THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:  Baker, Bilder, Cearlock, Coover, Creamer, Ganesan, Goldenberg, Gotthardt, Gregory, Gresholdt, Henry, Ilsley, Jennings, Jones, Kaplan, Kasuba, King, Kitterle, Kolb, Kowalski, Larson, Legg, Martin, K. Miller, R. Miller, Mini, Mohabbat, Morris, O’Kelly, Orem, Pope, Povlsen, Richmond, Ridnour, Schuth, Song, Sorensen, Spear, Wheeler, Williams, Wolfskill, Young, Zar

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was also present.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:  Burgess, Butler, Caldwell, Carson, Carter, Conde, Curley, Garcia, Graf, Griffiths, Harris, Kafer, Kitterle, Lockard, Miranda, Mulligan Musial, Pavia, Perez, Pernell, Rubin, Simon, Stalker, Tolhurst, Wade

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the University Council was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters:  Is there a motion to adopt the Agenda?  So moved.

J. Zar:  We have a walk-in.  Could we put that on the Agenda?

President Peters:  Yes, actually we have one walk-in and an announcement, but we have a memo to Sue from Bob Wheeler on Guidelines for Online Courses that I think goes under the Academic Policy Committee Report.  Is that correct?  All right, so add that.

J. Zar:  Why not put it under the Consent Agenda as is recommended?

D. Mathesius:  That was from last meeting.  The Academic Policy Committee is going to report on it.

President Peters:  Let the record show that Dean Zar was wrong for once.

The Agenda was seconded and approved as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 10, 2001 UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING (Pages 5-23)

President Peters:  Approval of minutes of October 10 following on pages 5-23 with our usual Executive Summary.  Are there any additions or corrections?  Motion to approve?  Second?
The minutes of October 10, 2001 were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: I’ll keep my announcements short today, but obviously we have an empty Chair and our Sue Willis is in the hospital having some tests and she’s been in there for a few days. I understand she’ll be coming home and we’ve conversed with her and asked whether we should cancel the meeting today but we thought it would be best if we forged ahead. We believe everything is okay; she’s in the analysis stage of some medical problem. Donna, do you have anything to add to that? Hopefully, she’ll be up and around at our December meeting. There is an item on our Agenda today that sort of deals with this issue about what happens when, for whatever reason, the Executive Secretary cannot attend. Again, I called Dean Zar and asked for advice and, for the first time in the history of the University, when I asked for advice there was silence on the other end of the line but we do have his written proposal on that. I’m confident that Sue is going to be on the mend and we look forward to having her back.

As far as my report is concerned, if you go to our Web site, you’ll see in the right-hand corner there is a link to something called NIU response and procedures, and that is a Web site dedicated to the national crisis and it is filled with useful information of various sorts. If you or students or staff have questions about safety, we’ll put all our news releases there that relate to this issue. There is Q&A section that we’re going to keep updated. There is a section called “Seeking and Understanding” that sort of walks through people if they have issues they need to talk through. There’s a section on special student concerns. There’s a section on emergency numbers and links to other state, local, and federal information and we monitor what we’ve linked to previously, and then there’s a special section on computer safety. Now I believe there is also a link, Dr. Williams, when the student page comes up and the faculty page. Is that right?

E. Williams: That’s correct.

President Peters: Do you want to add anything to what I’ve said? I don’t think that’s a trivial item because now it is a place for you to go and for the community to go when there is a question, and we’re going to continually update that and put the effort into making that a good vehicle for communication because we do live in very challenging and interesting times and, as the students know, we’ve had some issues. Virtually every day there’s a question when we scratch our heads and try to get the right information to people. Communication in this time is key. So I bring that to your attention.

There are other things that I want to mention that have struck me as being significant since we last met. I was so extremely proud of Professor Hosmane receiving the Humboldt Prize in Chemistry. This is a great step in the right direction for all of us. It’s the kind of external validation that we all seek and the University seeks and I am just so proud of him. I don’t think he’s here today but he is just a great example of an NIU professor.

Last Friday we had an opening at 215 West Superior Street, in Chicago. On the third floor we have the wonderful NIU art gallery and there are wonderful examples of art from our faculty. If
you’re in Chicago, it’s just a short walk from North Michigan Avenue. Take advantage of that. Take relatives to see it. It’a treasure and we need to do more to publicize it and I’m just stunned at the quality of what happens there and of our faculty.

This Friday there’s an important event at NIU Naperville and it is the Latino Conference that we’re hosting to talk about a whole range of issues with regard to Latinos and the collegiate experience. The spearhead for this is the new Chair of our Board of Trustees, Manny Sanchez, who is a busy, busy lawyer but has put in the time to make this a success. I’m just so pleased about this and Kathy Buettner from our Office of State and Federal Relations has helped out there. There are so many people that have helped out and I think we’re going to have an overflowing crowd, and so I’m very pleased about that.

