THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Bisplinghoff, Booth, Burns, Cummings, Engstrom, Espe, Gilbert, Graf, Gorman, Gresholdt, Henry, Hurych, Kafer, Kamenitsa, Kaplan, Kitterle, Koch, Kolb, Kowalski, Legg, Lockard, Minor, Nelms, Novatney, Pappanduros, Pernell, Richmond, Rose, Smith-Shank, S. Song, X. Song, Spear, Stoaddard, Tolhurst, Vohra, Wang, Wagner, Webber, Williams, Willis, Wolfskill, Young

L. Jennings attended for S. Clayton.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Arriola, Barr, Becerra, Bose, Buffo, Butler, Crisler, Goldenberg, Gregory, Johnson, Loubere, Newman, Orem, Peterson, Powers, Robinson, Rusin, Schneider, Seaver, Sorensen, Wade

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: We will call the last meeting of the academic year to order for the University Council.

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda for today. There are no walk-in items that I know of. Is there a motion to adopt? Second? All those in favor say aye. We have an agenda.

The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2004 MEETING (Pages 3-5)

President Peters: Roman III, Approval of the Minutes of April 7 on pages 3-5 following in your packet. Let me first call for additions or corrections. Hearing none, a motion to adopt? Approved? Second? All those in favor of the minutes of April 7 say aye. Opposed? Abstain? We have minutes.

The minutes were approved as written.
IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of the University Council (Xueshu Song, Geoffrey Gordon, Ngoyi Bukonda, Patricia Henry, and Eric Johnson)

President Peters: I now call for a motion to go into Executive Session for the purpose of hearing a report to evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council. Second? All those in favor say aye. All right.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Recognition of University Council members whose terms are:

Completed

President Peters: All right, are we prepared on ---? Okay. President’s Announcements. Let’s first go over the recognition of members whose terms are completed and if you’re here, you know, stand – I’ll call you all out. We’ve got John Engstrom. Thanks John. Rebecca Butler. I think I saw Rebecca. Sherilyn – Sheri Spear. Elvia Arriola. Okay. Mary Larson. Sue Willis and Jeff Kowalski. Where’s Jeff? I saw Jeff. Thank you everyone.

John Engstrom, College of Business
Rebecca Butler, College of Education
Sherilyn Spear, College of Health and Human Sciences
Elvia Arriola, College of Law
Mary Larson, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Sue Willis, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Jeff Kowalski, College of Visual and Performing Arts

Re-Elected

President Peters: Then the re-elected. David Wade, College of Business. I don’t know if David’s here today. Oh, okay. Xueshu Song, I know you’re here. He’s the grand inquisitor. Michael Kolb. Mike? And John. I know John Wolfskill’s here. All right.

David Wade, College of Business
Xueshu Song, College of Engineering and Engineering Technology
Michael Kolb, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
John Wolfskill, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Newly Elected

President Peters: I don’t know – do we have any newly elected people here. Rick Ridnour? Rick, stand up so people – they probably know who you are. Toni Tollerud from Education.

Rick Ridnour, College of Business
Toni Tollerud, College of Education
Jody Newman-Ryan, College of Health and Human Sciences
John Walton, College of Law
Janice Hamlet, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
William Baker, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Brad Peters, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Kent Gallagher, College of Visual and Performing Arts

Just a couple of things. First on the budget. We are done with our appropriation cycle and we were well received by the Appropriation Committees of the Legislature. They understand our issues. All the chancellors and presidents of the public universities requested a return to the IBHE budget recommendation which was a flat ’04 budget, and that would be a put back of the 2% reduction in that base in the Governor’s request. There was sympathy for that, I mean, there was sympathy for us but very little indication that that would be accomplished. There’s been a lot of heavy lifting there. This was true of both the House and the Senate side. There was very little in the way of substantive or specific debate about other issues, tuition and so forth.

There were some questions about diversity and minority hiring as there always are on the House – a little bit on the Senate side – as there always are but the questioning was – the meetings were not long and yet we did spend a lot of time with individual legislators. A great deal of time and, you know, we’re down here trying to make the case for higher education plus secondary education in the state and the legislators are up here with the Governor trying to argue about a budget gap that is either 1.2 or 2.2 billion dollars and so it isn’t – doesn’t translate down to our level at this point.

