

**GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Minutes of the December 9, 2016 Meeting

Brian D. Mitchell, Chair

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Governors State University Board of Trustees meeting for Friday, December 9, 2016 was called to order by Chair Brian D. Mitchell at 8:44 am. Roll call was taken and Trustees Patrick Ormsby, Anibal Taboas, Lorraine Tyson, and Yolanda Pitts were present. Trustees Eileen Durkin and Bruce Friefeld were absent. Chair Mitchell introduced Faculty Senate representatives in attendance: David Golland, Jelena Radovic-Fanta, Sayoni Bose, Ravi Nigam, Xinghua Gao, and Alice Keane.

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, Interim Vice President for Administration and Finance; Will Davis, Vice President for Development; Alexis Kennedy, General Counsel; Aurelio Valente, Vice President for Student Affairs; 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; Andrea Evans, Dean, College of Education; Jun Zhao, Interim Dean, College of Business; Colleen Sexton, Associate Provost; Ann Vendrely, Associate Provost; Randi Schneider, Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management; Joyce Coleman, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Diversity; James McGee, Director of Public Safety; Melinda Gieseke, Associate Vice President for Finance; Jim Zumerchik, Interim Associate Vice President for Facilities Development Management; Tracy Sullivan, Assistant Vice President for Procurement; Betsy Joseph, Director, Auxiliary Services and University Housing; Betsy Essex, Professor; Rupert Evans, Professor; Alli Cipra, Professor; Sasha Cervantes, Professor; David Rhea, Professor; Kendall Wright, Student; and Villalyn Baluga, Internal Auditor.

Chair's Report

Brian D. Mitchell

Chair Mitchell made the following remarks: Welcome and thank you, and each student thanks each and every one of you for what you do. Our agenda today is full. We'll begin with our normal Budget and Finance Committee items, such as reports on purchases and budget to actual.

We then will hear reports concerning the financial audit, the compliance audit, and the Internal Auditor's Annual Report. For the last 18 months, longer actually, we have been discussing the state budget stalemate. It feels like forever, doesn't it? For those of you that spend 8-10 hours a day at the University, I applaud you for your efforts and encourage you to continue to do so. Financial decisions are always important but they take on extra weight in our situation. Therefore, the Board has asked for a few study sessions. We will hear about a zero-based budgeting exercise that each unit will be participating in. In this time of austerity, it makes sense that we take a look at all our expenses in order to make informed decisions. We will also take a deep dive into our tuition and fee structure. Along with state appropriations, tuition and fees make up the bulk of our revenue. Raising tuition is never done casually and we hate to have to do it at all. However, we need to consider it as it is our fiscal responsibility to look at all options.

For something inspiring, I am looking forward to hearing from Dr. David Rhea, Director of our Honors Program. This is a great program that showcases some of our best students. Provost Bordelon will also update us on program review and accreditation, as well as the work of the Academic Program Elimination Review Committee. Several Board members met recently with the three senates on campus. I enjoyed the meetings, and we had excellent conversations and dialogue. Each senate created their own agenda for the conversations, and I want to thank Professor Barbara Winicki, Sheryl Jones-Harper, and Justin Smith for the time and effort they put into preparing and conducting the meetings. Each of them will also give a report at today's Board meeting, and then we will celebrate a bit at the GSU holiday party.

In spite of our challenges, we do have things to celebrate. Just watch our students, whether playing basketball, performing at the CPA, or in the classroom. Our students are the most important reason to be here. Our work is important, students are important, and they deserve our hard work.

President's Report

Dr. Elaine P. Maimon

President Maimon made the following remarks: Thank you. I want to point out that we are viewing the Board Book on our iPads thanks to a donation from a distinguished alum, Dr. Curtis Crawford, who developed the electronic Board portal—Board PortalPLUS®. To further assist us Dr. Crawford hired a student intern, Bridget Drury, who just finished her last final yesterday and is now off to graduate school. Dr. Crawford has emailed me to state how impressed he has been with Bridget, and that she will continue working for him while she attends grad school. To keep us supported on campus Dr. Crawford hired two more student interns, Jim Schoenecker and Anthony Olszewski, whom I would like to recognize today.

It is now official—GSU has attained the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) full accreditation. AACSB is the gold standard for business colleges, with fewer than 5% of the 16,000 business schools worldwide with this accreditation. It's been a team effort. I want to thank Provost Bordelon, former Dean of the College of Business Ellen Foster Curtis, Interim Dean Jun Zhao, and all the faculty and staff that worked tirelessly on this achievement.

Earning this accreditation is a case in point for GSU's commitment to quality, even in the midst of severe budget challenges.

