
Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: Let me call the Wednesday, April 5, 2006 University Council to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first order of business is to adopt today’s agenda. You will see there’s one walk-in item which is placed under VI, Academic Policy Committee and it is a revised instruction sheet for student evaluations. With that, is there a motion to adopt the agenda for today? Is there a question or a motion? Motion. Is there a second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right.

The agenda was approved as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 8, 2006 MEETING

(Pages 3-7)

President Peters: On pages 3-7 you will find the minutes of the January 25 meeting. I’ll call for additions or corrections. March 8? Oh, in other words, word processes being what they are, change January 25, 2006 to March 8, 2006. What we just changed is III; just the announcement of the approval. Yeah, John?
J. Wolfskill: Actually, the same mistake is present on page 3 of the minutes where it refers in item III to the minutes of the January 25.

President Peters: Yes, let’s change --

???: No, that’s correct; that is right. Those were the January 25 minutes, oh, but it’s 05 not 06.

President Peters: All right, we’ll make that editorial change. We’re on a roll. All right. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We have minutes.

The minutes were approved as amended.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: I have just short remarks today just to update you on the fluid budget legislative situation in Springfield. I spent two days in Springfield and returned last night and I’m going to Washington soon so I’m restocking my Maalox between trips. Originally the legislature was scheduled to adjourn on April 7. That looks like that will not happen. There is some indication that finally there’s been talk between the Governor and the legislative leaders yesterday and therefore if they come into agreement, it’s possible things will move and the best guess right now, and that’s all it is is a guess, is that if things move maybe next Tuesday or Wednesday, the session will adjourn. Now, the issue is the budget. The Governor’s budget as moved to the legislature, which contained the modest but important increase in our general revenue base was in that budget. The Governor’s budget is being debated because it provides for increases above last year’s budget that the legislature contends does not have the revenue stream to support that increase so there’s the discussion of that. Now, there is, in many annalists view, a revenue increase expected last year that could cover some of the increases proposed in the Governor’s budget without new taxes, without even some of the revenue enhancer’s fees and so forth that the Governor proposed. So this is all being made in the eleventh hour. We remain optimistic that our increase will be in that final package; we remain optimistic but it is a fluid situation and there is a bit of a bump in the road that was not unexpected. So that’s where we are. It does not look favorable for any capital bill in this session; maybe in the veto session. That looks less likely. So, you know, it is an election year and this is the end of legislative strategy. This is subject to change at any moment because this morning at 8:00 a.m. when I got a report, the report was different than what I received twenty minutes before I came over. So there is movement; people are talking. So we remain hopeful and the case has been made and we continue to monitor the other legislative issues including the SERS retirement and other issues but not much to report at this time.

Paul and I decided that rather than wait until new business, we’d ask Steve Pace, under my report, to give you an update on the planning and the roll-out for our student information system implementation which, let me say having been through two of these, is non-trivial for the campus. It’s going to take a great amount of effort and cooperation amongst all units as we implement this rather significant new system. So I’m going to turn it over to Steve.
S. Pace: Thank you Dr. Peters. I’m basically here representing Gip Seaver who was going to be attending but is out of town. We want to invite faculty and staff and others to attend the kick-off meeting that we’re going to have for all of campus on Tuesday, next week, April 11 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. Dr. Peters will be speaking and will be talking about the project and the timeline for the project and where we are so far. We actually began the project in January. We had consultants here beginning in January and working through talking with people on campus in different groups and putting together a charter document for expectations and issues that we need to consider. We’ve had people at training and are involved right now with what’s known as the “fit-gap” sessions where we’re looking at the product and looking at our processes and saying where do those fit and where are there differences and how are we going to address those. So that’s a process that’s going to take a couple of months and then we’ll move into another phase of actually implementing the system so I would encourage you, your staff, students that would have interest, to attend that session on April 11 for some details on some specifics of the project. It’s in the Altgeld Auditorium.

President Peters: Okay, Altgeld Auditorium.

S. Pace: April 11 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

President Peters: April 11 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

S. Pace: And there’s a reception after that.

President Peters: Okay. We’re finally there; we’ve been working on it very hard and we’re all looking forward to its implementation.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: We have no consent agenda to adopt. I forgot, I wanted to acknowledge someone who’s last meeting is today. She served us faithfully. Shey Lowman, you’re leaving us, retiring, and we thank you. Is there anything you’d like to say? Want me to leave the room?

