations that has been given to PBAC and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This cost analysis shows the total projected savings over a three-year period of less than $90,000. The bases of this estimate are questionable. It is also unclear whether the eliminated program courses will continue to be offered when they are required for other programs. The list of programs included in the cost analysis is incomplete; for example, the MA in Psychology Theoretical Sequence, which makes a profit, is not included. The cost analysis' estimated Tuition Revenue Loss by program includes only eight programs. The cost analyses cost savings over three years includes only ten programs. As you know, 22 programs were eliminated in March. This type of incomplete data should be viewed with extreme skepticism by Board members.

The Faculty Senate is also deeply concerned about the ill-informed assertions contained in the materials the Board of Trustees has been given today. In particular, the information in the Board Book under “Consider Further Programmatic Consolidation/Restructuring” reflects a lack of basic understanding of the University’s academic units. The author has been careless with the very specific language used in our institution. The author seems not to know which units are departments and which are divisions or that there is a difference between these two designations. The only departments in the University are housed in CHHS, where each program is a department led by a chair holding an administrative position, instead of a program coordinator holding a faculty position. There is no such entity as a Division of Counseling or a Department of Psychology. In addition, moving Psychology into the Division of Humanities and Social Sciences within CAS would further complicate the issue of the size of such a division. The author does not seem to know that this consolidation of divisions within CAS has been approved already. Again, the carelessness with which these proposals have been articulated would indicate that the proposals themselves should be viewed with skepticism. Thank you again for this opportunity to speak today.

Chair Ormsby recognized Faculty Senate Representatives in attendance, David Golland, Lara Stache, and Alice Keane.

Sheryl Jones-Harper, Civil Service Senate President
Ms. Jones-Harper made the following remarks: Faced with anxiety and a bit of apprehension due to the State’s failure to pass a budget, many Civil Service employees are filled with uncertainty, especially those not represented by a union. The Senate, however, is still working diligently to proceed despite the dim outlook. We are collaborating with other organizations and planning and participating in various activities. We are encouraging those that are able to join UPI’s “Teach Out” rally in Springfield on April 27. We are also supporting the Student Senate in their effort to engage students and legislators in a discussion regarding the effects of the budget impasse at their event, the Illinois United Student Senate Forum.

Other concerns include converting from an anticipated to a delayed payroll system; work release time to take advantage of workshops and training sessions offered during the workday; layoffs; and low morale. We are also concerned about the rising cost of medical insurance coupled with no wage increases for the last several years. The Civil Service Senate is working with SUUA to educate employees about retirement options, and is working with Human Resources on professional development opportunities. That being said, we are willing to work collaboratively with administration, staff, and students to make the best of a bad situation by doing whatever we can to raise morale, suggest cost savings and efficiencies, and work collectively to make the experience as positive as possible.

Justin Smith, Student Senate President
Mr. Smith made the following remarks: Good morning. We are just days away from the Illinois Student Senate Forum on Higher Education, our signature event, which will be held on April 12 from 11am-1pm in Sherman Hall. It is a collaboration of student leaders from eight Illinois universities and representatives from the *Young Invincibles*. State Senator Pat McGuire will serve as the keynote speaker and former GSU Student Senate President Mychael Vanarsdale will moderate the discussion. Participants in the discussion will include Illinois State Representative Will Davis, Representative Will Guzzardi, Representative Al Riley, and Senator Laura Murphy. In addition, a representative from the Governor's Office has been invited, though their attendance is tentative at this time. The Student Senate also completed their first round of elections and we welcome seven new senators. I am happy to welcome the new Student Trustee for AY2017-2018, Linda Coleman, who will be sworn in on April 14. On April 28, the second round of elections will take place to fill positions on the Executive Committee. We are very proud of the growth of the Student Senate, and our ability to serve the University.

Academic Program Elimination Review Committee (APERC) Report
Dr. David Rhea, Chair, APERC
Rhea thanked the Board and President Maimon for adding the Committee's updates to the agenda. He reported that APERC was reactivated and met on March 8 with a specific charge to review all open academic programs with a goal to help address the University's structural deficit, estimated at $2.74M. The Committee was given a savings target of $639,000, almost 4% of the expense of Unit A and B faculty academic program instruction at GSU, in just over 30 days. During the month of March APERC did a lot of listening to faculty concerns about the potential of faculty loss, further program closure, and the concern that program quality would suffer. The Committee also listened to the concerns of the Trustees and their desire for faculty to get serious about addressing University savings. Rhea reported the Committee also witnessed concern on student's faces, wondering for the second time this year if their program would be around long enough for them to earn a degree.