The other thing that I would like to announce is that recently we were notified through the Illinois First Program, through the Office of Governor George Ryan and through the help of our State Senator Brad Burzynski, that NIU has been given a $7.8 million grant for our chiller project. There’s really more to it than 7.8 million dollars. Add to that 2.2 million dollars of our own funds that the Board has approved plus 7.5 million in federal money that the Capital Development Board of the State has given to us for fluorocarbon abatement. So that’s about a 15.2 million dollar project that will address so much of our chilled water, environmental and other issues on the west campus. Dr. Williams, you want to add anything to that?

**Dr. Williams:** This is one of the projects that we’re very proud of because it combines several planning documents that we have put together over the years that are designed to upgrade our campus and address many of the concerns that arise because of the use of various types of refrigerants in the coolants and also in terms of the useful life of some of our equipment. Through this effort, which combines funds through the State of Illinois, and from our bond revenue sources, it becomes a 15 million dollar project, a 15 million dollar improvement for our campus. It is much needed and we will reap the benefits not only in terms of, as the President indicated, that we will be cool, but we also will have the opportunity to generate some savings because of the efficiency of the use of this type of equipment and system. So we’re very pleased with this. This has been a seven-year fight to get this funded and we’re very pleased that our Senator was able to deliver this for us and our President was able to go before the legislature and those involved to make sure that it happened.

**President Peters:** If you’re so moved, you may want to drop a little note to Senator Burzynski. That never hurts because there’s always the next time.

Just a little update on my activities. We’re beginning to get ready for the veto session which sounds more ominous than it really is. It’s just the fall legislative session that ties up loose ends and I will be visiting with legislators. We’ve had some legislators and some county officials on campus. We started sort of a quiet new program, some of you have been involved in it, and let me just tell you how it’s configured. We will bring representatives from our area, let’s say from Kane County, and we will bring them to the University. We will tell them about our needs and our plans and then we will give them a tour of the campus and then, depending on their interests, we will take them to a classroom, we will show them a research project, we will showcase something. Try to contain it in a two to three hour period. We’ve done three or four of these on
an experimental basis. They’re remarkably successful and interesting because so many of the individuals have said “Well, I only live a little east of here but I haven’t been here for years,” and they’re stunned at what’s happening here. We’re going to continue that. Obviously, as we go into the session it’s hard to do but during the summer and during the fall we’re going to continue that and we may be asking for some of you to help out by meeting with these people, depending on what their interests are, in an attempt to build good will. We’re also going to be going to Washington, maybe, to begin working our federal agenda for next year. Of course, it’s getting much more difficult, even in Springfield it’s going to be more difficult because there will be new security protection. I imagine access will be a little more difficult but we’re going to go ahead and do what we need to do.

I don’t have anything to report on the budget except the obvious. We have reviewed our quarterly accounts. We feel we’re in good shape. We are monitoring every vacant position as we normally do this time of year and each vice president is responsible for either releasing money or not. The budget situation with the State and revenue is really a fluid situation. It’s changing daily but it’s all in the negative direction and we are monitoring it and waiting for instructions; but again, as I’ve said many times, we’re being prudent. We go into this in a strong fiscal situation and when we hear a little bit more, I’ll be pulling the right people together about how we’re going to manage any mid-year rescission if that happens; but, again, I think we’re in really, really good shape and I know that everyone involved is being prudent. So that’s about all I have to say on that subject right now.

P. Henry: Just a quick question as to the status of the hiring freeze. Is it still in effect?

President Peters: We always have a modified hiring evaluation between November and January so that’s in place and, basically, we have a list of all positions and each vice president reviews that and makes a determination on whether a position should be filled or not. Obviously, jobs for which we were searching we are moving forward with, so it’s the new vacancies that we question. If we ever get into a serious situation, and I’ve only had this conversation with Senior Cabinet and with Dr. Legg and Dr. Williams and Dr. Kaplan, probably what we would do we would have set criteria that would move from the core of what we do, making sure that students have classes, that our basic safety is taken care of, and then we would probably review on a very regular basis, about every two weeks, every vacant position and make decisions – rolling decisions. Some process like that. Some rational process. The criteria which one uses in a situation like this are always what are the critical positions that you need to fill; and, obviously, maintaining our instructional programs is a high, high priority. Maintaining our safety is a high priority. Right now, there is just so little solid information that we really don’t know. There is half a billion dollar gap in this year’s state budget and I think the Governor has made indications that with some of the things he’s put in place in the code agencies, and some other things, that it will be tough, but that might be able to be handled. But you know, the situation could get worse and so that would dictate another strategy.