S. Lowman: I’d just like to thank you. I’ve really enjoyed being part of shared governance over my thirty-two years. It’s been a very valuable experience and I really appreciate the entire University Council and all the people who are represented here and how gracious you’ve been over staff issues so thank you very much.

President Peters: Well thank you. Thirty-two years of commitment to an institution. Our good wishes go with you. Thank you.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sharon Holmes – no report

President Peters: Now to reports. We have no report from the Faculty Advisory Committee.
B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report (Page 8)

**President Peters:** We do have a report on the BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. Ferald, are you giving that one because I know Buck is not here today.

**F. Bryan:** I’ll be happy to answer questions about the report. Actually, Buck Stephen presented it last time and it’s a good summary of the meeting so I’ll be happy to answer questions. I was present at the meeting; I do have the packet of information. The important thing that I would stress and that he also emphasized last time in his oral report is that we do have a very supportive Board in terms of faculty sabbaticals. Both he and I spoke to that and were gratified with the response of the Board. The other action items are listed there for you and I’d be happy to answer questions.

**President Peters:** Very good. Yeah, I’m very impressed with the support and the understanding that our current Board of Trustees shows toward those things that make our faculty and staff professional life better. This is not the case in many, many institutions and, during times of budget problems, one of the first things to consider eliminating is sabbaticals and many institutions, good institutions, do not have sabbaticals. In my own experience at the University of Nebraska and the University of Tennessee had no sabbatical policy. Those are pretty fair institutions and if you wanted a sabbatical, you had to bank – you had to over-teach for several years and then – but it wasn’t like ours and I think that’s a very, very good thing. You know, when you see trustees you might let them know and reinforce that. That’s the single most important thing I think you can as faculty and staff; we have staff sabbaticals. Now the next thing is presidential sabbaticals. That’s called retirement.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Rachel Turner and Shey Lowman – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report

**President Peters:** Paul Stoddard you have a BOT report.

**P. Stoddard:** This will be very brief. The full Board met and approved the recommendations made by the various committees including Finance, Facilities and the Academic and Student Affairs committees which Ferald just reported on. The Finance Committee had, just to remind you, approved the student fee schedule, and had approved various contracts and other business arrangements and some money for smaller capital improvements such as new elevators for Zulauf and College Avenue repairs. In addition to that, we also got a brief report from two of the resident advisors. These are students who live in the dorms and act as another resource for their fellow classmates and dorm mates. The two students who presented did a very nice job and both expressed a lot of personal growth that they achieved by being part of that program. So I think
we want to thank Dr. ??? for putting that together and keeping that program going. That was basically it in terms of, yeah, that was it. If there are any questions? If not, thank you.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Colin Booth, Chair – report – walk-in

**President Peters:** Our next item is Academic Policy Committee. Colin Booth and we do have that walk-in report and I believe this is a potential action item.

**C. Booth:** The committee was charged with reviewing the instructions for administrating student evaluations of instruction. We did eliminate outdated instructions on there and so on and the revised version is attached. That’s what the walk-in item is. We did not get around to resolving the procedures for on-line evaluation so we will be back next time with that one. In the meantime, I’d like to move that the revised instructions which are included here be adopted effective Fall of 2006.

**President Peters:** All right, so that comes forward from the committee. We can act on it today. Is there a motion to adopt these changes? All right. Is there a second? All right, discussion?

**W. Tolhurst:** On reading this over hurriedly, my understanding is that according to these instructions, that on campus evaluations have to be returned to the department office or other appropriate place immediately after the conclusion of the evaluations, the class, I’m not sure which, but it strikes me that when you’ve got a class that meets 6:00 to 8:40 in the evening, that may not be possible.

**President Peters:** Did the committee consider that?

**C. Booth:** No, we sort of accepted the departments have their procedures for returning the reviews directly. In our department, for example, the evaluations would be returned I think to the main office; they might have to be slipped under the door or something like that in the evening if it was in there. Usually, there’s someone around with a key, I think that would ---

**W. Tolhurst:** The person around with the key is typically the faculty member being evaluated.

**C. Booth:** That’s true.

**W. Tolhurst:** If he or she is not supposed to have anything to do with the process, I take it that they can still open the door and let them ---

**C. Booth:** We didn’t change that instruction from the original set of instructions.

**President Peters:** John?

**J. Wolfskill:** This is something I wouldn’t normally bring up except if we’re revising the document anyway, I’d like to propose an editorial revision on the students’ side of this. For item C, it says “*Note: The student administrating this evaluation should clearly write information identified below by an asterisk on the board for the class to read*”. What I’d like to propose is
that the asterisks, instead of it being at the end of the statement in items 3, 4 and 5 for example, be put on the numbers so that they would stand out more. So we’d have item 1, 2 then 3 asterisks, 4 asterisks, 5 asterisks and so on. In my opinion, that would stand out more and make it easier to be flagged.