I also want to thank Justin Smith and the Student Senate for a successful FAFSA completion drive, which is essential for student access to funding. Let me also reiterate GSU's commitment to cover MAP grants for fall 2016 and spring 2017. We are doing that regardless of what the State does, and hope it's a good example to the Governor and the General Assembly. I will also affirm continued service to "Dreamers," undocumented students who have graduated from Illinois high schools. Dean of Students, Aurelio Valente, recently sent a special correspondence to students with a link to a letter I signed urging continuation of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. The letter, signed by close to 200 presidents, says, "DACA beneficiaries on our campuses have been exemplary student scholars and student leaders, working across campus and in the community....To our country's leaders we say that DACA should be upheld, continued, and expanded." Provost Bordelon sent a similar letter to faculty. There is a lot of concern amongst our undocumented students. One-on-one communication between faculty and students is essential, so please, continue to help ease their anxiety. The Lumina Project forming the Completion College Consortium has gained momentum. GSU, along with the other four universities in the Consortium, will participate in Beta testing this spring. I was proud that my article, "Helping Students Finish What They Start" was published in the November/December issue of *Trusteeship* magazine.

Now on to the painful portion of my report—the budget. As I reported in October, for the last 18 months GSU has received completely inadequate stop-gap funding. Standard & Poor's and Moody's tell us that stop-gap funding means nothing to them. It means something to us, but not near enough. Illinois state universities, including GSU, for the second year in a row are in the unprecedented situation of functioning without an operating budget. We have never, at least in the 9.5 years since I've been president, had any deferred maintenance funding, but instead used operational funds or borrowed money. Borrowing is no longer an option because of the downgrades from the credit agencies. The small amount of regular appropriations has resulted in cumulative gaps that cannot be filled even on that long-awaited day when we finally get an annual budget. Currently, we see no plan for reliable appropriations. The University itself, with guidance from the Board, must make broad-based and long-term decisions. The Board has charged the Administration with developing a long-range plan for diversified revenue sources and for reduced expenditures. You have asked us to do so while remaining true to our mission, putting students first, and affirming our commitment to the highest quality in everything we do. Fulfilling this charge must go beyond tinkering around the edges and holding our breath about the next appropriation. Today's agenda includes a study session on zero-sum budgeting and tuition setting. We will be discussing new ideas and procedures that the current challenges mandate.

At the same time, we are continuing our political efforts. You may have read about the University of Illinois (UI) Compact, a bill that will be presented to the General Assembly during this session. It focuses on accountability in terms appropriate to the flagship. UI has invited the

regional universities to draft amendments to this bill with accountability measures appropriate to us. GSU benefits from accountability, so we will continue to monitor the advantages and disadvantages of accepting UI's invitation. I have consulted with most of you on our plan to seek legislative sponsorship for a separate bill to authorize \$6.7M to GSU to replace our water pipes. Whatever is decided on general appropriations, we must replace these pipes. We will also seek fair, differentiated operational funding for GSU. The University has been at a disadvantage for years because our base funding is seriously inadequate. Even 100% of our FY15 funding is unfair to us. Differentiated funding for public universities has occurred ad hoc. We will try to build on the precedent of greater fairness in base funding for Governors State founded on performance principles. Lobbying will be directed in that regard. We will also continue asserting that public universities are a public good. We will do so even when we feel most alone.

Finally, in the darkest times and in the darkest season of the year, we must continue to light candles—at least metaphorically. We will do so today at the holiday party. Faculty, staff, and students will entertain us and I hope you will all attend. Many thanks and best wishes to all assembled here for the holiday season.

BUDGET AND FINANCE

Budget and Finance Committee Chair, Patrick Ormsby, presented the following items:

Information Items:

Report on Purchases \$50,000-\$99,999 for the period September 12, 2016 through November 20, 2016

The report is in the Board Book. There were no questions.

Budget to Actual Report as of November 30, 2016

Thomas provided a Power Point of the report. The bottom line is that there was a shortfall of \$7.8M in FY16. Ormsby commented that the University is eating up its reserves. Thomas confirmed that, adding that if GSU does not receive any additional funding for FY17 the fiscal year will end with a deficit of \$2.6M. Ormsby pointed out that the original budget for FY17 was \$54M, which then was adjusted to \$51M. The approved contingency fund is currently unfunded. He commented that the University is doing a good job of staying under the adjusted budget, and praised the Administration for their efforts.

Report on FY15 Financial Audit

Gieseke presented, pointing out this report reflects a fiscal year that ended 17 months ago and does not reflect any of the budget struggles of FY16 or FY17. The State Auditor General is required by the Illinois State Auditing Act to conduct a financial audit and a compliance examination of every State agency. These audits and examinations inform the public, the Legislature, and State officers about the obligations, expenditures, receipts, and uses of agency funds, and provide State agencies with specific recommendations to help ensure compliance with State and federal statutes, rules, and regulations. The FY15 audits were conducted on behalf of

the State of Illinois Auditor General by the independent auditing firm of E.C. Ortiz & Co. LLC. The auditors are normally on campus from May until January. This was the final year of GSU's 6-year engagement with E.C. Ortiz & Co. The primary purpose of this audit and report was to express an opinion on the University's FY15 financial statements. Based on their audit, the auditors have "expressed an unqualified opinion on the University's basic financial statements." The auditor's opinion state that the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the University at June 30, 2015.