Well anyway, to end on a little more positive note, I’ve been so pleased with the performance of our athletic teams like our football team. We still need a little help but I think it would be great on November 30th if we were able to have a Mid-American Conference Championship game here. I’m very proud of the way the football team overcame its adversity, and you know what I
mean. I’m very proud of that. It’s behind them now and our chins are up. The MAC, by the way, is a very good conference because it balances athletic excellence with academics, and the Council of Presidents voted to bring into the Mid-American Conference Central Florida. Now, my sense of geography is challenged but Central Florida is one of the fastest growing universities in the nation and it’s very interesting, because it has a lot of characteristics of NIU. It has regional sites very similar to NIU’s and we’re proud to have them in the Conference. So now we are at fourteen teams. Seven in the east, seven in the west and Bowling Green moves to the west so Bowling Green – John LaTourette had a stint at Bowling Green – is now in the west division.

All right. Those are the President’s announcements.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: Is there a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda? Second? Discussion?

A. Proposed Bylaw Amendment – see memo from Mike Gotthardt – refer to Rules and Governance. (Pages 24-25)

B. Continuing Education Advisory Committee – see memo from Anne Kaplan – refer to Rules and Governance. (Pages 26-28)

The consent agenda was passed.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – no report.

President Peters: We have no report from the FAC to IBHE.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones and Dan Griffiths – no report.

President Peters: No report from Dan Griffiths on the BOT Academic Affairs Committee.


President Peters: No report on the BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee.


President Peters: No report on Legislation, Audit and External Affairs.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – no report.
President Peters: No Sue report on the BOT. Does anyone want to ask any questions?

F. Academic Policy Committee – Mary Larson, Chair

1. Guidelines for online courses carrying undergraduate credit – walk-in

President Peters: Now we have a report.

M. Larson: Very briefly, the Academic Policy Committee would just like to recommend that the University Council accept these Guidelines for Online Courses Carrying Undergraduate Credits with the addition of one sentence at the end that would say “These guidelines shall be reviewed every five years”. So this is the walk-in that you got as the memo from Bob Wheeler.

President Peters: Is that last sentence reflected in this walk-in?

M. Larson: No, it is not.

President Peters: And where does it go?

M. Larson: Right at the very end. “These guidelines shall be reviewed every five years.”

President Peters: So right after the sentence “Online undergraduate courses will – then you want to add – give it to me.

M. Larson: “These guidelines shall be reviewed every five years.”

President Peters: All right. Is there a motion that this report be accepted? Second? Discussion? Dean Zar.

J. Zar: I’ll make up for my previous faux pas by pointing out a grammatical correction. On that very last page, the statement that starts “Acceptance of – it should be “acceptance is subject to” not “are subject to.”

President Peters: All right so “Acceptance of online courses is subject to.” Will that be accepted as a crabby amendment?

M. Larson: It’s accepted.

President Peters: All right.

J. King: The new sentence, the sentence you added at the very end?

M. Larson: Yes?

J. King: Might we have a bold-faced heading leading into it since it really doesn’t appear to be
University administrative considerations?

**M. Larson:** Okay.

**J. King:** How about “periodic review”?

**M. Larson:** Periodic review. That’s excellent. Thanks Jim.

**President Peters:** So we will add a “Periodic Review” under a bold heading and then put that last sentence in about the five-year review. Is that accepted?

**M. Larson:** Thank you, yes.

**President Peters:** All right. Chris?

**C. Sorenson:** Just a question of clarification from the Committee if I might. Under “that requirements should be announced in the Schedule of Classes and publicized with dissemination” when these rules are created, are these for courses that are explicitly online or does that include courses that are partially online?

**M. Larson:** I think Bob Wheeler knows the answer to that.

**President Peters:** Vice Provost Wheeler?

**B. Wheeler:** This is intended to include courses that are partially or fully online and we are working with the Office of Registration and Records to determine how that can be entered in the schedule books so that students will be aware.

**President Peters:** If I may ask a question, how do you define partial? I know what other universities do; it’s the percent of the course that’s delivered electronically.

**B. Wheeler:** The informal standard that we had been working with was the 50% level.

**C. Sorenson:** We’re getting to the point where almost every course includes some online component. That’s what I was wondering.

**President Peters:** All right. Any other questions? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

Motion passed.

**President Peters:** Anything else Mary?

**M. Larson:** No, that’s all.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Gary Coover, Chair
President Peters: Resources, Space and Budgets. Gary?

G. Coover: The Faculty Senate-University Council Committee on Resources, Space and Budgets had two meetings since the last report to University Council. We met on October 11 and then again last week, November 1, with Executive Vice President Eddie Williams and Assistant to the Vice President Patty Perkins for discussion on campus planning of buildings, infrastructure and land use.

Ms. Perkins described for the Committee the capital budget process and three things came through to me. Large projects, for example, tend to develop over a period of many years. The funding for a developed plan may take years of repeated requests to the IHBE. For example, the storm-water project took seven years to get funded. We just heard today that the chiller plan also took seven years to get funded. But we have been using for fifteen years, the concept master plan of Sasaki Associates. A second point: instructional capital projects such as the Engineering Building are carried out under the responsibility of the Capital Development Board of the State of Illinois. The contracts are not with NIU and our personnel are not used. However, for bond revenue capital projects, that is for non-instructional capital improvements, we utilize NIU personnel that is once IHBE approval has been granted. A third point: the development of specific plans involves a long process and involves also repeatedly returning to the users for input.