President Peters: So put the asterisk on the numeral, is that what you’re saying?

J. Wolfskill: Rather than the statement, yes.

President Peters: That’s an edit. Will the committee accept that as an editorial suggestion?

C. Booth: The committee chair is okay with it.

President Peters: Okay, so that’s – I don’t hear any opposition to that editorial suggestion. Okay.

P. Henry: I have a question on the other side of the walk-in where it’s talking about the student assessment and the packet instructions. In my department, we make the students go and pick up the material as well but this looks like the instructor could, in fact, deliver the envelope containing the rating materials to a student enrolled in your class. Is this what should be happening? Is it a problem that our department does it differently or ---?

C. Booth: I’ll answer that. Our department also will hand the package directly to the student. The original document that we had on there had the instructions to the instructor was just a small section at the end of the same page as the instructions to the student so what we decided was it was more appropriate to pull those instructions for the instructor if they were needed, onto a separate sheet and also we expanded them a bit to make sure the instructor had to leave the classroom and that sort of stuff. So it is meant to be a second sheet as needed.

P. Henry: Okay.

President Peters: Does that meet your question? You have a question Bill?

W. Tolhurst: Since so many evaluations are given in smart classrooms, it’s hard for me to see why you should require students to write them on the whiteboard or whatever when the secretaries write them out so neatly and they could be put on the ELMO. I trust no one would be prosecuted if they did that instead.

C. Booth: I could make one answer to that Bill which is that, in general, the students in our classrooms would not really know how to operate the smart classroom material and don’t know the combination on the locks to get into it so the instructor would have to be there to at least make it work, you know.

W. Tolhurst: Well, this instructor is typically there for the class and having turned it on for the class, could walk out having left the ELMO on. I take it that putting a piece of paper on the ELMO is not terribly challenging.
C. Booth: Yes, but I would also argue that writing the instructions on the white board is not that challenging either to be honest.

W. Tolhurst: Right, but often hard to read.

President Peters: I can’t help you on that one. All right, more discussion on voting on these changes as suggested with the editorial revision.

C. Booth: I would like to add one thing by the way; we do recognize that departments have their variety of instructions. These are meant to be guidelines that go out from the Council to the departments.

President Peters: Okay, understood. All right. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Colin, any other issues from your committee?

C. Booth: No, we’ll just be back with the on-line stuff next time.

President Peters: Okay, very good. Thank your committee for this work.

The motion passed with an editorial change.

G. Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee – Amy Rose Chair – report (Pages 9-10)

President Peters: Amy Rose on Resources and Space. You’ve lost your voice?

S. Lowman: Amy asked me to please be her voice at this meeting. Our committee was asked to examine the question of whether years of budget cuts have affected the physical plant and the maintenance of the university to such an extent that the academic mission has been affected. I encourage you to please read all the details in this report; it’s really interesting. I’m just going to try to just highlight a couple of things here. One of the things that we were told, because of the continuing cutbacks in the budgets, performance contracts have been developed with the idea that energy savings will pay for improvements. NIU has been a state leader in developing this performance contract concept and we currently have performance contracts in twelve buildings. The President’s office has recently indicated it will dedicate funds to aid in the effort to have quickly response to repair requests. This will not be new money but will come from existing resources. The committee is making the recommendation that an effort be made to improve communication concerning the status of work orders and when they can be expected to be filled. We urge the university to consider developing a website where the status of work orders can be monitored with a tracking number. In addition, the website should have the capability of indicating dates so that departments can effectively track their own requests. We also recommend that the university develop a newsletter or quarterly publication which can be posted on the website to update the university community on maintenance related issues. If anyone has any questions?
President Peters: All right, that is the report. Read it carefully; it’s an important issue. All right, thank you. Thanks Amy Rose. I hope your voice comes back.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair – report (Page 11)

President Peters: John, Rules and Governance.