Report on FY15 Compliance Audit

Gieseke once again presented. The purpose of this examination is to ensure that GSU complied, in all material respects, with Governmental Accounting Standards Compliance, Federal Compliance, and State Compliance. For FY15 there were seven audit findings, of which four were federal findings and were procedural. Gieseke explained that while great strides have been made in University processes, Federal compliance is such that even a minor error will trigger a finding. In the area of State compliance, all three FY15 findings were repeats of FY14, 1) faculty's noncompliance with timesheets; 2) inadequate controls over verification of job applicant's information; and 3) weakness in controls in regards to payment card industry data security standards. Actions have been taken to address these areas. Going forward the State Auditor General has engaged Borschneck Pelletier and Company as the external audit firm for the next six years. Gieseke commented that a new audit firm provides a fresh perspective that allows the University to make improvements in unaddressed areas, adding that by strengthening various University departments and processes, GSU will continue to make progress in all areas of reporting.

Internal Auditor Annual Report

Internal Auditor Villalyn Baluga presented. The Office of Internal Audit (IA) is dedicated to enhancing and protecting organizational value by providing risk-based and objective assurance, advice, and insight, although it has no authority over processes and is an independent agent. The Office of IA is mandated to provide a detailed annual report to the President and the Board of Trustees. To achieve the degree of independence necessary to effectively carry out the responsibilities of the internal audit activity, the Chief Internal Auditor shall have direct and unrestricted access to the University President and the Board of Trustees.

Due to the absence of the internal audit function for a significant part of FY16 due to a retirement, the FY16 internal audit was not completed by the deadline. Baluga stated the University anticipates an audit finding for the late submission of reports, which is required to be reported to the Board of Trustees. Going forward this should not be an issue. Baluga reported that every five years the Internal Auditor is subject to a peer review. This was due in August 2016, so an extension was requested and granted, and this will take place in August 2017. Ormsby asked who does the peer review. Baluga responded the Office of Internal Audit Advisory Board will conduct the review.

Report on Mandatory and Discretionary Waivers

Thomas presented. Referring to the report in the Board Book, she explained that \$2.8M in mandatory and discretionary waivers were awarded to 1,146 students in FY16, \$135K less than FY15. Mandatory waivers include unfunded veteran benefits, children of employees, senior citizens, and teacher special education. Discretionary waivers include academic, athletic, civil service, inter-institutional/related agencies, and several other categories. There were a total of 913 discretionary waivers in FY16. There were no questions.

Non-Academic Units – Zero-Based Budget Exercise

Thomas presented on the topic. She stated that in theory, zero-based budgeting is an efficient way to decrease unnecessary costs by looking at each expenditure and keeping spending to a minimum. It is efficient, aligned with the University's strategy, and promotes decision making by desired outcome. The process will begin in January and will take place in conjunction with the (Planning and Budget Advisory Council) PBAC process. Ormsby commented that zero-based budgeting is common in industry and he very much supports it because it can provide insight into where processes can be improved and efficiencies can be found. Taboas raised a question about waivers, asking if mandated are funded or not. Thomas replied that they are unfunded mandates. Taboas asked if MAP grants fall into that category, to which Thomas responded that because they are currently not being funded and the University is covering the cost they are essentially an unfunded mandate. He then asked if the University is expecting any MAP funding. Thomas stated none is expected in the near future. Fall 2015 and spring 2016 MAP grants were funded, eventually, but no funds have been received for FY17.

STUDY SESSION

Tuition and Fee Analysis for Academic Year 2017-2018

Maimon outlined the topics to be discussed, the first being undergraduate tuition. GSU has always prided itself on keeping tuition as low as possible in order to provide greater access to higher education. However, this may not be the best strategy going forward as GSU becomes more and more dependent on tuition revenue. The Administration is reevaluating such assumptions as the Board of Trustees has mandated a 10-year plan for diversified revenue sources leading to less dependence on State appropriations. Tyson thanked the Administration for this study session as a proponent of keeping college affordable; however, recognizing in these trying fiscal times that GSU needs to be as independent as possible from State funding. Maimon pointed out that she strongly believes undergraduate tuition should not be at differential rates, but that at the graduate level differential tuition rates are warranted. For example, now that the College of Business has accreditation from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) accreditation the cost of graduate programs should increase. A 15% increase in these programs is being investigated, along with lower percentage increases in other graduate programs. GSU's doctoral degrees are already priced higher than master's degrees but must remain competitive and therefore a market analysis is being considered. Other proposals on tuition and fees to be presented include one-rate tuition, flat-rate "banded" tuition, and a student fee analysis. Tyson commented that she supports giving Illinois residents an advantage. Taboas

expressed his appreciation of the concept of bundling what a full-time student is because it aids with completion and encourages students to take more credits. He would wholeheartedly endorse an initiative that pushes students to finish, and as far as undocumented students, he fully endorses supporting them.

