I. CALL TO ORDER

Provost Alden: First of all I just wanted to let you know that President Peters is out of town so I am going to serve in his role today.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Provost Alden: I guess the first item is the adoption of the agenda. Could I have a motion to adopt the agenda as it stands? A second? Oh, I’m sorry. There are some walk-in items. I should have said something about that with respect to the agenda. There is the first thing which is the – what is this - the minutes which is a walk-in item. The second item is the Board of Trustees’ report that Paul is going to give and the third is a walk-in item on the Academic Calendar. So those will be added to the agenda and you should all have those in front of you as part of the new agenda. Is there any other comments or questions? Okay. Could I get a vote on the agenda? All in favor say aye. All those opposed? Abstained? Thank you.

The agenda was approved as amended.

III. APROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 19, 2008 MEETING

Provost Alden: Okay, the next item is the approval of the agenda (should be minutes). You have that in front of you. If you want to take a minute or so just to go over it and then we’ll call for a motion to adopt the minutes from the last meeting. Can I have a motion? Second? Okay. Anybody see anything they want to add or correct? All those in favor of adopting the minutes say aye. Any opposed? Any abstained? Thank you.

M. Morris made the motion; M. Venaas was second. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Provost Alden: Since I’m not the president, I don’t have president’s remarks but I did think were a few things I should say about what’s going on. We’re in the middle of the budget season as you’re all aware. We had the budget hearing in Springfield for the Senate last week. Nothing too surprising but also no new news. We have heard from the Governor’s office there’s a significant revenue shortfall that will require some sort of action and cooperation between the Legislature and the Governor’s Office and therefore we don’t know where we stand for next year. The House Appropriations Committee meeting will have their budget hearings next week
so I’m not sure that that’s going to be any more enlightening. There is no indication of when a budget will be finalized so I think it’s pretty much where we were at this time last year.

The only item I just wanted to mention – we are working with a number of agencies on starting to write grant proposals to recover some of the funds associated with the aftermath of the February 14 event and we are going to Department of Education, Department of Justice, IEMA, HHS, and the counties as well as possibly a state special appropriation to try to and recover and to fund some of the future recovery efforts so that’s all being worked on and we’re coordinating those efforts. I’ve asked Harold Kafer, as a member of the Deans’ Council, to serve as a contact point for coordinating these efforts so we will be working with people throughout the university to try and get these grant proposals together. Harold and I and a number of students and people from Student Affairs will be going down to Virginia Tech next week. It is their first year anniversary. They have a number of memorial services and since they have provided us so much support, we wanted to not be obtrusive, but at least show the support to them that they have given to us and we will be giving them a memento, a plaque, showing our gratitude and I’ll briefly read the engraving that will be on the plaque. “To the students, faculty, staff, and administration of Virginia Tech in gratitude for the support and comfort provided in our time of need.” From the students, faculty, staff and administration of Northern Illinois University. Two universities; one family. April 16, 2008.” So they will have something that at least indicates our support for their memorial services and we will have a strong group there and as I understand it we will have a concurrent candlelight service to their service on campus here so we would hope everybody would participate.

Okay, the next agenda item unless there’s any questions on those items, - do we have a consent agenda – no consent agenda this time so no item V.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

Provost Alden: In terms of the reports, we have no report from the FAC. No report from the various Board of Trustee committees but we do have a walk-in report from Paul on the Board of Trustees’ meeting.

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – no report.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Nancy Castle – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report – walk-in
P. Stoddard: Thank you. Yes. The full Board met on March 27. It was a well attended meeting at least in terms of a media standpoint. This may be the last major media presence we have on campus for a while hopefully related to February 14. This was the first full Board meeting since that time and in recognition of that, Chair Murer began the meeting talking about February 14. She called for a moment of silence to remember those who perished that day. She then went on to note that the state of Illinois has already had in place a taskforce looking into the impact of Virginia Tech on Illinois and what that means for institutions here and that their report has been postponed a little bit so that they could then think about what happened here and incorporate that into their report. As a result, that report will be made available to the Board of Trustees in June. In addition to that, Chair Murer asked for an internal review by the campus on what happened. The President will name the people to serve on that taskforce or group and they are to report their findings to the full Board of Trustees in September. After that, some of the media left; a few stayed and the Board went on to complete their regular business which is receiving reports from the various subcommittees. They then went to the University’s reports. The President started his remarks again by noting what happened on February 14. Then they moved into the main business which they actually got through in record time after they finished all of the first bit. Things that are significant and have been reported I think previously from the committees but, nevertheless, bear repeating – student fees and room and board increases were approved. Fees are going up 5.29%. Most of that is due to a 7.71% in student health insurance. That’s an issue beyond our control essentially. The object is always to try to keep those increases to no more than 3% but health insurance costs have been going through the roof and we really have not been able to cap that. Room and board is also going up a large amount, almost 10% but that is in order to pay for the sprinkler systems that have to be added to the resident halls. That’s a nearly $15 million project that will be undertaken over the next four years.