J. Wolfskill: Ladies and gentlemen, I direct your attention to page 11 of the packet. On this page you’ll see the Rules and Governance Committee’s response to two items which were referred to us earlier this term from the UCPC. In the first case, we’re proposing a change to the APPM, that’s the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. There’s a section in there which contains working rules for the UCPC, specifically voting procedures and around the middle of page 11 you’ll see our proposal that a particular section of text be inserted in those voting procedures as follows:

“In any case involving a recommendation of an individual’s tenure, promotion, or sabbatical leave which comes to the UCPC for action, the motion to be considered by the UCPC must be made in the positive sense; that is, a motion to recommend tenure, promotion, or sabbatical leave for that individual.”

Our proposal, and I’ll move this on behalf of the committee, is that this be inserted in that section of the APPM as Item 1.4. The current thing that is listed as 1.4 would then be pushed back to 1.5.

President Peters: All right, so you move that on behalf of the committee. For purposes of discussion, is there a second? Now discussion? All right, hearing none we’ll vote. All those in favor of inserting this new language say aye. Opposed? All right, we will insert that language.

The motion passed.

J. Wolfskill: The second half of the report details our response to the other issue and that’s purely informational.

President Peters: All right, any questions on those important issues? Okay, thanks to the committee for their work.

I. University Affairs Committee – Xueshu Song, Chair – report (Page 12)

President Peters: Xueshu Song, do you have a report from the University Affairs Committee?

X. Song: The University Affairs Committee has delivered its recommendation of the Academic Calendar 2015-2016 on page 12. The recommendation is based on the majority vote by the committee members and also based on the concurrence from Executive Vice President Eddie Williams. The choosing of this particular calendar is because it starts the spring semester one week later than the other possible alternatives and this means lower costs for the heating of academic buildings. That’s why the strong preference was given by the majority of members of
the University Affairs Committee as well as the office of the Executive Vice President. This is again as presented on page 12 for UC’s approval.

**President Peters:** Remember our bylaws require we set these ten years in advance. So, that comes as a motion from your committee?

**X. Song:** Yes, I move for the UC to approve this academic calendar, 2015-2016.

**President Peters:** All right, is there a second to that? All right. Discussion? I wish we could have done this so we could have reaped the benefits in this decade rather than whoever will be sitting here will be reaping them in 2016. All right. All those in favor say aye? Opposed? We’ve set the calendar for 2015-2016. Thank you for your committee’s work.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Brigid Lusk, Chair – no report

**President Peters:** Brigid, no report on Elections and Legislative Oversight? No? All right.

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** Any unfinished business?

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** New business? Paul Stoddard, do you have an item?

**P. Stoddard:** As it turns out, I do. In recognition of a member of the Council and a very important member of our university community, I have a resolution I would like to propose to the Council for their approval. I’ll read that to you and then we can vote on it.

> “Whereas Ivan Legg has faithfully served Northern Illinois University in the cause of public higher education for many years, and whereas he has contributed significant new knowledge to the scientific world as a research chemist and long-time professor of chemistry, and whereas Dr. Legg’s steadfast support for student and faculty priorities has strengthened academic life at every institution he has served, and whereas his heartfelt commitment to diversity has enriched the NIU experience for students, faculty and staff of all backgrounds, and whereas Dr. Legg’s leadership on issues involving student life and academic support issues has measurably improved the overall collegiate experience for countless NIU students, and whereas he has consistently provided strong direction and wise council to college deans and other academic leaders, and whereas his support for NIU’s system of shared governance has helped build consensus for numerous key initiatives, and whereas Dr. Legg is nationally recognized for his expertise in the area of faculty rewards and professional development, and whereas his commitment to providing students with maximum exposure to real-world learning experiences has increased student participation in faculty research, internships and service learning experience, and whereas Ivan Legg’s reputation for person integrity and generosity of spirit has created a leadership legacy at Northern Illinois University. Now, therefore, let it be resolved that
the University Council and Faculty Senate of Northern Illinois University extends this expression of appreciation and gratitude to Provost Ivan Legg, scholar, teacher, gentleman, and beloved friend.”

President Peters: Is there a second to that resolution? By acclamation, all those in favor say aye. Thank you Ivan. A great resolution. Thank you Ivan. I will have a chance to thank you several times before you lay this burden down.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Are there any comments or questions from the floor or anything for the good of the order? Our next meeting is our last meeting of the year which is always followed by our revelry. All right?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Programs for Certification in Education
E. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
F. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
G. Minutes, Graduate Council
H. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
I. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
J. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes

XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: Motion to adjourn? We’re adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.