Rhea went on to explain that in late March APERC began to receive and review copious amounts of finance data to aid with the analysis. He thanked Provost Bordelon, Vice President Lambert-Thomas, and Director Krcatovich for their timely assistance with numerous data requests. The Committee began discussions on three types of recommendations, and remains open to other solutions, to address the structural deficit. One recommendation is elimination of academic programs running a deficit of $50,000 or more; however, only six open programs were identified with such a deficit. Rhea advised that addressing the structural deficit with only program eliminations presented few options.

Therefore, other solutions are being addressed including program restructuring and program rebalancing. With program rebalancing APERC would recommend removing a portion of faculty effort from an academic program in an effort to rebalance their student/faculty and cost/revenue ratios. This recommended portion of faculty effort removed from an academic program could be as fractional as one section of one class, but ultimately not so large as to significantly affect program quality, delivery, or accreditations. Most importantly, a program rebalancing recommendation does not result in a program elimination. Rhea explained that programs would remain open, there would be zero revenue loss, and any full or fractional loss of faculty effort identified would generate 100% savings to the University.

Rhea concluded by stating the Committee's report is due to the Administration on April 21. The Committee will continue to meet and analyze data, as well as meet with constituents throughout campus. Rhea thanked the APERC members for their tireless effort in this process. The Committee will continue to work on crafting recommendations that will serve the students, faculty, and University well. Ormsby thanked Rhea and APERC for their efforts.

Dr. Elaine P. Maimon, President

President Maimon made the following remarks: Thank you, senate presidents and the chair of APERC for your constructive approach on how to move forward. Our agenda today is a study session or a deep dive into the University's financial situation. "Unprecedented" is a term we have been forced to use much too often in the last two years, but I will say that in my decades of experience in higher education in several different states I have never experienced or even imagined the current situation. Well-managed public universities across this state are being weakened and forced into increasing deficit by state neglect. Today, Vice President for Administration and Finance, Kim Thomas, will review the University's budgetary and financial condition in depth, focusing on differentiating between cash flow and deficit. We have managed cash flow in the last two years so that we have not had to institute furloughs or cancel classes, but the deficit is another matter. After building up reserves for eight years - through FY15 - we had to start drawing on, and depleting, those reserves. Last August, we began taking long-term actions, first eliminating programs, most of which had been on our watch-list for many years. The next step in October 2016 was to plan for another round of program cuts, culminating in Board action at the March meeting. At that March meeting, as stewards of the public trust, you asked the Administration and Faculty to find ways to cut deeper into expenditures. Both are working to do so, and we will report to the Board on those efforts at the regular meeting in May.

In the meantime, nothing is happening in Springfield, not even stopgaps. I want to thank Justin [Smith] and the entire Student Senate for planning and sponsoring the Illinois Student Senate Forum taking place this week. It is very timely. Last year, like many of you, we thought this couldn't go on any longer. That has not happened. There are some legislative proposals in the General Assembly, but none that appear to offer the support desperately needed by the State's universities. Representative Greg Harris, a Democrat, introduced HB 109, which he calls a "lifeline budget" for public universities and human service providers. As currently written the bill would provide GSU with FY17 operational funds to bring our appropriation for this year to 70% of FY15, and reimburse for fall MAP grants. The bill could provide additional funds to correct the deferred maintenance of our water pipes as well. This bill passed out of the House on April 6. However, the Governor has already announced that he will veto HB109 because he says he wants a full budget, not stop gaps. Senator Bill Brady, a Republican, has proposed SB2182 with some provisions for university funding in FY17 and FY18, but that bill has not yet been heard in committee. So today, we have no choice but to present to you the types of additional budget-cutting or cost-saving measures we are considering based on worse case scenarios. What you will hear is disturbing, but we have to face reality. We must plan for things not going our way because we have little evidence that they will. This meeting focuses on the actions under our control to alleviate, to the extent we can, the impact on our students, employees, and the institution. Thank you.

Ormsby thanked President Maimon, and stressed the importance of addressing the concepts of budget deficit and cash flow. As Maimon indicated, over a number of years the University was able to build up reserves through prudent fiscal management. Some of these savings were used to complete numerous projects on campus. However, with the deficit now before the University that savings account is being drained. Vice President Thomas will provide some forecasts as to when the University would run out of money. The second concept is that it is very difficult to plan for the future due to the uncertainty of state revenues, and therefore models must be built around assumptions. Ormsby reiterated that the biggest problem, by far, is that there is no certainty with regard to the State. He then introduced Vice President Thomas.