Last week Dr. Williams reviewed for us the past fifteen years of planning, assessments and constructions. Several major planning actions played a major role in the determination of what has been added to our campus and where over many years. In 1986, the University established a Master Planning Committee and hired Sasaki Associates to prepare a concept master plan and then, subsequently, to prepare a more specific campus master plan for the physical development of NIU. The campus master plan of 1987 recommended many developments that have been carried out and that many of us would recognize such as the development of King Commons, the siting of Faraday II and the Engineering Building, acquisition of off-campus properties such as the Palmer Music Building on First Street, the Art Annex off Sycamore Road and the Roberts School for the School of Nursing. Also, the plan set out the reconstruction of Lucinda Avenue along with the City of DeKalb. The master plan also recommended building a Student Life Center and a College of Business facility on the north side of campus. Now that was fifteen years ago. Further, it recommended that space be reserved between King Commons and Cole Hall for a future Liberal Arts and Sciences classroom/office building and this, of course, hasn’t happened; but it shows the breadth and continued relevance of the master plan even fifteen years later.

There were subsequent plans and assessments. In 1991 there was a plan for the north forty, which considered what could and should be done with this property including siting of a possible business college facility, a possible lake and a few other buildings. In 1995 a thorough space study was done on our buildings which showed that NIU is short of space by national standards, short of building space by 350,000 square feet. In 1997 a west campus master plan focused on dormitory upgrades, infrastructures such as water retention and steam tunnels and the dormitory grounds and, as we know, they’ve turned the dormitory grounds into a central dorm-area park.
that is really quite nice. If you go bicycling or for walks on campus like I do, it’s really fabulous over there. It used to be a horrible place to go to.

All of these plans brought attention to the conditions of buildings and infrastructure and also the need for improvements in safety and the need for improvements in appearance and attractiveness of the campus to students. Our discussion last week suggested that when you consider the long view, then immediate needs are highlighted as well, and vice versa. The campus plan of 1987, for example, focused on the need to separate pedestrian and automotive traffic. Just last Wednesday in the Faculty Senate meeting questions were asked about traffic safety on Annie Glidden. Another question on joint planning by NIU and the City of DeKalb and about planning for bicycle paths on campus. We discussed these issues the very next day at our committee meeting. Last year it emerged through a task force on pedestrian safety on Annie Glidden, and the University and the City of DeKalb developed a plan that has led to the placement of a temporary traffic signal at Stadium Drive which you may have seen in the last few weeks. As a temporary safety signal or traffic signal, it cost less than one fourth as much as a permanent installation and this allows a couple of years to determine its contribution and also to changing traffic patterns of the students. I thought I’d noted last year very clearly that a lot of the students do go around the rec center and cross over at Stadium Drive, and this traffic light should make that safer. It also allows a few more years to address the possibility of an alternative solution to the traffic signal such as a pedestrian overpass, perhaps, or a concourse that extends the central mall westward from King Commons to and beyond Annie Glidden, perhaps with Annie Glidden passing over the concourse as a bridge. I didn’t say underpass. A concourse is passed over by a bridge. The task force on pedestrian safety on Annie Glidden proposed other changes that are still in the works and these include, for example, countdown timers for pedestrians so that they see in just a few more seconds they will be able to cross over. I hope that will work well. Also, for crosswalks further up Annie Glidden from Lucinda, there will be imbedded in the pavement pedestrian-activated lights so when someone is crossing the street that pathway will light up and warn the traffic of pedestrians.

The plans we discussed last week were developed before the acquisition of 220 acres to the west which was initiated about four years ago. The next large plan, the far west campus plan, is now incubating. It’s hoped that the Committee on Resources, Space and Budgets will be informed next spring of progress on a concept plan for the space west and northwest of the Convocation Center. NIU is working with the City of DeKalb on far west issues such as the placement of the extension of Bethany Road to the west of Annie Glidden and southward then to Lincoln Highway and perhaps beyond over the railroad tracks. Mayor Sparrow just last week publicly indicated his awareness of the importance of running that extension to the west of the far west campus rather than right through the middle of it. The committee expects to meet soon with the Provost to discuss the reallocation of space in Wirtz Hall. Are there questions or comments by the members of the Committee?

President Peters: I wish I was at that meeting. That’s an excellent and very thorough report. Questions?