There is a very interesting interaction going on between the legislature and its leaders and the Governor. The most recent set of events is that there appears to be some concern among some members of the legislature and its leadership regardless of the side of the aisle as to whether or not some of the revenue enhancements that have been proposed by the Governor are in the long-term best interests of the economy or the people of the state. That is long-term borrowing, pushing off two years when my son there pays for that versus perhaps a consideration of a broadening the base of the income tax or the sales tax, which the Governor opposes.

So, there isn’t an awful lot to report because they’re at 30 thousand feet and they’re headed for a May 31st landing, you know. It’s sort of like being at 30 thousand feet in Wheaton trying to land at O’Hare. That’s about where they are. Now you can think of all the possible options. They may go on to Omaha. No, Cleveland. Gosh, I’d wish they’d hit Lake Michigan. They could be one with the Great Lakes. Then the Governor sent an interestingly – I’ve got a copy of it – I was going to reproduce it but I’d be violating copyright. I wouldn’t do that. It’s Capital Facts and
it’s a good political dope sheet and it has the Governor’s letter, which is public. I think you probably can go on the web site and read the Governor’s letter but it’s a reiteration of his budget priorities and then also a fine line in the sand of, you know, read my lips – no new taxes. So, you know, you’ve got that going back and forth. So, the answer is we don’t know. You know, I think we’re going to monitor on a day to day basis and I think come around the 31st we’ll have some answer. My guess – you see, if you go past that and there’s a special session, it requires a super majority to pass any budget issue. It is election year and if you go on history, the legislature will cobble together a budget that may or may not be in balance and then they will adjourn for the session and then the Governor will have to figure a way of getting the budget into balance. The Governor of Illinois has a very good set of tools to do that, mandatory vetoes and so forth so, you know, I wish I could be more definitive about this. Our accounts are balanced but we have no reserve left. If they want a reserve now, they won’t get it because it isn’t there. Is that right? Ivan, Dr. Williams – there’s nothing left. We’ve spent it all on good things. On educating the students who are going to get their degrees come this Saturday.

We still have not heard about capital within the Governor’s budget as it will appear in the – was supposed to appear about three weeks ago. So, you know, I’m not saying that’s good or bad, it’s just where we are right now. We’re not certain. I would say that we will be expecting a passage of the budget as is. Perhaps as the best-case scenario. I just don’t know at this point but we’ll be, you know, we’re monitoring on a daily basis and I’ll keep you updated. It may be that there are things that in the veto session in November, there are attempts to override. So you can see, this thing has a rhythm that doesn’t have a beginning or an end. One of the more experienced staff people, legislative people, explained it to me this way. Normally in the budget – it’s, you know, it’s peaks and valleys as you move toward adjournment. They solve some things and they hit a bump in the road, they solve that but pretty soon they begin to come into – this is more a crescendo. This is building toward that landing on May 31st. So, we’ll keep you informed.