STUDY SESSION

Financial Overview

Thomas thanked everyone who continues to work hard to help the University achieve its mission. She reiterated the following forecasts are best estimates based on the data currently available.

History of Revenues and Expenditures

Thomas provided a Power Point presentation, starting with a graph reflecting the correlation of the decline in state funding offset by the growth of the University income fund over the past ten years. Prior to the budget impasse, the University relied on State appropriations to fund at least 43% of its operating budget. For FY16 and FY17 the University has had to go into reserves to support operating costs. This has created a structural deficit. Thomas provided a chart indicating 86% of FY16 expenditures were dedicated to salaries and benefits, while only 14% were non-personnel costs. It would be very difficult to cut anymore from non-personnel expenses. Another chart indicates that once the University runs out of state funds it will have to borrow from auxiliary or contract funds, which would constitute a “financial emergency.” Thomas then brought up a slide demonstrating the effects of reduced state funding, stopgap funding, and the non-funding of MAP and veteran’s grants, for a total $30M shortfall in state funding over the past two years. Ormsby asked if all the stopgap 2 funds had been received, which Thomas confirmed they had. Taboas asked for clarification of the meaning of “financial emergency.” Thomas explained that would constitute having to use restricted funds for operating expenses, such as salaries and utilities. Taboas then stated one could legitimately conclude that the state has not made any MAP payments or reimbursements for veteran grants, and the state is not under any pressure to make good on those. Thomas confirmed his statement, adding that veteran’s grants are unfunded mandates. Ormsby added that as far as the MAP grants are concerned it is the University's choice to fund those or not, which Thomas confirmed.

Structural Deficit

Thomas stated numerous strategic initiatives were completed with the help of carry-forward balances, designed to strengthen the University's future. When the budget impasse began, reversing this forward momentum, a depletion of critical reserves began to occur. That structural deficit has grown from $2.7M in December 2016 to $3.2M as of February 2017. Ormsby asked what would happen if the University had to declare a financial emergency. Thomas deferred to Kennedy, who explained an extreme emergency is exigency. In that scenario, the University would have to reorder its financial organization and contracts, including employment contracts. It is something the Board would have to consider, and could face legal challenges by contractors and employees. A financial emergency could be declared before financial exigency; however, both are very dire.

Cash Flow Projections

Thomas explained a major distinction exists between cash flow and budgeting. The budget is an important tool to direct resources needed to achieve the University's mission. In contrast, cash flow projections predict the inflows and outflows of cash required on hand from all sources including fees, receipts from grants and contracts, and budgeted-but-not-paid obligations to pay current (daily) obligations and to forecast the University's future cash needs. Based on assumptions detailed in the Power Point and in the Board Book, the University's cash projection report as of the end of February 2017 shows cash will be exhausted as of October 2018. Considering the need to keep six months' worth of operating expenses in reserve, this effectively means the University may have to start closing its doors starting April 1, 2018. She reiterated these are assumptions, and could change with changes in enrollment and State appropriations.

Friefeld asked, given this dire prediction, what the University is doing now to prepare for such a crisis. Thomas replied that by doing these projections it gives one a picture of what would happen if the University essentially did nothing. However, increasing efforts to build on enrollment as well as other proactive initiatives could help avert coming to this point. Griggs questioned whether it was fair to assume that by April 2018 the State will not have made any further appropriations. Thomas responded it is hard to predict given the erratic nature of stopgap funding over the past two years. Taboas speculated about non-cash assets. Thomas replied the GSU Foundation has restricted funds and the sculpture park, although the ability to sell any of the sculptures is unclear. Therefore, the University essentially does not have any non-cash assets.

Debt Services and Credit Ratings

Thomas reported the University currently has five debt service obligations with a combined annual debt payment requirement of $4.2M. GSU is current on all obligations. She provided a summary of the outstanding debt service, including both principal and interest, as of June 30, 2016.

With respect to the University's credit rating, the ongoing budget impasse has led credit rating agencies *Moody's* and *Standard & Poor's* to downgrade the State of Illinois' credit rating, which resulted in similar actions for all the Illinois public universities. GSU's *Moody* credit rating on revenue system bonds has dropped to Ba1, and COPs to Ba2. This adversely affects GSU's ability to borrow. Further downgrades are expected.