Moving on, parking lot 24, at by HR and the football field, is going to be resurfaced. Actually, more than just resurfacing. That was approved.

The Proton Treatment Center passed a major hurdle when the Illinois Health Facility Planning Board granted a certificate of exemption. So far we are the only facility in the neighborhood to have that certificate and that’s good for us. This puts us on a time table to start treating patients. The terms of the certificate is that we need to be treating patients by February of 2010 so that’s just a little less than two years from now.

The Board approved a program fee of $175/credit hour for Master of Accounting Science courses. This large increase is necessary, according to the program, to keep them ranked among the top programs in the country. This is something that is being done among the other top programs in the country as well. So this is for facilities, for faculty and staff in order to keep them competitive.

Of special importance to the faculty and staff, the Board of Trustees approved all 50 of the sabbatical leave requests that they received and again expressed their support for the program in general.
A new minor was approved in Mechanical Engineering, a new emphasis in Mechatronics. Ferald says he doesn’t know what that is and I don’t know what it is either but Mechanical Engineering presumably does. Then a new specialization in Nanoscience within the Ph.D. in chemistry.

Finally, we got an information report from the NIU Foundation. The February 14 scholarship fund as of the time of the meeting had raised $219,000 from 975 donors. The goal for that is try to establish 5 endowed scholarships for students here on campus in memory of course of the 5 students who died. The Foundation is not actually trying to get money for that, but merely providing information to interested parties. They again want to raise $150 million for True North. They’ve raised so far $118.6 million. This is totally separate from the February 14 fund and they also, within that total, have raised a little over $17.5 million towards the goal of $31 million for endowment. That’s all I have. I’ll be happy to take any questions anyone might have. Yes?

**L. Kamenitsa:** I actually have a question about the internal review that the Board asked for. It was reported in the press with virtually no details. Do you have any sense of what sort of scope or parameters of that review were? Do they give any kind of charge like that?

**P. Stoddard:** No, they didn’t. Yeah, I just – we haven’t talked about – I mean, I haven’t been privy and I don’t think anyone has really thought too carefully yet about what scope that has. I know you may be aware that the university has already been conducting a review all year long of the Virginia Tech report and how we might be prepared in light of that. I sit on that review panel. It was very surreal on February 14 and in the aftermath to see all these things we’d been discussing all year in some sort of vague, some day scenario and suddenly coming to fruition so just speaking off the top of my head and please don’t hold me to this. It seems to me some people from that would be involved but again, I don’t know that those decisions have been made yet and I don’t know how deep they’re going to delve or what sort of issues they’re going to get in to.

**Provost Alden:** Okay. No Academic Policy Committee report. Resources, Space and Budget Committee, Linda Derscheid has a report.

F. Academic Policy Committee – William Baker, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Linda Dersheid, Chair – report (Page 2)

**L. Derscheid:** Yes, we met with Associate Vice President of Finance and Facilities, Robert Albanese, who serves with Dr. Williams and he talked about the announcement, because this was February 27 that we held our meeting and that particular afternoon was the announcement by the Governor of trying to support a $40 million memorial hall to replace Cole Hall and, although we were sort of mildly excited at that point, we all were still sort of wondering if that was really going to come through.

We talked about the Proton Therapy Center, saying it had been ranked #1 and the final blessing from the federal still needs to come through and it probably has by now.
We also talked how NIU has expended its budget for snow removal. We were at that time still thinking or thought that the winter was very long and even now we still think the winter is way too long so he did promise thought that, although the budget had been expended, that snow removal would still continue to be a high priority to keep our campus safe.

We talked about saving money on energy costs by the performance contracts and working on replacing windows and other energy maintenance enhancements. We talked about the state not giving us, of course, enough money to handle all our energy expenses for operation costs and how we need to figure out ways to cover those expenses. A new chiller plant is being proposed for this summer near Campus Life Building. Next summer there are some plans for demonstration wind project west of the Convocation Center and some plans for a parking deck with solar panels. Trying to think green here and save energy costs.

We discussed capital improvement projects of with Stevens still the top priority. So that was pretty much our discussion. Any questions?