Now, on the, I guess, good news front, you know last week as we were – in the last two weeks as we were in Springfield, it became apparent that CMS had made some decisions on health care plans that would have made a major impact on a thousand of our employees and really ninety thousand individuals in the state of Illinois when some of the HMOs that were in our plan were ruled out of our plan by CMS and a lot of people did a lot of hard work to make the case that this may not be in the best interest of employees and it hit university towns real hard. It hit Urbana hard, it hit Bloomington hard, it hit DeKalb hard and it hit Carbondale hard, Macomb was hit hard and others and it’s rather unusual. When we first started to make inquiries, these sorts of decisions are hardly ever, if ever, overturned. When we first started to make inquiries, these sorts of decisions are hardly ever, if ever, overturned. It does require a vote of the legislative what is it – Economic and Fiscal Committee – something like that but because this had hit a nerve in employee health care, the legislature held special hearings last Monday and a lot of people got involved. I know Steve Cunningham is here to explain the details but the CMS before that hearing, made a decision that they were going to re-bid, I believe that’s what it was and I’m going to ask Steve to tell us the particulars of what that might mean so that if you have friends and other colleagues who are asking, maybe you can help with information. We’re not exactly sure of what, you know, this will – what a re-bid will mean but I’m going to have Steve talk a little bit about that. Steve?
S. Cunningham: I’ll find a corner here. Thank you. Yes, Northern has been very active with this. We were on Monday before the House Committee on Government Administration and we were the only university I think to file official testimony at that Committee Hearing. By then there was a great deal of reaction across the state, throughout the university community and also with state employees primarily about Health Alliance. The hearing involved a great deal of questioning of CMS, then with the Health Alliance Group, then with the Vision Care Plus Group, another one that was announced to be eliminated, and then finally, individuals and universities or anyone else who was there. Essentially, as President Peters indicated, as we build through this session there’s a great deal of pressure on resources for universities for salary increases. The retirement system is under pressure, and we’re entering a time when the health insurance plans too are up for restructure in terms of premiums and the stop losses and co-pays applied to the program. So CMS is undergoing in this fiscal environment, a full restructuring as it does periodically, as you know, of the CMS plan so these forces all come together. Higher ed is currently paying I think $45 million into the CMS plan to help fund it. Our share of that is $3.5 million, Eddie, if I’m correct on that, and those are significant allocations of resources that could be used for other things including salary increases so we do have a certain vested concern with the program. The Health Alliance issue was a surprise. President Peters did send an e-mail and announced it to the campus last week and then as you received more detailed information from me as well about what CMS was contemplating. Currently though, they’re going to maintain at least Health Alliance after July 1 and then re-bid the program. This may mean that the other HMO’s such as the Order of St. Frances in Rockford will also be retained. They have not announced anything official about that yet, so it’s short-term progress but we’ve got a ways to go.

President Peters: Now I’ve had some e-mails and some inquiries from faculty and others about the vision plan. Would you have any – could you enlighten us on that.

S. Cunningham: That plan they did testify at the hearing on Monday as I understand it, CMS has taken no action to reverse their course with regard to the Vision Care Plan. Whether or not that will be included in the re-bid opportunity, we don’t know. CMS did announce that Spectra Vision would replace Vision Care as of July 1 and they have notified all of the practitioners – DeKalb Optometric for example that the plan will no longer be effective after July 1 so they’re a long way toward completing that issue. That leaves us with I think, the Wal-Mart organization as the authorized vision care reimbursement provider; Wal-Mart is a fine organization, but one issue that we have is the value of community based professional practitioners as the authority for reimbursement.

President Peters: We’ll continue; we’ll be on that. But that one, that sounds a little further down the road.

S. Cunningham: We’ll keep watching that.

President Peters: Well, good work. That broke when I was down there waiting between offices and we were writing the e-mail from office to office, picking up faxes and e-mails. We were able to communicate almost instantaneously. We were informing legislators before they got informed officially. Yes?
P. Henry: Just quickly, do you have any suggestions if we want to bring pressure to bear, how we would do that?

S. Cunningham: The testimony that we entered into the record – the written testimony – is on the HR web site. We have three employees who I do want to mention, Ada Hetland, Wesley Coates and Cathy Cradduck who also attended the hearings to offer their own personal testimonies with respect to Health Alliance. I think any personal messages those could be – CMS does have a web site. There should be on that web site an opportunity to contact CMS and I see nothing – no reason why employees who have issues about this should not look into that.

President Peters: That’s where I’d direct mine. I mean, legislators fine – they know but it’s CMS and other administrators.

S. Cunningham: Health Alliance’s web site they probably would be pleased also to refer testimony also. They’re going to work hard on this.

President Peters: How many individuals are in the vision program.

S. Cunningham: In the vision program here?

President Peters: No, I meant across the state.

S. Cunningham: That applies to ---

President Peters: To 90,000 voices we’re speaking – Health Alliance. How many voices are speaking.

S. Cunningham: Essentially there you’ve got well over 120 – almost 200,000. All of the state employees have access to vision care and the thing about that is it’s simply a defined benefit. Any additional costs are paid by the employee so it doesn’t matter where you use it so it’s interesting that that would change.

President Peters: Pat, was that what you needed? I think Bill – Jim?

J. Lockard: Yes, just in response to your question about contacting CMS, the question came up last week at Faculty Senate as to whether e-mail from an NIU account was as verboten as NIU stationery would be?

S. Cunningham: Well, I mean, if you have a private account that’s the best way to go. We tend to discourage it; that’s our policy just so issues don’t arise. We try not to give them anything they can make an issue about but ---

President Peters: Snail mail.