Other Financial Factors and Deferred Maintenance
Thomas explained that as part of the annual institutional update reviewed by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), institutions are required to calculate and submit their composite financial index (CFI) score. The CFI score is used to assess the financial health of colleges and universities and is a combination of four major ratios: 1) primary reserve ratio; 2) net operating revenues ratio; 3) return on net assets ratio; and 4) viability ratio. Thomas reported GSU's FY16 CFI score fell to -0.19, below the acceptable zone (0 to 1.0) for public institutions. Typically, when an institution falls below the acceptable level the HLC sends out a financial review panel; however, the HLC is aware of the State's situation and therefore may not do so. Ormsby asked if there is any one factor that carries more weight than others do. Thomas responded the biggest factor is flexibility.

Thomas stated that like most public universities, GSU relies heavily on State funding to maintain its physical plant. GSU currently has a deferred maintenance backlog of $42.1M. She emphasized the inability to address this growing deferred maintenance backlog is placing the University's financial solvency at risk.

FY18 Budget Development Process and Cost Savings Measures Under Consideration
Thomas reported as part of the budget development process FY16 and FY17 spending trends were analyzed; operational costs due to inflation were considered; negotiated salary increases are under negotiation with the unions; and cash flow projections were made in order to reduce the structural deficit and create a realistic operating budget. After careful consideration, PBAC approved the conservative scenario 1 (stop gap funding of $12.7M) that would result in a budget shortfall of $3.4M for FY18, and then charged all budget units with cutting 3% from their operating budgets. Ormsby asked if the University's cash flow would be extended if these budget cuts were accomplished, and Thomas confirmed it would. Ormsby then asked Thomas to speak to the Governor's recommended appropriation in his February budget address. Thomas stated GSU's appropriation under that plan would be approximately $20M; however, his budget was not balanced so the odds of GSU receiving that sum are slim. Thomas went on to explain other measures undertaken to address the structural deficit include eliminating the majority of University sponsored cell phones; the work of the Administration and Finance Process Improvement Team (AFPIT); the zero-based budget exercise being undertaken by Administration and Finance units; a print management program to right size the University's printing processes; a voluntary retirement program for eligible faculty and academic advising staff; and restructuring of the College of Education.

A discussion ensued regarding the three scenarios proposed to PBAC, 1) stop gap State funding of $12.7M; 2) the Governor's recommended appropriation of $20M; and 3) zero State funding. Griggs questioned why PBAC chose scenario 1, stating best practices for cash flow are to use what is in hand. Thomas explained the budgeting process requires making projections, and this is the one PBAC recommended. Ormsby asked for confirmation on scenario 3, stating that if the State provided no funding going forward the University would run out of cash in October 2018. Thomas confirmed that is correct, reiterating that various outcomes are possible dependent on the projections made. Griggs agreed that worst case scenarios are important to consider; however, financials should reflect the current situation. Thomas conceded that since State appropriations have been so erratic the past two years the projection component is difficult to pin down. Barr asked if a voluntary retirement program for Civil Service employees is being considered. Thomas answered it was not because the rate of pay is typically much lower than faculty and therefore the savings would be minimal.

Bordelon addressed the enrollment component of developing budget projections. The best practice when projecting cash flow is to utilize assumptions that are reasonable, valid, and reflective of known trends. The following assumptions were used to generate the February 28, 2017 report, enrollment projections for summer 2017: -3%; fall 2017: -5%; spring 2018: -4%; and summer 2018: -4%. As of April 3, summer FTE is down -4.97% while SCH is down -9.86%. Bordelon explained one of the largest declines is seen in international student enrollment with a 47% decline. A major challenge is that GSU currently works with only one recruiting firm in India, The Indus Foundation, with which the University has an exclusivity clause. Because of that, GSU has no recourse if the number of applications they send the University decreases. Bordelon pointed out the relationship with Indus has been good; however, the exclusivity clause is hindering recruitment efforts, and efforts are underway to renegotiate the contract. She added that most institutions contract with multiple international enrollment agencies, while GSU contracts with just the one. Efforts are in place to secure contracts with other international recruitment agencies.