One-Rate Tuition Proposal

Thomas introduced Dean of Students, Aurelio Valente, to present the one-rate tuition proposal. Valente reported during the August 2016 GSU Board of Trustees Retreat a White Paper was submitted on a “One Rate” proposal that would provide in-state tuition rates to all undergraduate students who have a permanent residence within the United State of America and its territories. Borders are becoming increasingly irrelevant. Currently GSU offers in-state tuition to Indiana residents, online students, and where required by law, whereas all but one other Illinois public university offers in-state tuition to bordering states. In fall 2015 98.1% of students were in-state, and in fall 2016 98.4% were. That amounts to 55 out-of-state students, 41 of whom are Indiana residents that pay in-state tuition. A one-rate policy would position GSU to be more competitive when recruiting out-of-state students by attracting students with higher levels of academic preparation; mitigating declining Illinois high school demographics; allowing for an increase in the diversity of the student profile; building up the residential student body; decreasing the use of state waivers for out-of-state recruits; and aligning GSU with national College Completion/Lumina Project priorities. He added that is considered controversial with flagship campuses that typically charge more and are at capacity, thus displacing in-state students; however, GSU does not fall into that category.

Tyson asked if governmental affairs has been consulted as to how this would play out. Valente responded that Maureen Kelly, Director of Governmental and Community Relations has been at the table during these discussions. Western Illinois University rolled out a similar plan last year. Kelly stated she believed the General Assembly would understand the need to raise tuition given the fiscal situation. Tyson requested more discussion and some strategic analysis before the Board votes on such an action. Kelly reiterated that GSU can make the case given the lack of funding. Tyson emphasized that GSU is an Illinois public university, GSU is educating Illinois residents, and they should retain the benefit of being in-state students. Taboas responded that certainly it is a philosophical issue; even with in-state tuition GSU is far more inexpensive than its competitors. He added that if GSU were on the playing field it would be an important factor. Pitts asked Valente what programs the Indiana residents were enrolled in. Valente replied they have not been surveyed, but of those students he knows personally programs are a deciding factor. Ormsby asked whether GSU has agreements with other border states. Valente responded that Indiana was the sole state.

Ormsby asked when such a proposal would come before the Board for a vote. Maimon indicated it would be at the March meeting. She reiterated the need to seriously vet this in the General Assembly (GA), as Trustee Tyson noted. If there is pushback from the GA it will be important to take this into consideration. She urged Kelly to monitor the situation. Valente reiterated the encouragement of a broad proposal because it is easier to explain and market, with a focus on

Northwest Indiana and Wisconsin. He added that these students would not be eligible for the tuition freeze Illinois resident undergraduates are afforded under law. Ormsby asked what the next step is. Maimon responded the GA would be vetted, of course, but that the Administration is open to recommendations from the Board. Ormsby stated he would favor additional proposals because opening up in-state tuition to all 50 states almost feels like “we’re really in trouble here” to an outsider. GSU’s quality and reputation may suffer. Tyson also asked for more proposals, adding that she felt there should be some incentive for in-state students to attend a state university. Thomas acknowledged that out-of-state and border states could be at a different multiplier. Pitts favored allowing some benefit to border states.

Differential Tuition Proposal – College of Business Graduate Programs

Thomas presented. She explained that differential tuition rates (DTR) are a surcharge a university or college charges students above the base tuition in order to participate in a specified degree program or course. DTRs are generally applied to high demand academic programs, academic programs with expensive instructional costs, or programs with high earning potential. The University is expecting accreditation by AACSB in spring 2017 following a successful site visit and many years of hard work. Therefore, the Administration is proposing a DTR for all College of Business graduate programs to help sustain AACSB accreditation as well as generate revenue for other programs. Tyson asked for a breakdown of current and proposed costs. Thomas indicated that base graduate tuition is currently \$307 per credit hour. For a 36-45 credit hour graduate program the cost would be approximately \$12,000. With a 15% increase in tuition business graduate programs would cost \$374 per credit hour or \$13,464 to complete. Tyson asked how a 15% increase was determined, adding she would recommend a larger increase. Thomas explained the Chicagoland higher education marketplace was surveyed. The increase in tuition would take place in fall 2017, if approved. Taboas asked if current students would be affected by the increase, to which Thomas responded they would. Taboas asked if a phased-in approach was being considered as an incentive to current students. Thomas stated all options will be revisited based on the Board’s feedback prior to bringing anything before the Board for a vote.

Tuition Analysis – Academic Year 2017-2018

Thomas presented. Each spring the Board sets tuition rates for the next academic year. Tuition setting objectives need to take into account adequate funding to meet GSU’s academic mission and *Vision 2020* goals in a climate of declining and uncertain State funding; maintain an affordable education for students; remain competitive in the higher education marketplace; and ensure sufficient institutional aid for merit-based award programs. To complete the process, it was necessary to look at enrollment projections, communicate with the Colleges and programs, consider price sensitivity and tuition elasticity, the State law mandate freezing undergraduate tuition, unfunded Illinois Veteran programs, and mandatory and discretionary tuition waivers. Various scenarios were formulated based on this data and State appropriation levels of 50%, 60%, and 70% of the base FY15 appropriation, and at this time the Administration is recommending a 10% increase for undergraduates, a 6% increase for master’s students, and a 4%

increase for doctoral students. Thomas reiterated this is a difficult exercise to undertake when State appropriations are so uncertain.