S. Cunningham: Snail mail, written accounts, use your own e-mail.
President Peters: Professor Lockard writes letter during business hours and – all right? Good work Steve Cunningham.

S. Cunningham: Thank you.

President Peters: And Kathy Buettner and all the rest of them and Representative Pritchard and Representative Jacobsen from Urbana and there’s heroes and heroines to go around on this one.

All right, just the other thing I wanted to report is that we had a special session of the Board of Trustees last week and the Trustees reluctantly – I recommended reluctantly and they approved reluctantly but unanimously with one voting present – new tuition rates for next year and for a full load which we define as twelve hours, we always report it that way for continuing students, the rate is up 7.75% and then for all new students coming in as of ’04 – new students defined as freshmen, transfers – that rate would be 15% above the current for a full twelve credit hour load. I’m just going to give you the undergraduate rates to keep it simple. Then, of course, because of Truth in Tuition, that rate for the new students next year is good for four years plus a grace semester. All right, that’s what Truth in Tuition did. It put some predictability in. All right. So this is the last year we will have two rates; one for continuing students and one for new entering students. From here on, there will only be one rate and it would be a one rate increase and that would be for new students and that four years plus a semester holds for both freshmen students and transfer students. We just couldn’t figure a way of fitting the legislation in with policy. We think that is appropriate. So our rates are very similar to the rates of every other public university. They’re all within that same 7% to 8%; 14%, 15%, 16% for new students. So, there you have that. We’re done with that.

I’m now done with my report.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: We have no Consent Agenda.

VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 6-7)

President Peters: Let’s hear Reports from Councils. Pat Henry?

P. Henry: I will yield to Sue Willis who attended the meeting but I might have a quick comment after.

S. Willis: Okay, yes I did attend the meeting at the DePaul University Loop Campus on April 23. You’ll find my written report on page 6. There was much discussion about this newly formed Committee on Priorities, Productivity and Accountability. As I note there, their time scale is quite short. They’re supposed to have a preliminary report out by October and their final
one by December because what they want to do is take what they’ve decided and use it as part of the FY06 budgeting process so that’s where that deadline comes from. I put down the Committee’s charge there. They’re reviewing the match between the university’s mission and the array of academic programs that are offered, examining the nature and the scope of faculty work in light of the institution’s mission and focus to better understand and define faculty productivity. Let’s see, they’re looking for ways to streamline the reporting process, which actually is probably a good thing, and also accountability measures to see what works, what needs improvement, what can be eliminated, and what might be added. Finally, they will make recommendations for the FY06 budget cycle. One of the questions that we do not know the answer to at the moment is from whom this committee is going to get information. The last thing that happened was they asked the FAC for it, which was odd. What they’re going to do this time, I don’t know. Because of the time scale it seems as though it’s likely that much of what they do is going to occur during the summer, so I’ve warned Paul.

Okay, then we met with a couple of the local legislators there, both Democrats, one of whose district includes Governor Blagojevich’s home which I thought was interesting. They both were very despondent about the state of the state and its finances and the way the Governor and Legislature are going about trying to do something about them. Both were in favor of raising taxes. One favored a tax swap where you raise income tax but then you lower property tax but I didn’t hold my breath on any of this.

Okay, there were some things that we talked about having to do with on-line course offerings having to do with how to evaluate such things. Apparently the University of Illinois at Springfield – their Provost has come up with a grant to have what they call shadow courses so all of their degree programs will be offered on-line as well as on-campus so I was just reading about this in the Chronicle of Higher Education where is also where the University of Illinois at Springfield faculty read about it and they, at least as of the 23rd of April, had essentially no communication from their administration as to anything basically so they’re frustrated and curious I guess I would say.

Then finally it was noted that some land-based universities which offer degrees on their own campuses are also offering totally on-line degrees and when you get a diploma, it doesn’t say that. So, that raised a question as to whether the totally on-line degree is really equivalent to the on-campus one even from the same institution. We didn’t answer that question but we heard it’s a good one to ask. So that’s about it.

**President Peters:** I don’t know what to say. I was just wondering if you had a public relations – I don’t know anything about public relations but why would you call it a shadow of a course? Is it a mirage? Or a clone? At least then there maybe some mapping you could do but a shadow?