I would just have to say that it’s my dream and all of our dreams that in twenty years that NIU is known on those lists of beautiful American campuses to visit. We have that potential but we
have to make the right choices and I have been concerned and remain concerned, and the Mayor is
c-concerned, we’re all concerned about traffic safety. The issue of Annie Glidden we’re
working hard on but I think the solutions are deep and more fundamental ultimately than some
traffic lights and that. I mean, it’s an expensive solution and it will require the help of many
government agencies and also the fact that we have major truck traffic flying through that really
ought to be addressed and I’m very, very pleased that the Mayor and State officials are interested
in doing that.

As far as that Bethany bypass, I find that in talking to Dr. Williams and Senior Cabinet, it was
pretty apparent that I didn’t want to make the mistake that others have made way in the past
because I didn’t want the Bethany bypass to go through the middle of our 220-acre far west
campus because in fifty years or a hundred years, guess what will be? Another Annie Glidden. So I
wanted to hold firm that it should be way to the west. Of course, maybe something less will
happen but I think that’s just not a good structural solution but next year, when all of these
buildings come online, we’ll probably be turning our attention to looking at that master plan and
bringing it all together, but for right now we’ve got a lot of construction projects that are in
various stages.

It was very interesting that you made the distinction that sometimes it’s not understood that
State-funded projects, in terms of the control and speed at which they’re done, are controlled by
the Capital Development Board, which is a wonderful State agency, there’s no doubt about that,
but things happen on their schedule and their time according to their priorities; but that on bond
projects, dorms or private, like Barsema, where we can control, we can speed things up a little
bit. That’s not to say that the Capital Development Board isn’t good, it’s just that we don’t
have as complete control as we would like. I got an e-mail from a sophomore wanting to know if
I could hurry up the filling of the lagoon. I thought about how many lengths of garden hose I
had, but that’s a capital development project. I have my time frame and they have theirs. That’s
the way it is. That’s not a criticism, that’s just a reality. I’m glad you brought that up. Okay,
any other questions for Professor Coover?

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Susan Mini, Chair

President Peters: Rules and Governance, Susan? You have items?

1. Revised Language and additions to Committees of the University

S. Mini: We’re introducing four different Committee Book changes.

a. Changes to Student Affairs Professional Staff – FIRST READING
(Pages 29, 31)

S. Mini: The first is Changes to Student Affairs Professional Staff. My understanding is that
this is just a name change to Student Affairs from Student Services and the reason this has been
requested is because “services” caused some confusion with other University offices and
according to Gary Gresholdt the change is consistent with the meaning within similar higher
education facilities.
President Peters: So it’s a change, a substitution of Student Affairs to Student Services.

S. Mini: Student Affairs Professional Staff Advisory Committee. I’d actually like to move that we waive first reading on this.

President Peters: So the motion coming from Rules and Governance is to adopt changes in the Student Professional Affairs staff language by substituting “affairs” for “service” and the motion is to waive first reading. Is there such a motion? Second? Discussion? Dean Zar?

J. Zar: This does not require first reading in any event. It’s not a policy change. So unless we want to defer it for some reason, we could vote it without waiving first reading.

President Peters: Would you withdraw your motion and just move the item?

S. Mini: I certainly would and, in fact, under those circumstances I move that we go ahead with all four of these items?

President Peters: En masse or one at a time?

S. Mini: I can explain them one at a time.

President Peters: What is your pleasure here? Let’s do them one at a time.

S. Mini: All right.

President Peters: There’s a motion to adopt the changes in item “a”. Is there a second? Discussion?

Motion passed.

b. Changes to Student Affairs Advisory Council – FIRST READING
   (Pages 29, 32)

S. Mini: Item “b” is Student Services Advisory Council. This is not just a substitution of “affairs” for “services” but it’s also the addition of the Director of Student Legal Assistance, and my understanding is that this person already sits with this committee.

President Peters: Again, this doesn’t require a first reading?

S. Mini: No.

President Peters: All right. So there’s a motion to adopt the changes suggested under “b”. Is there a second? Discussion?

The motion passed.
c. Changes to Educational Services and Programs Faculty Advisory Committee – FIRST READING (Pages 29, 33)

**S. Mini:** Okay, letter “c” Educational Services and Programs Faculty Advisory Committee. We’re just returning this to its original configuration. Apparently, Professor Krishnamurthi was a member and then he became the Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center Director and they added him to this committee. I talked to Professor Krishnamurthi. He says he has almost no face-to-face interaction with students any more in his capacity and he doesn’t feel that he needs to be on this committee, although he’ll be happy to meet with them and advise them if they want him to. So what we’re doing is changing this committee back to its original configuration.

**President Peters:** I take it we don’t need a first reading on that?

**S. Mini:** No.

**President Peters:** There’s a motion, is there a second? Discussion?

The motion passed.

d. Addition of Teaching Assistant Training and Development Advisory Committee – FIRST READING (Pages 30, 34-35)

**S. Mini:** Okay, “d”, the fourth one, is the addition of the Teaching Assistant Training and Development Advisory Committee. This comes from the Graduate School’s Office of Teaching Assistant Training and Development, which has begun its third year of operation. The Rules and Governance Committee recommends that we accept this for the Committees Book, and we would like to accept this under Category 3, which is committees not normally within the jurisdiction of the University Council. That’s what the other three committees were.