Taboas stated he is a little offended by the percentages since the University needs to be financially healthy regardless of what the State does. GSU has to be in business for the long term, and presenting it this way does not help the University's cause. He added that perhaps it is a comment on style. Thomas asked Taboas what he would suggest, to which he proposed focusing on diversifying funding. He stated the document presented could be used for political fodder and he would hate to walk into that area because it's making an assumption that GSU's State appropriations will continue to slide. Thomas emphasized that this is an internal document. Tyson expressed that she found the analysis helpful because it shows what kind of position GSU is in, which is a tough one. She did question the retention rates, which seemed a bit high. Thomas responded the retention figures are a combination of two things, fall to spring, as well as new admits. Tyson asked her if she was comfortable with that assumption, to which Thomas affirmed she was since there was a 2% decline from the previous academic year, fall to spring.

Flat-Rate "Banded" Tuition Analysis – Undergraduate Programs

Thomas presented. She explained this is a strategy adopted by many universities to encourage undergraduate (UG) completion. It consists of charging UG students a flat rate based on 15-credit hours for tuition and fees if they are registered for 12-18 hours. This does not apply to graduate students. Part-time students (enrolled in 1-11 hours) will be charged tuition on a per credit hour basis, as will summer courses. Thomas explained that potential advantages are an increase in full-time student 4-year completion rates; a favorable financial incentive for students enrolled in 16-18 credit hours; and possible increased tuition revenue. Potential disadvantages are that it would benefit full-time students only; by design it encourages students to enroll in either 11 or less credits hours, or 15+ credit hours; and it is an isolated strategy to promote the "15 to Finish" initiative.

Tyson asked how many credit hours are considered full-time. Thomas answered that 12 credit hours are based on reporting standards; however, this program would encourage students to take 15 credit hours per semester in order to finish their undergraduate degree in four years. Tyson expressed that many students may not be able to handle 15 hours, and perhaps go somewhere else, or take less than 12 hours. Life responsibilities get in the way. Maimon emphasized many scenarios are being studied and analyzed to help define the best tuition and fee practices for the University. Tyson expressed her appreciation for the all the work being done. Ormsby added that he is sensitive to the part-time student as his assistant is currently enrolled at GSU and taking 9 credit hours. He asked for statistics on part-time students in the future, which Thomas agreed to provide.

Mitchell called for a break at 10:45 am. Open session resumed at 10:59 am.

Student Fee Analysis – Academic Year 2017-2018

Thomas presented. An analysis of student fee assessments was conducted in an effort to realign them to address current and future needs in Student Services, Health Services, Facilities repair and maintenance, and Technology upgrades. In the future, an analysis will be conducted biannually. Thomas referred to a Power Point which demonstrated total fees per credit hour would remain at \$76; however, the Administration is proposing the Facilities Fee be increased \$2, the Career and Counseling Fee be increased \$1, the Student Activity fee be increased \$3, the Student Center fee be increased \$1, the Strategic Initiatives fee be decreased \$3, and the Technology Fee be decreased \$4. These proposed fee rates are designed to better align with current needs on campus. Pitts questioned why the Technology Fee was being reduced by \$4. Thomas explained that an assessment of expenditures in this area, following several years of technology upgrades, could be lowered so other areas could be served better.

Action Items:

Resolution 17—11: Approval of the Internal Audit Charter

Ormsby requested a motion to approve Resolution 17-11. Tyson made a motion. Beaupre seconded. Ormsby asked Thomas to please frame up why the University needs an Internal Audit Charter. She replied it is required by the Internal Audit Advisory Board. The last time it was revised was in 2008, and therefore an update is warranted. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Academic Affairs Chair, Anibal Taboas, presented the following items:

Information Items:

Retention report – Dr. David Rhea, Director, Honors Program (HP)

Bordelon introduced Rhea, who thanked the Board for this opportunity, and introduced student Kendall Wright, an Honors Program student, who would like to share her experiences. Ms. Wright made the following remarks: I remember coming to GSU as a freshman and meeting Dr. Rhea, who said, “Hey, want to be part of the Honors Program?” He explained all the benefits, and I decided to take part. The Honors Advisory Board was instituted to get students involved because there initially was not a lot of participation, and I and another student decided to revamp the Honors Council Board. We plan events for students, do community service, move forward and help build the Honors Program. It has provided so many opportunities for me. I went to the National Honors Collegiate Conference, in Chicago and then Seattle, which was the first time I had been on a plane. I had never even traveled out of this area. It helped build my self-confidence and connect with students from around the country. Laura White, an English Professor, then encouraged me to present at a regional conference in Illinois, which I did, and it has also opened a lot of doors for me. I really appreciate Dr. Rhea and everyone involved with the program. I appreciate the push. I don’t always pay attention to my talents, and this has pushed me to do so and succeed, and to identify my potential. Thank you.

Rhea presented a Power Point on the program, which he emphasized gives students' strong ownership. The Honors Program has transformed since 2013, with its purpose evolving into a blend of academic affairs and enrollment management to encourage high quality students to attend GSU. It now offers an enhanced education experience dedicated to classroom experiences, and opportunities for engaged learning in leadership, research, prestigious scholarships, double majors, and study abroad. Rhea explained there is strong emphasis on professional and personal development in order to prepare students for the workforce upon graduation. The HP encourages students to BE leaders, not simply study leadership. Four years into the Program's Trans4mation participants are up to 110, a 134% increase since 2013. The third freshman cohort is full at 30 students, 66% of whom are of color. Retention rates are high as are the number of scholarship recipients, and HP students continue to dominate leadership roles on campus and off. The first dedicated Honors Study Abroad Program will take place in May 2017 when a group will travel to Rome, Italy.