**P. Henry:** I just wanted to point out that on page 7, the next page over, there’s a letter that now sort of the official FAC letter that went to certain representatives and senators – not just to first and last and company name – but this went out under the Faculty Advisory Council. It has some points there supporting the IBHE budget and the last paragraph – the next to the last paragraph there – mentions “as faculty members, we experience first hand how the impact of reduced
budgets and the diminution of student support impacts educational quality and student opportunity” and I think it would be appropriate for individuals who can really speak to this specifically to send this knowledge forward as well.

President Peters: Very good. Just one other thing. I can assure you that given the timing of these things and the cycling, the economy/election cycle, I think there will be a major state, fully integrated effort beginning for the FY06 budget to make a case – a large case – for funding for higher education. You have to cycle these things; you have to – I can assure you that there are discussions going on and you will have to play a role and parents will have to play a role and students and others. You have to think of these things in cycles. So this is good. All right? Yes?

D. Wagner: This is my last time to say this so I’ll say it again but when two Representatives call for loud voices of support for turning to the income tax, it seems to me that the only person in this state who doesn’t want to raise the income tax is the Governor and it might really help if the university supported raising the income tax. I’ve said this about five times but I repeat it.

President Peters: I was asked – let me talk about that – I appreciate that. Many of you were there when I testified; when I did my thing and one of their representatives asked me with all the brain power we have at NIU and the universities as I was speaking for universities, if we supported tax increase and that’s a very loaded question for someone who is really a state official like myself because classically our role is to make the case for your agency but not to make a political statement, particularly on the revenue side. But what I did say was that our organization, our students, our parents would understand if the case was made for some sort of a revenue enhancing policy that was fair and broad-based and had the probability that that increase would directly benefit higher education, not only other things. Because you can talk about a tax increase all you want but would we benefit from that and that seemed to resonate but if you just read this Capital Facts, the Governor is very clear in this and I understand immediately after that, powerful figures in the Legislature who had been toying with the idea immediately backed off that. So employee groups, business groups, parent groups, student groups can take a position like this. Agencies cannot take positions like that. We can get the information out to make the case. We can help organize but to publicly do that would be unprecedented I think.

P. Henry: I just have one other thing I wanted to ask in regard to the report and talking about the Priorities, Productivity and Accountability Committee, the FAC’s attempt in this line, as you mentioned, didn’t satisfy the IBHE but I think as it comes to the individual universities which is really where it should come I think as well, the public universities missions and so forth – how do you see the faculty having input in these discussions?

President Peters: I have no idea. I’ll find out.

S. Willis: I did tell them that we wanted to be in on it.

President Peters: I would think that faculty on individual campuses as organized through bodies like your Faculty Senate and then also our administration are in the best position to give input as to what our instructional workloads, our research and teaching workloads should be
norm to our kind of institution. To ask a super-body like the Faculty Advisory Committee – that represents a different sector of the academy to give input on that is okay because it is one perspective ---

P. Henry: But it was very general.

President Peters: But you, this body the Faculty Senate, would not want totally that body speaking for you because then they will take that as definitive that the faculty has spoken. Okay? So I’ll watch for that to make sure we have our say and you have your say and you too. You have two roles and I know you agree with that.

P. Henry: I was speaking in my private faculty voice there.

President Peters: You asked the question because you heard me talk about that.

B. Tolhurst: This seems to me to be a continuing issue that arises also for members of the Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees and it seems to me that one of the things that seems to be lost in the shuffle is just what the role of a Faculty Advisory Committee to a body is. My understanding is that we are a liaison, carrying information from that body to our constituency and providing some information to them but when they ask, if they were to ask us, and I know our Board of Trustees never would, to do something inappropriate don’t we need the Faculty Advisory Committee to say clearly that the kind of thing they’re asking for is inappropriate from that kind of body because it requires the liaison committee, the Advisory Committee, to step beyond its bounds, to act as a committee that can speak for the institution in a way that it is not empowered to do.

President Peters: That’s well stated.

P. Henry: Could I just respond quickly? I think that’s what the FAC felt as well and you recall what we presented was a very broad document that tried to address the fact that, in fact, different institutions would have different responses to this.