**President Peters:** Does that need a first reading? So, we’ll take that as a motion? Is there a second? Discussion?

The motion passed.

2. Substitute for the University Council Executive Secretary (Pages, 30, 36-38)

**S. Mini:** I believe the next item for Rules and Governance was Substitute for the University Council Executive Secretary. Dean Zar made some suggestions. I think they start on page 36. The Rules and Governance Committee looked at them and decided that these should be reviewed by the Faculty Senate, and one of the reasons for that is because almost any decision that’s made will involve a bylaw change for the Faculty Senate so we would like to send them over to the Faculty Senate as a courtesy and ask them if they might consider looking at this.

**President Peters:** Does this require a vote?
S. Mini: No, this is informational.

President Peters: It is a matter that we should attend to because I think we need to make provision for that. It’s happened twice now and it’s probably easily fixed. In just reading through Dean Zar’s comments there seem to be plenty of good alternatives. Does the group want to express a preference for any of these?

S. Mini: I don’t believe we did, do we?

M. Morris: I think the Faculty Senate should decide. It’s their call.

President Peters: All right, I like “2” myself. Good work. So, it will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate.

S. Mini: Yes.

President Peters: It will come back to us.

S. Mini: Right.

3. Revised Language for the Statement of Professional Ethics – Action Item (Page 39)

S. Mini: Last, but certainly not least, we have an action item. We had first reading of this last time. This is the revised language for the Statement of Professional Ethics. The Rules and Governance Committee endorses this and hopes that this body wants to endorse it. I’d like to move that we accept this with the indicated changes. We’ve already adopted this provisionally last year, I believe. Last year in May.

President Peters: There are some changes and you are moving to adopt the changes.

S. Mini: Yes.

President Peters: As a motion?

S. Mini: Yes.

President Peters: Is there a second? Discussion?

M. Gotthardt: I’d like to make two suggestions. In the fifth section, the phrase “to their students” is repeated and I just recommend taking out one of those clauses. The phrase “to their students” in the second sentence of the fifth section. Section five, the third line.

S. Mini: Thank you.
M. Gotthardt: And the last sentence, “faculty” is capitalized and, not to diminish ---

President Peters: Are those accepted as friendly amendments?

S. Mini: Certainly.

President Peters: Dean Zar.

J. Zar: I’d like to point out that “faculty” is capitalized elsewhere in the document also. It ought to be consistent at least, but also I wonder if the world “faculty” should not be in the title of the document inasmuch as other groups are also developing their statements of professional ethics.

President Peters: Dean Zar, you didn’t mean to suggest that we should not capitalize faculty if it begins a sentence.

J. Zar: You can do that. For example, in section two the third word is capitalized.

President Peters: Is this a friendly amendment that we amend the title to “Statement on Faculty Professional Ethics”?

J. Zar: Yeah.

S. Mini: So “Statement on Faculty Professional Ethics”.

President Peters: “Statement on Faculty Professional Ethics”.

M. Morris: I think since this speaks to faculty it doesn’t have to be so titled and why make it confusing? It’s a statement of ethics, it’s clear in every paragraph it speaks to faculty. It is a faculty statement and I’m not sure that putting a title on it adds any significance other than we’ll now the grammarians come in and tell whether it’s a proper modifier or noun or whatever.

J. Povlsen: Our council has so decided to title that and if all the various constituency groups are going to be coming up with that I think it should be clarified unless we plan on folding them all into one at some point, I don’t know where we’ll go with all these ethic statements.

President Peters: So read your title again.

J. Povlsen: A “Statement of Professional Ethics for the Members of the Supportive Professional Staff at Northern Illinois University.”

President Peters: So the parallel would be “Statement of Professional Ethics for Faculty at Northern Illinois University.” Would you accept that as a friendly amendment?

S. Mini: It looks good.
President Peters: All right, that’s acceptable. Further discussion?

The motion passed.

B. Wheeler: Will this language be placed in some official document of the University?

S. Mini: I wish I knew the answer to that.

J. King: My impression was that Sue Willis is working on this question and is consulting with the presidents of faculty senates at other institutions, particularly other Illinois institutions; they have an association and from what I’ve learned so far or the impression I’ve gained is that it is included as an addendum or appendix to documents like a university constitution.

S. Mini: I should say also that we will be sending this statement over to the Faculty Senate as a courtesy to them to let them look at what we’ve done.