**Provost Alden:** Thank you very much.

**Provost Alden:** Next item is Rules and Governance Committee. Bill Tolhurst, report?

**W. Tolhurst:** Yes, you’ll find on one of the back pages of the packet, a draft of a motion to change the title of the University Personnel Advisor. This was recommended by the current Personnel Advisor and the Supportive Professional Staff Council. The problem that this is designed to fix is the underutilization of the Faculty Personnel Advisor by Supportive Professional Staff who apparently don’t always realize that they are eligible to avail themselves of his services so they motion would change the Bylaws so as to change the title and it designates all the areas of the Bylaws that will have to be changed in order to accomplish this. This is just a first reading; we will vote on it at our next meeting.

**Provost Alden:** Any questions on this item? Okay, the next item is the University Affairs Committee. We actually have two items; one in the package and one a walk-in. David Wade?

**I. University Affairs Committee – David Wade, Chair – report – ACTION ITEM**

**Provost Alden:** Do we have a second? Any discussion? Okay, seeing none all those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Any abstained? Thank you.
D. Wade: Okay, the second item is back on the table since last month when it was a first reading. The recommendations regarding the office of the Ombudsman, the Faculty Personnel Advisor and the Faculty Rep to the IBHE. We pretty much reviewed them last time. There were some concerns about funding. I heard nothing. There were some concerns about the use of a one month stipend versus a fixed sum or a stipend with a maximum which was another suggestion offered last month. After consultation with my committee, we stand on the existing recommendations although we’re certainly willing to listen to any discussion that’s up to it and of course this body makes its decision based upon what they think we should do. We were charged with offering recommendations; we have done so. You can consider them, accept them, or reject them at your pleasure.

Provost Alden: Okay, we probably ought to have a motion so we can discuss this item.

D. Wade: I move to approve the items.

Provost Alden: Okay, do I have a second?

D. Wade: Do we want to do them one at a time or do we want to do it – because last month we talked about doing them one at a time.

Provost Alden: I think that would be wise.

D. Wade: Okay, I’ll make a motion to – okay, I’m going to move that the provisions dealing with the Office of the Executive – we should probably do that last because that funds everything else, right? Okay. I move that the provision about the Faculty Representative to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Bylaw change, be approved.

Provost Alden: Okay, and this is item 16.5.

D. Wade: Correct. Bylaw 16.5.1 actually.

Provost Alden: Second: Okay, discussions?

J. Kowalski: I’m Jeff Kowalski. Yeah, at the risk of prolonging this a bit, but coming from the College of Visual and Performing Arts that I think has perhaps somewhat lower averages on the salary scale, it does concern me a bit that if someone volunteers and is selected to do this that we may have very differing pay scales for doing what essentially the same amount of work and the same commitment so I would like to see a formula devised that could provide a reasonable and justified stipend.

Provost Alden: Paul and I discussed this in our meeting this week and one possible alternative would be instead of having a stipend, having a stipend that is fixed to the average faculty salary for tenured faculty on campus. That way as peoples’ salaries hopefully go up over time, we wouldn’t have to keep changing the stipend that’s listed in the Bylaw and as I indicated my position last time when I wasn’t chairing the meeting, I don’t see particularly tied to anybody’s discipline. It requires the same input of services and time commitments regardless of which
department or college you’re from so in the interest of a level playing field, I would tend to favor
that but I’m not going to tell people what to do in terms of any sort of alteration or amendment to
the motion. Jeff?

J. Kowalski: I like the idea of pegging it in some way to sort of a mean or an average salary for
the university whether that would be at the professor rank. That would be nice but, you know, at
any rate, something that would peg it to an average salary would be helpful.

Provost Alden: I should in interest of full disclosure, when I discussed this briefly with the
President, he was not at all comfortable putting in commitments for budget items that we don’t
have in our budget in the Bylaws to begin with so I did need to express his concerns. He has no
problem with negotiating up to a certain point but to fix it at that point, we just may not have the
budgets to do that so I do need to say that since he did go on the record with me anyway of
indicating his concern about this. Bill?

W. Tolhurst: Does this concern raise a problem for the suggestion you just made of tying the
compensation to an average salary or is that something the President might be comfortable with?

Provost Alden: Well certainly it addresses the issue of a level playing field among disciplines.
I think his concern is that some of these positions have no budget line item and so if we come in
next year with, you know, a flat budget or a budget decrease then this is more or less putting in
the Bylaws that we’ll be doing something that we may not have the resources to do and I think
that was his concern.

W. Tolhurst: If I could follow up on this then, that means then that any attempt to provide
funding for this is problematic from that point of view. Isn’t that right – unless or until the
Bylaws are changed or ---?