President Peters: I’m not sure how much is going to get done this summer but we’ll – there is a president on that – he’s a president at Eastern – by the way, if anyone in the disciplines that were impacted by the fire at Eastern and I think it was Sociology, Anthropology, you know, some of those folks lost their research and I talked to the president, Lou Henson that the building was salvageable but they lost a lot of their written material and they’re trying to recover from their hard-drives. I think a couple of their professors lost twenty years of research materials so it may be – and I was just thinking maybe what we need to do is a collective on the part of all the university campuses to see if we can’t – if they need some support for those academic functions. They are close to Urbana so they would have access to I presume to the libraries and things up there but anyway, Lou Henson – Lou Hencken, rather. He is a bit of Muppet – that was Jim – he is a wonderful guy and he’s very much on top of the situation for the presidents so we’ll monitor.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – no report
C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Bev Espe – no report

E. BOT – Sue Willis – no report

President Peters: Sue are you going to give the Board report?

S. Willis: You already gave it.

President Peters: I already gave it.

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

President Peters: All right, that takes us down to Academic Policy Committee.

J. Wolfskill: No report.

President Peters: No report.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – William Goldenberg, Chair – report (page 8)

President Peters: Bill Goldenberg, he’s got a report on page 8. Are you here William? On page 8 it’s a report. I heard that it was a very good meeting with Chief Grady and you can read it over. There’s some good recommendations and I’m really pleased with what Chief Grady has done for the campus. Students agree. It’s just been a great, great choice for us.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Carole Minor, Chair – report

President Peters: What do we have here! Rules and Governance, Carole Minor.

C. Minor: We have a report.

President Peters: Yes, all right.

C. Minor: First I’d like to thank the Rules and Governance Committee and I’d like to read you their names so you know who they are. They’re very hardworking people. Ferald Bryan, John Engstrom whom we can congratulate on his impending retirement, Pat Henry, Eric Johnson, Jeff Kowalski, LeRoy Pernell, Xueshu Song, Bill Tolhurst, Promod Vohra, and Fahui Wang. These folks were so dedicated that they insisted we have two meetings since the last University Council meeting rather than one so that we could address all the comments that came in from the colleges. I would like to thank you all for your responses. We received responses
from every college and we received responses from several individual members of the UC. Most of the requests, as I said in my report, involved clarifications that the Committee believes strengthens the document and you had an opportunity to look at those in your packet. One request – two requests were contradictory to each other – contrary also, the time lines are too short and the time lines are too long. So we decided to shorten some times lines and lengthen some time lines and we think we did that in a reasoned and appropriate manner. Some involved deletion of language and other things that I’ll go over in detail in just a minute. The first thing I’d like you to do is to attend to Dean Zar, former Dean Zar, who was the chair of the original committee who wrote this document and he met with us much of the spring semester in order to help us understand what the original committee was intending and to help us address the suggestions that we received from the colleges and others and so I’ve asked him to give us just a brief background of an answer to the question, why do we need this. Dean Zar?

**J. Zar:** Am I recognized?

**President Peters:** Yes, you’re younger than I remember you and I’m older.

**J. Zar:** That’s because after eighteen years on the University Council and on the Rules and Governance Committee, I’ve been away for two years.

**President Peters:** Welcome back and glad we are you’re here.

**J. Zar:** Delighted. It was in the spring of the year 2000 that the Executive Secretary of the University Council brought to the University Council a recommendation that the University’s Faculty and Staff’s Grievance Procedures be examined. Currently we have in place three different sets of procedures for faculty and staff. The faculty grievance procedures are in the University Bylaws. The Supportive Professional Staff have grievance procedures which are outlined in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual and Operating Staff have grievance procedures which are in the Business Procedures Manual. The Executive Secretary pointed out that there are considerable inconsistencies and inequities among these three sets of grievance procedures. For example, they were approved in a different manner. Faculty grievance procedures were approved by the University Council. The Supportive Professional Staff grievance procedures were approved by the Executive Cabinet, not the University Council and the Operating Staff procedures also were not approved by the University Council. The three sets of grievance procedures differ in the grounds for grievances and in the procedures for pursuing grievances. So there are these inconsistencies and inequities. So the University Council did decide at that time to establish an ad hoc committee to examine the grievance procedures. At the time, the Provost also made the comment that the problems with the existing procedures are real; they’re not just perceived. The Committee met for about two years. It was composed of faculty, supportive professional staff and operating staff. Representatives from the University Council also and also attending as non-voting members were the University ombudsman, the faculty personnel advisor, executive secretary of the University Council and somebody from Human Resource Services. The purpose of the ad hoc committee, I’ll read to you from the University Council minutes, was “to examine elaboration, condensation, consolidation or other modification to the existing procedures that will result in desirable provisions for faculty and staff to pursue grievances” and the committee was to recommend to the University Council such modifications
of procedures and propose where they should go in university governance documents. As I said, the committee spent about two years on this, examining the three different sets of procedures for grievances, considering their flaws, and developed a consolidated document that has been presented to the University Council for approval. Actually, as Professor Minor indicates, the current Rules and Governance Committee has been examining and polishing that document and has now come to the University Council for a second reading. What you have in front of you as a consolidated set of procedures is probably not perfect and will probably need fine-tuning if it goes into place. I think the major question for the University Council at this point is whether this new set of procedures is better than the three separate sets of procedures that are currently in place; better for all parties, all faculty and staff concerned. I can stay for a little while if there are any questions that I can specifically answer. Thank you.