Rhea went on to explain the *Building High-Minority Honors Program Populations* initiative, which is nationally recognized. The goal is to break down barriers that many minorities face in qualifying for traditional honors programs. GSU has tailored its HP program to reflect its demographic by conducting quantitative and qualitative analyses of the GSU population, as opposed to using the traditional HP qualifiers of ACT scores and high school GPA. This allows a greater number of students to participate in the HP and gain valuable life skills. Students in the program do have to maintain a 3.5 GPA to remain in the program. Rhea opened the floor for questions.

Tyson thanked Rhea for the presentation, and for serving underrepresented populations and not basing everything on standardized test scores. Rhea responded that as the program was being built it became clear that it would not be very successful if GPAs and standardized test scores were the only measurement for qualification. He explained that the HP has students with an ACT of 18 or 19 that are very successful in the program. The HP wanted to make sure it attracted the most suitable students for the program, ones that would really benefit from the rigor of it, without basing qualification of one or two numbers. Bordelon thanked Rhea for his leadership, which has helped transform the Honors Program over the past three years.

Program Accreditation Status Summary

Bordelon stated there are no accreditation visits scheduled for this spring, although there are several scheduled for the fall. She expressed her gratitude for the AACSB accreditation in the College of Business.

IBHE Cyclical Program Review for AY2016-2017

Bordelon referred to the report in the Board book. She explained that generally programs are reviewed on a 6-year cycle, except for new programs which are reviewed on a 3-year cycle. The IBHE Program Review Report will be brought to the May 12 Board meeting.

Update on Program Elimination Review Committee (APERC)

Bordelon explained that all academic programs are being reviewed, noting it is a very difficult process. When an initial review was done last spring only those programs with 15 or fewer majors were reviewed and then brought before the Board at the August retreat. With the continued budget impasse, the University must review all academic programs. Article 25 from the GSU-UPI Collective Bargaining Agreement establishes the Academic Program Elimination Review Committee (APERC) consisting of seven members representing all Colleges. The review of academic programs includes input from the APERC, deans, program chairs, and the Office of the Provost. Data is provided to all participants through a shared drive on the GSU system. This information includes enrollment data, graduation rates, labor statistics, academic program reviews, tuition revenues, etc. Additional information may be requested by the Committee or other participants. The initial meeting of APERC was held on October 27, 2016. Final recommendations will be brought before the Board at the March 3, 2017 meeting. Bordelon indicated that the General Education curriculum and the Honors Program are also being evaluated for efficiencies and improvements. Programs may be eliminated, revised, or merged. All options are on the table, including reorganization of units. The rubric being utilized was developed with input from several different entities, and consists of five areas: mission and vision; internal and external demand for the program; program quality; revenue; and potential for the program.

Taboas acknowledged this is a difficult process, and asked what exactly is being pursued. Bordelon responded there may be some programs eliminated that would affect faculty and staff, bearing in mind that this is a long term process with a three-year teach out, therefore savings would not occur immediately. However, this needs to be looked at now in order to plan for the future. Taboas indicated that he didn't mean financially per program, but globally--what is the thinking on that? Bordelon responded that the University is looking at a \$3.1M deficit across the next three years which is why a long term planning process needs to be undertaken to achieve cost savings while maintaining quality programming. Taboas asked if the \$3.1M figure was total, or per year, to which Bordelon responded it is the total amount. Taboas then asked if the desired result is not achieved will this exercise need to be repeated? Maimon stressed that whatever the legislation does moving forward, the University has to achieve a \$3.1M diminishment of its operating budget over the next three years, adding that the Board has mandated the University maintain reserves, which at this point need to be replenished. She added that the Academic Master Plan Committee is still looking at new programs that would enhance offerings. An assumption of reduced State appropriations is part of the equation. Tyson asked if cost savings as a result of program eliminations will be presented to the Board in March. Thomas responded they will. Taboas commented that he had a gut feeling that this is something that should be done every year going forward, however painful. Maimon explained there has been some reallocation of funds across budget lines; however, now much more radical action is necessary. These items will be brought before the Board in March for a vote. Tyson requested the Board materials two weeks prior to the meeting given the complexity of the issues, which Maimon agreed to. Taboas asked if any of the Faculty Senate members had any remarks. Winicki stated she would address the matter in her report.

Action Items:***Resolution 17—12: Approval of Honorary Degree Candidates***

Taboas requested a motion to approve Resolution 17-12. Ormsby made a motion. Taboas seconded. Maimon provided a brief recap of the process and the candidates. Golland stated he supported Resolution 17-12 on behalf of the Faculty Senate. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

HUMAN RESOURCES

There were no items to present.