Bordelon reported that in terms of transfer students, there are initiatives encouraging students to start classes in the summer to lock in the lower tuition rate (before the tuition increase is implemented in the fall). The recruitment of freshmen continues with outreach to high school counselors, as well as marketing to increase GSU's visibility. On March 24, high school counselors and community college counselors were invited to campus for a daylong event. She reported GSU currently has 783 freshman applications, compared to 801 last year. To date, 38% have been admitted. Bordelon stated there is a slight decline in graduate enrollment; however, the majority of that is due to the decline in international students. Overall, she stated, recruitment and retention is everyone's responsibility across the University, and that across the University employees must continue to be proactive in reaching out to prospective students in order to increase the applicant pool, and subsequently the admit pool.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Sondra Estep, President, UPI 4100
Dr. Estep gave the following remarks: Good morning and thank you for allowing the APERC Committee time on your agenda to speak about their diligent work. The equal time is sincerely appreciated. It should be noted that APERC exists out of the UPI contract. It is not a union committee and therefore what the Committee can and cannot do is dictated in the contract.

The handout I have given you fills the gap in the report that administration has provided you in the Board Book. They have given your totals without looking at individual programs. You can clearly see that the 22 cuts that were approved, after three years, result in the layoff of less than four faculty members. I would guess that by attrition, it would affect nobody.

The bigger issue is the programs that were eliminated that generate revenue, specifically the English, Math, and Special Education programs. Those three programs being eliminated will result in a loss in revenue to the University of about $380,000. These deserve a second look. You previously had no financial analysis to base your decision on. Now that you do, we are requesting reconsideration of these programs and possibly others. The tricky part of eliminations is that you cannot merely look at small enrollment numbers. We have programs where students take all but two courses in their major. So, a program with 7-8 students is just gravy added to existing courses in another program, except for their last two courses. It is because of issues like these that we are asking the Board to revisit the programs eliminated during the last round, particularly the three pointed out on the spreadsheet, to double check if these programs should be reinstated. That is, the profit-loss analysis presented demonstrated that they probably should not have been included in the previous eliminations.

To that end, I have talked about shared sacrifice since this budget problem began. We all know that 2015 saw all administrators receive raises in the 8-12% range, with one administrator receiving over an 8% raise this school year. The raises in 2015 cost nearly $750K. Faculty received a 1% raise that year and negotiated no raise for this current year. The faculty are sacrificing but it does not appear to be shared with administration. And note that this plays right into the Governor’s cry that universities have bloated administrations with exceptionally high salaries.

Understand that simply stopping the annuity contribution for the next three years, which is in addition to administrative salaries of upper level administrators, would more than cover the cost of programs being eliminated. That alone should bring into perspective how these eliminations have put our students, faculty, support staff, and wider community into a tailspin for something that did not need to happen. Perhaps all of this has little to do with money and has more to do with completely restructuring GSU. You notice in your last elimination report there was an entire section titled restructuring. Well, the Board has a policy about the restructuring process and it is not being followed. Using these hard times and program eliminations as a smoke screen to restructure the university following your policy and procedure should be unacceptable.

Last, we have now been notified that employees will have one paycheck withheld beginning in July and that the contract language that states our members will receive a lousy 0.7% raise this fall will not be honored. These are items that need to be negotiated with the union. You may have heard on the news this weekend that at NEIU there will be three more furlough days. What you did not hear on the news is that those days were negotiated with the union and six days will be paid back to those employees. Our UPI members are just asking for the same kind of respect to bargain these changes to the collective bargaining agreement. These issues should not be dictated. They should be negotiated. We are just asking for the respect that Illinois labor law entitles us to and just a modicum of respect for the faculty. We are in the process of setting up meetings on these issues and I hope that they are approached as an opportunity to bargain.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Chair Ormsby entertained a motion to go into Executive Session at 10:16 am. Pitts made a motion to go into Executive Session pursuant to sections 2(c)1, 2(c)3, and 2(c)11 of the Illinois Open Meetings Act. Griggs seconded. Roll call was taken and Ormsby, Friefeld, Taboas, Barr, Griggs, and Pitts were in attendance. Tyson had left the meeting. The Executive Session concluded at 11:45 am with a motion by Friefeld and a second by Pitts. Roll call was taken by Kennedy, and Ormsby, Friefeld, Taboas, Barr, Griggs, and Pitts were in attendance. Ormsby reported the Board met in Executive Session to discuss personnel; discipline, performance or removal of an occupant of public office; and litigation. No final action was taken during Executive Session.

TRUSTEE REMARKS

Ormsby thanked everyone for their hard work, including faculty, APERC, staff, and administration. He acknowledged these issues are not easy to deal with and thanked all for their time and effort. He reported the next meeting of the Board of Trustees will be a Committee of the Whole on Thursday, May 4, 2017.

Ormsby entertained a motion to adjourn. Pitts made a motion. Griggs seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote and the meeting adjourned at 11:50 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Johns Maloney