President Peters: Thank you Dean Zar. All right, so you ---

C. Minor: There’s more to report. I’d just like to highlight a few of the changes that we’ve made and I’d like to request a couple more changes one of which we did not find out about until this week. On your page 15 is the first place in 11.5 Formal Procedures. We have Associate Vice President for Administration and Human Resources (AVP). That’s no longer his title. We are informed that his title is Associate Vice President for Enterprise, Planning and Human Resources. Is that correct? Oh, he’s left.

President Peters: That’s an editorial change.

C. Minor: Yes, it’s an editorial change and that would be made all through the document. That person is very important in this process. The other one is – we recommended a change toward the end of the document in the time line for the President to respond and you will see that on page 21 I think. This is one of the time lines we thought was too short because it appeared to us that the President had a lot more serious things to attend to for about ten days recently than having to write this report. So we changed this wording to delete the “within ten work days” and we replaced it with “as expeditiously as is practical”. We felt the President could have good judgment about that and then we deleted the part on the next page about him having to explain that additional time is necessary because that would be no longer necessary. However, on page 14 there is at the beginning of this document a summary of the time lines and we failed to change that in the summary so that we request also on page 14 at the very top, 11.2.15 President’s Response, that we delete the words “within ten work days” and replace that with “as expeditiously as is practical”.

President Peters: So, does everyone understand those changes. I consider those all editorial. Not the ten days, that’s pretty substantive. Okay.

C. Minor: There’s one other editorial change on page 18 and we thought this had been taken out of all of them but it turns out it hasn’t. 11.533 (a) The Hearing Process, we changed from buried in the middle to saying the Committee could have a non-participating representative from the University General Counsel’s Office. We put that at the beginning and we forgot to take it out of where it was in the middle so we would delete on line – one, two, three, four, five, six, and seven – “the Committee may have present at the hearing a non-participating consultant
representing the Office of the University General Counsel.” Delete those words because we had added them at the beginning. They are no longer necessary. So this is the additional editorial change that we request from what you have in your possession.

President Peters: All right. This then represents the complete report and document?

C. Minor: It does and the Committee requests that the University Council – moves that the University Council adopt this new procedure which includes deleting portions of Article 10, which talked about faculty grievance procedures and Article 19 which was mislabeled and also there are editorial changes that are listed on the memo in which other articles refer to these articles, just the numbers would have to be changed so that’s all editorial. None of it is substantive.

President Peters: All right so, do we need a motion?

C. Minor: I just made a motion.

President Peters: Is there a second? All right. A motion and a second. Now for discussion. Are we ready to go?

C. Minor: Yes.

President Peters: All those in favor of adopting as amended or adjusted – the new combined grievance committee process say aye. Opposed? Abstained? Good work. Do you have any other handy work this year Carole you want to bring forward?

C. Minor: Our Committee is finished and we thank you for hearing us.

President Peters: Your finish is pretty fine. All right.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

President Peters: Richard Orem, University Affairs. He’s out?

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Deborah Smith-Shank, Chair

President Peters: Deborah, our electioneer?