FULL BOARD**Senate Reports****Dr. Barbara Winicki, Faculty Senate President**

Dr. Winicki made the following remarks: On behalf of the Faculty Senate and all faculty members, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to meet with some Board members on November 28. I hope the Board thinks, as I do, that the time was well spent and the information we shared will benefit the shared governance of our University.

First, I would like to provide updates on Faculty Senate activities since the previous Board of Trustees meeting on October 7. There have been three appointments to the Board of Trustees subcommittees. To complete the unexpired term of Olumide Ijose to the BOT Human Resources subcommittee, Alice Keane, Assistant Professor of Accounting; to complete the unexpired term of Yonghong Jia to the BOT Budget and Finance subcommittee, Ravi Nigam, Associate Professor of Communication Disorders; and to complete the unexpired term of David Golland to the BOT Governance subcommittee, Lara Stache, Assistant Professor of Communications.

On October 20 the Faculty Senate approved a revision of *Policy 35 – Emeritus Status*. The major changes are that faculty members who retire at the rank of associate professor will be eligible for the honorific “Associate Professor Emeritus” and that application will occur during the faculty member’s last semester prior to retirement. Also on October 20 the Senate charged a Joint Faculty Senate-UPI Task Force on Student Evaluations of Instructions (SEIs). The charge states: The purpose of this task force is to develop new items and procedures for assessing Student Evaluations of Instruction that are congruent with GSU policies, varied course delivery methods, and the new online system for collecting SEI data. The task force will also establish processes, with the cooperation of the University administration, to assess whether there is unfair bias in responses to SEIs and whether SEIs are valid measures of outcomes valued by the University community. The co-chairs of the task force are Dr. Pam Mohanty and Dr. Stephen Wagner, both of the College of Business. Also in regard to SEIs, the Faculty Senate is monitoring the implementation of the new, entirely online SEI process from the recently contracted vendor. We

have had reports of links to SEIs being sent to students who are not enrolled in the specified class and of students not receiving links to SEIs for classes in which they are enrolled.

Secondly, I would like to report on four issues about which the Faculty Senate has concerns. First, the Faculty Senate is deeply concerned about the program elimination process. In the Academic Program Elimination Review Committee's (APERC's) most recent convening, the committee has been asked to assess each and every academic program rather than programs truly in danger of elimination. The Faculty Senate believes this sends a dangerous message to students, prospective students, and the community at large. Moreover, rather than allowing the faculty committee to do a careful review according to the criteria listed in the UPI-GSU Agreement, APERC members have been told to use an administration-selected rubric – one that does not correspond exactly with the criteria listed in the contract. I have written up a comparison of the criteria in both documents and anyone who wishes a copy may have one. A second concern, as I have stated before, is that the tenure-track faculty evaluation system seems to be making it increasingly difficult to earn tenure. The long term good of programs and GSU as a whole are being sacrificed, I'm afraid, for short-term expediency. One source of this problem is that new tenure-track faculty members are being asked to take on administrative program coordination duties prematurely. This, in turn, is due to the lack of tenured faculty members in many programs. The hiring freeze and retirements have taken their toll. The third concern I mentioned at the retreat on November 28 is that of teaching schedules conflict with service commitments, particularly Faculty Senate and standing committee meetings. There are many faculty members who are not able to join faculty committees because they would not be able to attend scheduled committee meetings. We hope that chairs and deans will take this into consideration when faculty teaching schedules are developed, especially the schedules of those who are not yet tenured. In addition to these three concerns, I would like to express the Faculty Senate's concern about what seems to be an attempt to use the financial situation as a reason for allowing unqualified faculty members – including adjunct faculty members – to oversee graduate capstone courses and practica. This is in violation of *Policy 6 Graduate Studies Policy*, as well as a threat to the academic integrity of graduate programs.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak to you today.

Sheryl Jones-Harper, Civil Service Senate President

Ms. Jones-Harper made the following remarks: On behalf of the Civil Service Senate I want to thank you for contributing to the success of Civil Service Day. We were having trouble raising the funds needed, but thanks to many who contributed donations we were able to have a successful celebration. I want to thank the Board of Trustees for meeting with the Senate on November 28. Civil Service employees are serious about contributing to the goals of *Vision 2020* across campus. The Senate is concerned about losing vacation days and comp time due to the mandatory closing over Winter Break, as some employees may lose holiday pay. Civil Service employees are looking forward to working with Human Resources on upcoming professional development opportunities, and updating job descriptions. It is important that employees have input as to their individual job descriptions. However, Civil Service employees and the Senate

are still concerned about the inability to advance their careers here at GSU under the present system. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today.

Justin Smith, Student Senate President

Mr. Smith made the following remarks: On behalf of the Student Senate I want to thank the Board of Trustees for a very productive retreat on November 28. The Student Senate has been very busy working on improving the campus environment, ensuring the safety of water, and implementing programs such as *Rock the Vote*, which registers voters. Members of the Senate recently attended an IBHE meeting at Roosevelt University. One of the action items on the agenda was the approval of the FY17 budget, which was approved by ISAC on December 1, 2016. It acknowledged the negative impact of the budget stalemate on students, schools, and communities. An immediate balanced budget from the legislature and the governor was demanded to ensure financial stability for community colleges, public universities, and students across the state. At the meeting GSU's Student Senate representatives decided we were in support of the resolution and our Senate is composing a resolution to present to IBHE. This event was one example of how the GSU Student Senate continues to build relationships with colleges and universities across the state. Also in the planning phase is an Illinois United Student Senate Forum to be held in the spring semester, which will bring together legislators, student government members from across the state, and hopefully Governor Rauner or a representative from his office. We will keep you informed of this event as plans progress. Thank you.