President Peters: That seems reasonable. If it’s in the bylaws then it’s legally enforceable and we’ve worked with lawyers closely on this.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

R. Orem: The University Affairs Committee met for the first time this year on October 17 and I’m pleased to say that we had 100% attendance at this meeting of the committee. The first item of business was the residence hall meal plan. This item was prompted by concerns expressed by a number of students and by several parents that students and their families were not given adequate information regarding changes in the student meal plan, and that these changes were creating hardships for students because of new limitations placed on them for how they could spend Huskie Bucks and Dining Dollars. Emiko Pope of the Residence Halls Student Association addressed the committee and explained the issues, acknowledging that the association had also heard numerous complaints from students and parents concerning these policy changes. After considerable discussion the committee felt satisfied that the Residence Hall Student Association would take these concerns into consideration when adjusting the meal plan for the coming academic year and that this was the appropriate body for resolving this issue. It was also suggested that the association might want to return to the committee in the spring to inform us of adjustments in the policy with special attention to how the students participating in the meal plan for the next year would be informed of these changes. It is interesting that the complaints were all coming from returning students. No complaints had been voiced by first year students. It’s change; it’s hard to deal with I guess.

The second item of business referred to University Affairs was the issue of the effectiveness of University Council past and future. This issue was raised last spring in the Council. The issue as I understood it when simply put is “how effectively does University Council currently function”. “Does the University Council serve the best interests of faculty, staff and students as it is currently structured”? Members of the University Affairs Committee felt that they were unprepared to discuss this item without a more concrete proposal or statement of the issues. We adjourned at this point. I did take it upon myself soon after that meeting to canvas the other
committee chairs of University Council to ask several questions. First, could University Council be more effective in bringing issues of concern of the University community to the monthly meetings? Is the University Council functioning fine as it is? Are committees functioning as they are intended to function? Should the monthly meetings be restructured? Do we spend too much time simply listening to reports? The purpose of asking these questions was simply to begin a discussion and to get a sense of how others on the Council see these issues. So far, one committee chair has responded to my questions. I don’t assume this is a sign of contentment with current structure and function. Perhaps the Steering Committee would be a more appropriate group to be in a discussion about these issues. In any case, University Affairs will wait for further direction.

President Peters: Any questions for Professor Orem?

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Winifred Creamer, Chair

W. Creamer: No report.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Do we have any old or unfinished business?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: Does anyone wish to raise an item of new business?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Comments from the floor, Sherie Spear I think you have something for us.

S. Spear: Thank you. In your packet is a yellow flyer announcing an open forum. As President Peters indicated in his opening remarks, there are ongoing concerns about threats to safety that may be actual or where there is a perception of risk. Therefore the School of Allied Health Professions, particularly led by our programs in public health and clinical laboratory sciences, along with the DeKalb County Health Department, is sponsoring an open forum on next Wednesday, the 14th to take a look at how we are responding. One of our speakers is Roman Golash from the Special Bacteriology and Bio-terrorism Unit of the Illinois Public Health Department. Surely he will give us the up to date information on what are we really dealing with. Mark Matuck is from Cook County Public Health, and he wrote the response plan for Cook County, which has really become the model plan for Illinois. The other individuals who will make up the panel will not give formal presentations. They’re there as resources so that our University community and our larger DeKalb community can ask their questions of the people who are responsible to respond to risks and perceptions of risk. So we invite you all to attend. We ask for your help in encouraging others to attend and to help us publicize it.

President Peters: Does anyone have a comment on that? It sounds like a worthwhile activity. Anything else for the good of the order? Mike?
M. Gotthardt: I’d just like to announce that tomorrow at the Student Association we’re going to be holding an open house from 10:00 to 4:30 in our office which is in the Campus Life Building, Room 180. It would be cool if all you guys came out and checked us out. Troy Caldwell, our president, is going to be giving an address at noon and that promises to be very informative and enlightening I’m sure, so we look forward to seeing all of you and please come by and say hello.

President Peters: Is there any inkling on the subject?

M. Gotthardt: I couldn’t comment on that; I have no idea.

President Peters: You’re going to make a good faculty member someday.

J. King: In listening to the report on space planning and also listening to our success in gaining funding for major projects, I had to consider hard whether I’d bring up the following point which seems to be at the absolute opposite end of the spectrum, and that is furniture. I’m wondering if anybody here can tell me where would I turn to learn what plans are afoot to develop appropriate seating for our students in the classrooms. I look out at the students in my classes and I see that the desks, the portable desks, are too small for most but at any rate, they’re all the same size. They have to sit in them. They’re pretty uncomfortable; in fact, as an experiment I’d really like to have us all sit in those chairs for at least an hour and fifteen minutes. I suspect that this is a matter to which attention has been given and that there are people who are working on it. I’d just like to know to whom I would turn to learn something about this.

President Peters: I think that’s a good question. I’m going to ask Dr. Williams to handle the hard part but the easy part is something that I am elated about, and I know Provost Legg was elated about when he came from Tennessee, to find out that when you bring on a new academic building, you’re allowed to ask the state for what they call “FF&E”, furniture, fixtures and equipment, and so this year there is a request in the legislature for approximately five million dollars to furnish Barsema Hall. That is a new building to be brought online. What do you do about replacement equipment is a different story, and that’s what I’m going to ask Dr. Williams to talk about.