Provost Alden: What he was suggesting was put it up to this amount and then the years that it
could be covered it would be covered; the years that it couldn’t be covered we’d do the best we
could to cover it. But again, I don’t want to speak for him because, you know, iterations on the
argument – I can’t represent his position.

W. Tolhurst: It seems to me that if I understand the sentiment behind the recommendation, it
was a concern to indicate our commitment to shared governance and recognize that shared
governance requires a commitment of some sort in this area although I defer to my colleague,
David Wade, who was much more involved in those discussions than I was.

D. Wade: You know, we believe these positions deserve to be funded not only in times of a
raising tide but in times of below tide as well. If we’re talking about a level playing field, I think
a level playing field exists regardless of whether we’re flush with money from the state or
whether we’re deficit with money from the state. I’m not comfortable with floating the price of
these important services based upon, you know, legislative largess. That’s just a personal matter;
I’m not speaking on behalf of my committee. My committee may disagree.
Provost Alden: Well, like I said, I can’t speak on behalf of the President. I assume that if this is put in there, into the Bylaws, it may come through reallocation from other sources and other sources may be the colleges. I just don’t want to continue to argue a position that I have no basis to argue.

D. Wade: I – we don’t doubt the fact that there will be difficult times that this is adding money to the budget. There’s no question about that. There are positions that are unfunded that are being funded – some are simply being funded differently, in cash rather than release time or something like that but shared governance is the essence of what we do here and these are important roles within that system and I think the time commitment is sufficient that we should compensate them. It sends a signal of not only your time is worth it but this is an important role to play and should serve, we would hope, as some sort of an incentive so that people who are interested in doing this work rather than somebody who’s dragooned into doing this work, will step up and do it and – I’m not saying anybody’s doing a bad job and I don’t mean to imply that – but, you know, somebody who’s engaged will generally do a better job than somebody disengaged.

Provost Alden: Just so it’s clear, I don’t think the President disagrees with any of that. It’s just that when things are fixed in Bylaws, it makes it mandatory and then it may have to come from reallocation and then it may come out of someone else’s skin.

E. Johnson: Pardon me if I’m wrong, but if I understand correctly from previous conversations, the representative is given leave from the university or their time – are they docked or are they reimbursed for expenses while ---

P. Stoddard: The FAC representative, you might be confusing this with the Faculty Personnel Advisor who does get release time from teaching, the FAC representative gets no release time, gets no salary; does get reimbursed from our office for travel expenses and, yeah, for transportation and lodging.

Provost Alden: To the meetings.

P. Stoddard: To the meetings, yeah, which are once a month at various points around the state.

Provost Alden: Is there any other discussion on this item?

D. Wade: I believe we would be willing to accept a friendly amendment that indicated something in changing the person’s one month salary equivalent to the median salary of all tenured professors or words to that effect. If someone would offer better language or different language, we would be willing to accept it as a friendly amendment.

Provost Alden: Would anyone care to make a friendly amendment to that effect? Okay. Do I have a second for that amendment? Okay, does the person who seconded the original motion agree to that as being a friendly amendment? Okay, ---

D. Wade: I was the original mover; I’m saying I’ll accept it as a friendly amendment.
Provost Alden: Yeah, I was asking the second – is that you Toni? Okay. So I assume we – is there any discussion on the amendment because I believe we have to vote on that first.

D. Wade: Okay, so this is now going to read “the person shall received annual compensation equal to one month of the median salary of all tenured professors”?

W. Tolhurst: I just want to know where we are right now. As I see it, what we’ve got here is an amendment to change the amendment that’s already been offered and I take it ---

Provost Alden: It’s an amendment to his motion to accept the changes as I understand it.

D. Wade: I’m trying to craft the words of the friendly amendment.

W. Tolhurst: Okay, okay so there’s no need to vote on amending the motion if the amendment is friendly.

Provost Alden: This is a friendly amendment and the person making the motion and the person seconding the motion accepts it, then we vote on it as a package is what I’m understanding. Any other discussion on this particular item? Okay, all those in favor say aye. All those opposed? Abstained? Thank you.

The motion passed as amended.

Provost Alden: Okay, the next item.

D. Wade: Okay, so that was the FAC rep, correct?

Provost Alden: Yes.

D. Wade: Let’s do the Faculty Personnel Advisor next because it’s also a compensation issue. So this one now, with the new amendment which we might as well factor in, will read “the advisor shall receive compensation equal month of the median salary of all tenured professors each semester and summer session funded through the budget of the University Council.” Is everybody clear on the rewording?

Provost Alden: The last one you said tenured faculty. I assume you mean tenured faculty and not just full professors?