Mitchell thanked the three senate presidents for participating in the retreat on November 28. It was an excellent forum to hear not only about your concerns, but also about the great things you are all doing.

Information Items

Water Quality Report

Thomas introduced Jim Zumerchik, Interim Associate Vice President for Facilities Development Management (FDM). Zumerchik explained that the University is on a well water system managed by Aqua Illinois. It is considered "hard water" and has a high iron content, although within legal levels, that can't be rectified with filters. To combat this Aqua Illinois adds phosphates to the water. They are currently in the process of running a 14-mile line from the Kankakee River, which will be comparable to City of Chicago water, that is due for completion in approximately nine months. In the meantime, FDM and Aqua Illinois continues to analyze the water, as noted in the reports in the Board book, and perform more frequent flushings of the pipes to remove residue. Iron in the water has been an issue at *Prairie Place* that FDM has been working to resolve, including holding meetings with Student Affairs and students to ensure their concerns are addressed.

Mitchell asked if the infrastructure was in place to accommodate water from the Kankakee River. Zumerchik responded that it is, with the water being run to water towers in the Village of University Park. Mitchell asked for more information about service interruptions at *Prairie Place*. Zumerchik explained there was an iron buildup due to a water softener shut down that

took 4-6 hours to repair. Other events at *Prairie Place* have not been shutdowns, but issues with heating the water to adequate temperatures. Mitchel asked if this is being communicated to the students. Both Thomas and Zumerchik stated everyone is doing the best they can to reach out to every student affected. Maimon referred to a photo taken by a student during the shutdown, in which the water was full of sediment and foul smelling. She assured students and the Board that the University would never allow a situation where students were drinking or bathing in water that wasn't safe according to overall standards. Thomas added regular testing of the water will be done going forward. Smith asked what the pH of the water is. It was not readily available in the report, and Thomas agreed to get that information for the Student Senate and the Board. Tyson asked about the date of the report, which appeared to be from 2015. Thomas responded that the results from 2016 testing were not available yet. Zumerchik explained that Aqua Illinois tests the water yearly and posts the results on their website; however, with the recent issues the University is planning to perform more frequent testing on its own.

Action Items

Approval of the Consent Agenda

Recording Secretary Johns Maloney read the following:

Resolution 17—11: Approval of the Internal Audit Charter

Resolution 17—12: Approval of Honorary Degree Candidates

No requests were made to remove a resolution from the Consent Agenda. Mitchell requested a motion to approve for adoption and inclusion on the Consent Agenda. Ormsby made a motion. Tyson seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Approval of Minutes – October 7, 2016

Mitchell requested a motion to approve the minutes of the October 7, 2016 Full Board meeting. Tyson made a motion. Taboas seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Resolution 17—13: Release of Executive Session Minutes

Mitchell requested a motion to approve Resolution 17-13. Taboas made a motion. Tyson seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sondra Estep, President, University Professionals of Illinois Local 4100

Dr. Estep made the following remarks: I am the proud president of the UPI at GSU. Before I begin, I noticed that in January, four of our distinguished Board members' terms will expire. Jack, Eileen, Brian, and Pat, I want to thank you for your dedicated service.

To follow-up on Dr. Winicki's remarks on the APERC, in August you had two proposals before you, one from the Administration and one from the Faculty. You chose the Administration's proposal. Also at the August meeting, prior to the vote, at 8:10 am about 20 faculty members received a message that Public Comment would take place at 9:00 am. This left very little time

for faculty members to get on campus and share their thoughts. I want to express that the faculty did their due diligence at that time with regard to program eliminations, speaking to every program coordinator, and suggesting cuts just as deep, but more well thought out. These were disregarded by the Administration. I hope in March you will have both versions so you have a choice. Is everything on the table? That's not what the contract says. That's the review committee's choice, not the Administration's. Faculty are worried about being laid-off and students are worried that their programs will be eliminated. It is not fair to ask a committee to review 60+ programs and to use a rubric created by Administration. Everything can't be on the table according to the contract. And I want you to be aware of that. Also, you should allow time for public comments before a vote, not after. The faculty did a lot of hard work and it was totally disregarded by the Administration. Thank you for your service. Have a wonderful holiday.

TRUSTEE COMMENTS

Taboas stated although he was unable to attend the retreat with the Senates he wanted to thank them for their participation, and the Trustees that were able to attend such a worthwhile meeting.

Mitchell wished everyone a happy holiday season, adding that we are all here to make the best decisions for our students.

ADJOURN

Mitchell requested a motion to adjourn. Tyson made a motion. Pitts seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote at 12:39 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Johns Maloney