D. Smith-Shank: Okay, yes. Pursuant to Article 3.2 of our Constitution and Article 2.1 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, I’m pleased to offer for election to the office of Executive Secretary of the University Council, Professor Paul Stoddard. I ask that we have a motion to accept his nomination, close the nominations and unanimously approve his election to this position.
President Peters: Is there a motion? Second? All those in favor say aye? Stand up. Did you hear about the rule of buying dinner for all members? Welcome.

P. Stoddard: I’ll take that out of the pay raise that comes with the job.

President Peters: I’ll think of a retort to that. All right, well, welcome. We’re very, very pleased to have you.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: All right, is there any Unfinished Business?

IX. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: I recognize Professor Lockard.

J. Lockard: As you realize from the last order of business, we will have a new Executive Secretary and President of the Faculty Senate next year, which means Sue Willis will be leaving that office after distinguished service and I would like to offer to the University Council a resolution recognizing her service to us here. If I may, I’ll read that to you and ask that you adopt it as a resolution of the body.

The resolution reads as follows – if my glasses will stay with me –

“Whereas Dr. Suzanne Willis has devoted several academic years, July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2004, to the important task of University governance as Faculty Senate President and Executive Secretary of the University Council and while she has most ably served in this leadership position committed to the goal of shared governance and provided thoughtful counsel to the faculty and staff, to academic units and to the not-so-new President of Northern Illinois University, and

Whereas much of that time was also spent representing the faculty at numerous receptions and special functions performing the necessary but tedious task of munching on repetitious hors d’oeuvres and sipping wine, and

Whereas she has attended untold numbers of meetings of boards and committees and summarized the proceedings of Faculty Senate and University Council with clarity and brevity and, thereby, wit, she has attended numerous additional meetings of the Faculty Senate and University Council committees, assisting in the effective work of these committees and making available to them her considerable knowledge of the University Constitution, Bylaws and customs, and

Whereas she has provided counsel and insight regarding faculty and staff perspective to the President and other members of the administration working to maintain civil communication among all parties, and
Whereas in her leadership capacity, she has assisted the administration in providing the campus with a sense of stability and continuity during a period of nearly unprecedented budget angst, she has responded with intelligence and imagination to the current budget situation in the state, a situation that has made civil discourse and the context of shared governance even more important and as part of her response to budget restrictions, she has made valiant efforts to reduce the amount of paper and other natural resources wasted in the service of shared governance, and

Whereas despite budget cuts, she has drawn upon mysterious and possibly unnatural resources to provide the Faculty Senate and University Council with a steady diet of cookies thereby enabling members of these bodies to maintain their collective mid-afternoon sugar high albeit not at historical levels owing to the downsizing of said cookies,

Now be it therefore resolved that members of the University Council on behalf of the university community, recognize and thank Dr. Suzanne Willis for her outstanding and generous service to this institution.”

President Peters: Motion? Second? All those in favor? All right, you get the last laugh here.

The motion passed.

S. Willis: I’m – what can I say? I’m delighted and flabbergasted. My father is driving in today, he should be arriving from New Jersey for one of his usual one-day visits and so I will certainly show that to him with great pride. It has been a pleasure serving in this capacity and I certainly intend to continue serving the university in whatever ways that I can that would be most useful.

President Peters: Well thank you. You’ve been great to work with and we appreciate it. Yes, Bev?

X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Oh yes, Questions and Comments.

B. Espe: I’d like to announce that I’m ending my term and I’d like to thank the Council for the reception and the opportunities that I’ve had. It’s been a wonderful opportunity for me and I would like to introduce the President Elect of SPS Council who will take over on July 1 and that’s Shey Lowman. You may know Shey. She’s the Director of Document Services and she’ll do a wonderful job.

President Peters: Jeff Kowalski?

J. Kowalski: I’m leaving this body but before I do I’d like to see if I could get agreement from my colleagues to give a brief but tangible indication of our appreciation of the fact that the University of Tennessee’s loss is Northern Illinois University’s continued gain and indicate our happiness that you’ve stayed.
President Peters: A funny thing happened on the way to Knoxville during that process. It became so apparent to me and everybody that my heart was here and not in the other place. I’m really glad to be here. If you turn on the first road, it’s Woodlawn 901; and the second road is Longwood and I think the margaritas are being mixed as we speak. Thank you.

XI. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes
J. 2004 – 2005 Meeting Schedule (Page 33)

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 P.M.