Northern Illinois University
Supportive Professional Staff Council Meeting
MINUTES
Thursday, May 3, 2007
Holmes Student Center - Sky Room, 10:00 A.M.

Present
Linda Peterson, Adriana Moreno Nevarez, Steve Lux, Michael Stang, Jack King, Grant Olson, Phil Young, Lyndon Perkins, Michelle Pickett, Dana Gautcher, Todd Latham, Kay Chapman, Elizabeth Leake, Andre Crittenden, Sabrina Hammond, Michael Spires, Norden Gilbert, Jon Ostenburg, Abby Chemers, Monique Bernoudy, Bobbie Cesarek

Absent
Lynn Richards, Dan House, Matt Volk

Guest
Tim Griffin

I. Cesarek, Council President, called the meeting to order at 10:05 AM.

a. The agenda was approved.

b. Minutes of the April meeting were approved, with minor changes.

Announcements

a.) Employee Benefits Fair: Everyone was encouraged to attend the benefits fair to be held on this day until 2:00 p.m. in the HSC Regency Room.

b.) SPS Sabbaticals Workshop is May 14, 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.

III. Committees of the Council

a. Awards: Recap of the SPS Awards Reception per Cesarek. This event was well received—excellent attendance. We should consider moving to Altgeld Auditorium in the future. We received good feedback. Regarding SPS Development Grants, three proposals were received, and each has been funded: Wallace, Builta, and Quinlan. Sabbaticals may include professional conferences or technical training.

b. Communications: No report.

c. Constitution and Elections: Gilbert reported on those who had shown an interest in committee work. Nominations were heard and voting was conducted to fill any vacancies. A full report was provided by Gilbert as follows:

Supportive Professional Staff Committee Representatives

Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Advisory Committee (3 year term) (1 position)
Steven Estes

Campus Parking Committee (3 year term) (2 positions)
Kristi Misic
Susan Hansfield

Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee (2 year term) (1 position)
Philip Young
d. Finance: Full report is available. To date, $158.00 has been collected at after-hours parties. Perkins had made a generous contribution (thank you). Per Cesarek, funds necessary to hire a recording secretary may be made available next fiscal year.

e. Legislative: Regarding NIU’s participation in “Lobby Day, Leake reported that 300 were in attendance representative of all colleges and universities in Illinois. The NIU Annuitants Association sponsored a bus for those traveling from DeKalb. Thirteen attended from NIU; SIU had about 100 in attendance as did U of I. In Leake’s opinion, the trip wasn’t that successful because the legislators were unavailable as they were in session or in committee. Next year every effort should be made to make appointments in advance—not try to catch them on the fly. It was a good opportunity to network with the annuitants present and King’s students who were learning about the process.

f. Technology Resources: No report.

g. Workplace Issues: The University Service Policy was discussed. This policy was drafted to enlighten SPS that their volunteer service is acceptable. It is also designed to inform supervisors that the university is accepting of this practice. Minor changes to the verbiage were recommended. Someone asked if this included community service and it was decided that it addresses university business only—shared governance, not external community service. A vote to accept minor changes (need to identify changes – SPSC help please) was approved. Once approved by the administration and endorsed by the President, a copy of the policy will be available from Human Resources until it is included in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual.

Discussion ensued about job descriptions. A motion was made that job descriptions should be written; the SPS employee must receive a copy when they start employment; and the description should be reviewed annually and changed when necessary. It should be written without excessive specificity. Crittenden suggested that the Workplace Issues Committee acknowledge these basic principles in a letter to HR and ask that the APPM be amended to
include them. It was suggested that a discussion take place in advance to see if it is possible to consider these things before effort is wasted drafting a new policy. Additional discussion ensued. A motion was made to defer these items of discussion to the Workplace Issues Committee for further investigation and action. The motion was seconded and approved by unanimous vote.

h. Vice President: See electronic report forwarded by Latham to SPSC Exec. Latham thanked the Wellness Fair committee for their help.

IV. Old Business

a.) SPS After Hours Recap: Per Gillis, most were disappointed in the number of attendees, but the event was well received by those who were present.

b.) SPS Survey Update: Spires reported that the data was not yet ready (per Cynthia Nelson). We should see something in June.

V. New Business

a.) Increment Poll: Per Ostenburg, the results of the recent increment poll were shared. Council considered the feedback that was received and discussion ensued. A motion was made to forward option number 2 (of six that had been prepared) as the SPS Council’s recommendation for handling increments during the next cycle. Option number 2 stated: When the proposed increment is less than or equal to the cost of living [as established by: Consumer Price Index / All Urban Customers / Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI / CSMA – Chicago Metropolitan Statistical Area, using an annualized figure – for example 2.7%), all would be distributed “across the board”. Any remaining proposed increment in excess of the cost of living percentage would be available for distribution on a merit basis.] This will be communicated by President Cesarek, in writing, to NIU administration.

VI. University Committee Reports

See e-reports online from Board of Trustees, Faculty Senate, and University Council.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:04 p.m.

Minutes respectfully prepared by Elizabeth Leake, SPSC Co-Secretary

Supportive Professional Staff Council
2007 Increment Survey Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option #1</th>
<th>Total increment awards up to and inclusive of 3% would be disbursed “across the board”; any remaining increment would be available for distribution on a merit basis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option #2</td>
<td>When the proposed increment is less than or equal to the cost of living (as established by: Consumer Price Index / All Urban Customers / Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-UIN-WI / CSMA – Chicago Metropolitan Statistical Area, using an annualized figure – for example 2.7%), all would be distributed “across the board”. Any remaining proposed increment in excess of the cost of living percentage would be available for distribution on a merit basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option #3</td>
<td>One-third (1/3) of any increment awarded at the beginning of a fiscal year would be used for the merit pool while two-thirds (2/3) of the average increment would be awarded ‘across the board.’ A minimum and maximum cap would be placed on the award such that the average increment can be as low as -1/3 or as high as +1/3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option #4</td>
<td>Fifty percent (50%) of the total increment pool would be distributed to all eligible SPS “across the board”; the remaining fifty percent (50%) of the total increment pool would then be available for distribution on a merit basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option #5</td>
<td>The total increment would be distributed entirely “across the board”. There would be no merit component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option #6</td>
<td>The total increment would be distributed based entirely on merit. There would be no “across the board” component.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**