D. Wade: Tenured faculty, correct. That’s what I intended anyway.

Provost Alden: Tenured professors, tenured --- there is, so what would you think would be appropriate?

????: I thought you said faculty but I may be wrong.
Provost Alden: So which way, professors or faculty?

D. Wade: Tenured faculty.

W. Tolhurst: I guess my question is do you have associate professors serving any of these roles in which case ---

D. Wade: Yes we do. Yes. The Faculty Personnel Advisor has been, I don’t know what it is now, but certainly has been an associate.

P. Stoddard: I think I’d suggest that if associates and full are eligible for the role, it probably makes more sense to do the median salary based on everybody who’s eligible to serve rather than just put – in my way of thinking, which is just my way of thinking – it makes more sense to take the median salary we’re talking about and the pool of people who are eligible to serve rather than just from the full professors. So that means –

D. Wade: All tenured professors then.

P. Stoddard: All tenured professors, yeah. All tenured faculty.

D. Wade: Faculty, okay. Okay, so it reads “the advisor shall receive compensation equal to one month of the median salary of all tenured each semester and summer session funded through the budget of the University Council.” I move that we approve the Bylaw change.

Provost Alden: The second for that? Okay. Discussion?

P. Stoddard: David could I ask – given that this person’s role in the summer is likely to be less than the academic year, did you give any thought to that? Was there a rationale for making it a full month for each?

D. Wade: Well, it’s boom and bust no matter what because a lot of it gravitates around promotion and tenure periods in the fall so that usually is the heaviest work load. The reason why we included the summer session was currently, they get a one half reduction during their academic terms fall and spring and then the Provost’s Office has supported them with a one month salary paid over a two month period of time in the summer. We just carried forward the practice.

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you.

Provost Alden: Any other discussion?

E. Johnson: I personally – I agree with the President’s opinion that in these financially uncertain times, with the state budget going up and down, putting funding mandates that may not be there isn’t the best fiscal – it doesn’t showing good fiscal responsibility at this time.
Provost Alden: Okay, any other discussion? Okay. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. Any abstentions? Okay.

The motion passed.

D. Wade: The next item, excuse me, we’ll take the Ombudsman next. This is not an effort to – there’s no funding increase, decrease or change here. It is simply a different funding line. Rather than being funded as it is currently through the Division of Administration and University Outreach, it would rather be funded through the budget of the University Council and the Ombudsman will be involved in that so it becomes a line item for the Ombudsman’s office rather than the current system which I believe requires – Tim correct me if I’m wrong – do you have to go item by item to get funded for what you need for your office? Rather, he would be involved in producing an office budget which would then be funded in whole by a line item in the University Council budget. You know, our committee felt it was an appropriate thing given the importance of the Office of the Ombudsman and the necessity to be more independent or at least appear more independent commiserate with the significance of the person serving in that office and the office, we felt that they should have an office budget as most offices do on this campus rather than sort of hat-in-hand, I need some toner; can I have some money to buy some toner or whatever that might evolve into. That was our motivation in trying to make this more of a line item office budget rather than an item by item as it currently is funded and I move to approve this item as well, this Bylaw change.


D. Wade: And that brings us to the last item which is the Office of the Executive Secretary which is simply we did strike the editor of the Faculty Bulletin as Professor Sons mentioned that we should last time. This is merely a reiteration of the existing Bylaw on the funding mechanism. It simply adds those additional items to the University Council budget that were not funded through the University Council previously but there’s no particular change in the method by which the University Council budget is developed Bylaw – at least as required by the Bylaws. I’m not going to comment on practice and I move to approve this.

Provost Alden: Do we have a second? Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye. All those opposed? Any abstention? Do we need to go back and revisit the language on that other? Would you like to make a motion to that effect just a point of clarification or do we need to? Professor changes to faculty, correct? That’s the only change, correct.

J. Kowalski: I suppose I could make a motion about the wording of the section in italics under 16.5.1 be amended to substitute the world “faculty” for the word “professor” at the end of that italicized section.

Provost Alden: Okay, just to make it clear and make it official, do we have a second? Any discussion on this item? All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Any abstained?

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Toni Tollerud, Chair – no report
VII.  UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Provost Alden:  We – I don’t think we have any unfinished business.

VIII.  NEW BUSINESS

Provost Alden:  Any new business?

IX.   COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Provost Alden:  Any comments or questions for the common good here?  Well, we may have a record short meeting then.  Okay.

X.   INFORMATION ITEMS

Provost Alden:  Any information items anybody cares to bring forward.

XI.   ADJOURNMENT

Provost Alden:  In that case, I need a motion to adjourn.  All those in favor, leave.