E. Williams: I think the question is a good one. I certainly asked myself that question when I walked through DuSable about two years ago and saw the same desks and student chairs and so forth that were in that facility when I taught math there back in 1971. So, from ’71 to ’97 is quite a length of time. It does speak to the durability of the equipment that we purchased. I take my hat off to that group. In the same vein, it was identified as such, and through the academic area it is one of the things we try to do with the limited funds we have internally, because we’re not going to get much sympathy trying to go off campus through the legislative process to try to get funding for that kind of replacement; but through the efforts of Academic Affairs we identified that as a problem and, as many of you know, we did a major renovation in DuSable. It has been ongoing. We’ve added smart classrooms as part of that procedure. Included in there was replacement of some of those desks and chairs and so forth. So, I think the mechanism is similar to the mechanism we use for all our capital projects in the sense of bringing these to the
attention of departments, to colleges, to the academic division. Certainly we’re trying to identify needs as we go through buildings as well. I think that would be the process and, of course, with limited funding we’ll do what we can. But we have done something and in at least one set of rooms in DuSable we have furniture that’s less than a year and a half old, which is great.

President Peters: Let me say that of other places I’ve been the answer would have been, “um, we can do something about it”. We can’t do everything but we need to get lists and then we try to work the lists. I just saw a list recently and it isn’t at the level of what you’re talking about which is basic. It’s a decent chair, comfortable chair and a desk of certain size to be comfortable and functional. I’m left-handed and for years my crusade was about those right-handed desks now we have a solution to that, but I saw most recently (and maybe either Ivan or Anne can help me on this) in the past couple of years from our own funds and with funds we’ve saved from various fund balances, we have invested several million dollars and have upgraded twenty-five smart classrooms. It’s not what you’re talking about because that’s high-end equipment but when we go in we try to fix it all up and it’s really an impressive list. I’m going to get that list distributed maybe to Professor Coover for his committee because I was using it to show legislators what we were doing. Am I right about those numbers?

B. Wheeler: It’s more than that.

President Peters: It’s more than that? More meaning more classrooms?

A. Kaplan: I think it’s like forty-seven.

President Peters: Forty-seven. You didn’t know that did you. Forty-seven classrooms have been made smarter; well, at least the equipment is smarter. I’ll get that list to you. We are concerned about it. We need to build a list and when we see our advantage we’ll go to it but as far as the state is concerned, they’ll help on new buildings that are online but we’re kind of on our own with regard to replacement of basic furniture.

J. Wolfskill: I’d like to ask for clarification on funding for such a project. Let us suppose that it were decided that a major initiative would be put through to put in new furniture in classrooms. Is that something that could be done with bond revenue internally or would that be considered a major capital project and would go through the state.

E. Williams: That’s a good question because funding sources are the key, and that’s one of the creative things that we try to do. Unfortunately, because of the way state statute is written, neither the University nor the Board of Trustees can issue bonds or use bond money in support of any academic building. In fact, the statute is very clear as to the specific applications of bond funds to such things as residence halls, student centers, athletic facilities, parking facilities and the like. So, therefore, we’re very limited in that regard. The only way, as the President has indicated, that we can address these issues is through our own internal reallocations and savings and management of resources and we have done some of that and we’re working on that. I mentioned DuSable and I mentioned the chairs but this is only a part of what has been done. I think many of the faculty here can attest to the fact that there were offices that were painted and in many cases new curtains were made available and classrooms were painted and new lighting
was put in place. The only problem is we have such a vast campus and the need is so great and
the funds are so limited. So we’re doing as much as we can and I think, as priorities arise, those
should be identified and help us with that. What we want to do is have the best campus we can
and we want the classrooms, for example, to be functional. When I was a faculty member, I
didn’t want the chairs to be too comfortable. I had a tendency of having people nod off when I
got into derivatives and things of that nature.

President Peters: That was a good question. You can’t bond on GR state buildings. All right,
anything else for the good of the order? Dr. Kaplan?

A. Kaplan: I would just note that the Presidential Commission on the Status of Persons wit
Disabilities is as we speak giving their annual award; it’s called the Clogston Award, named after
a professor in journalism and is given to a person they believe has done the most for persons with
disabilities in the last year. This year it’s Elliott Lessen, and there’s a reception in the
Chandlier Room going on now in recognition of that if you’re interested.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

President Peters: There are three information items under Roman X.

1. Article from Beacon News, “College faculty find free speech is exercised at their
own risk” (Page 40)

2. Article from online Pantagraph.com, “Delaying state employee health claims a
bad idea” (Page 41-42)

(Page 43-45)

4. “Responding to Bioterrorism” public forum flyer – walk-in

XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: Is there a motion to adjourn?

The meeting adjourned at 4:15.