UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 3:00 P.M.  
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council website under University Council/ Agenda Meeting Transcript.


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER  The meeting was called to order at 3:07.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J.Peters: There are two walk-in items. Roman VI. G and H under Rules and Governance and Resources, Space, and Budgets.

The motion to accept the agenda with the addition of two walk-in items was made by E.Hansen and seconded by P.Henry. It passed without dissent.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2010 MEETING (to be sent electronically)

The motion to accept the minutes as written was made by P.Henry, seconded by B.Cesarek, and passed without dissent.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J.Peters: We have a really full agenda today, so my announcements will be brief. I would like to introduce Nancy Castle who asked for time to talk to us about the Faculty/Staff campaign for True North.

A. Nancy Castle, True North
N. Castle: Thank you very much. By now you should have received the letter from Dan Gebo and Dave Changnon about the faculty fund. The True North Campaign is the first comprehensive endowment campaign that NIU has undertaken in its history. In its final months it has turned its focus to two things: the scholarships and endowments on campus and, two, the campus community as people who could really contribute to these endowments and scholarships.

Your letter from Dan and Dave talked about the faculty fund. It also talked about the faculty and staff campaign. The slogan for this is “A Little Kindness” which is what really we are asking the campus community to exhibit. The faculty and staff campaign is not about how much we give, it is about how many of us give. We are asking all of the full time faculty and staff to make a contribution to this effort.

There are a couple of points to keep in mind about this. One that is very important is that 100% of what you give will go to whatever it is that you designate as long as it is not something that you have signature authority over. You can contribute $10.00 and that would be very helpful. We thank the 931 full time faculty and staff who have contributed to date. That gives us a 25% participation rate. We would really like for that to be a lot higher. I realize times are tough. The cost of a couple of Starbucks over a month is all we are asking for. If you can do more, we’d love it. If you are looking for ways to give, if you go to the NIU home page click on True North and when you get to the True North Home page, there is a little icon that says Faculty and Staff Campaign. If you click on that, there are stories of students who have succeeded due to various sources that come through the foundation. There is a form you can download. You can make a one-time contribution and send it in. You can make a contribution with a credit card. You can donate through a payroll deduction.

I came here as a junior and I received an NIU Alumni Scholarship. Had I not received that scholarship, I could not have afforded to come to NIU. Back when Linda Sons was still here, I was a co-chair of the faculty fund campaign. I contributed in that way. I continue to contribute because we are what makes NIU good and continues to make NIU good.

So please think of making a contribution; a one-time contribution, a many time contribution, but please participate in the faculty staff campaign so we can end up with a True North Campaign worth well over $153,000,000.

B. Cesarek: Nancy, I wonder if that letter went out to the entire community or faculty only. I don’t know that we have received it in SPS or Operating Staff.

N. Castle: That’s a good question. It is the faculty fund letter so I am guessing that it went to just the faculty. So, many of you have not received the letter from Dan and Dave, but if you go to the NIU home page, go to True North, go to Faculty and Staff, it would be appreciated.

B. Cesarek: We have an SPS Council Meeting tomorrow. I will be sure to mention it.

J. Peters: I thank Nancy for doing that this year. We are ending the True North Campaign, our first ever capital campaign. Actually, we are at about $159,000,000 today.

I think, given the times, that this has been a tremendous effort and we are going to be ending it in June. And of course we will take a break, catch a breath and we will run another capital
campaign. Because that is the nature of funding for higher education. We need private funding. And we have a good base now and know what we are doing.

My remarks are going to be brief because I have not much to add to what I said last week regarding the budget. The legislature was not in session last week or this week, so we are safe. It is a quiet before the final legislative push and there is no feeling out there is that there is going to be an early adjournment. Last year, remember, they passed a six-month budget, we don’t know what they’ll do this year, but we have taken the kind of steps that are prudent and based on the best evidence that we have on what fiscal ’11 budget is going to be. I am comfortable that we have done all we can do to prepare and that we continue to do that. And the fact of the matter is as we sit here that we do not have a budget problem. We have a payment problem. It is a cash flow problem. Our budget has not been ridiculously slashed. It is just that they have not paid us anything.

We are owed about $55,000,000 and we don’t know whether or not we will get any more payments. You may be interested to know by the way, I got some website statistics this morning on our budget website. That website, since it went up, has had over 5,000 hits. I have to say that the questions are profound and sensible. And if you look at it, you can see some of the answers we are producing.

My budget message of March 10 got over 1,000 hits and I had about 1,000 hits about my presidential email. We are trying to communicate in every way we can and do rumor busting.

Since I talked to you last, we did have our senate appropriation hearings. I discussed that in my letter. The meeting was postponed at the last minute due to passage of the pension reform bill. And I observed the legislative process and the way that pension bill went through. It was the fastest thing I had ever seen and with a lot of bi-partisan smiles. And so the next morning, we had our hearings and they are all sympathetic about the cash flow, but nothing much was done about it, could be done about it from their perspective, but they are sympathetic.

And then this week was the IBHE meetings and there wasn’t that much on the agenda. The public presidents and chancellors talked and compared notes about the status of things and we are all in about the same boat.

We will begin to monitor the budgetary process again next week, and we will keep you informed.

Saying that, now this is the most productive time of year for us, for all of you. This is the time when we have all of our graduation ceremonies and academic honors and celebrations. I know our calendar is full-up with faculty and staff award receptions and dinners. Liberal arts is closing out its fiftieth year anniversary. And, you know, whenever I get down, I think about all of the good things we do here and the graduates, the good education, all of the good research we do, service to our community, and I am very proud of that. I feel that way about all of the public universities. I think they are institutions that the local community and the state should be proud of us. We are doing what is expected of us despite the tough times.

V. CONSENT AGENDA
VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES.

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report (pp 3-7)

**E. Hanson:** The memo that you have in here is taken from the notes of the meeting that I did not attend at the University of Illinois Champaign. When we met with the IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee, they told us that we are the largest contingency of any advisory group that they have ever had. One member was asking about the funding situation and asked if anybody in the audience would raise their hand if they thought they could cure the budget problem without raising the state income tax. Not one hand went up. There is an issue with the legislature, and that is the next topic that was brought up. How do we as faculty and administration and staff of the universities get the attention of parents so parents can talk to their representatives? It is extremely important that the parents understand that we are going down the tubes if we don’t get some funding.

Higher education is more than just the professor standing in the classroom. It is research, it’s business, it’s the economy. I think John, in your letter to us you mention a loss of $11,000,000 in revenue to the DeKalb area. That is devastating to communities like DeKalb, Carbondale or McComb, or Charleston, any place that that does not have a strong economic base besides the university.

I raised the question how are we, as academicians, to tell our students that they should go back to their parents and talk to the legislators regarding funding. I honestly think that we as a faculty group should give this some strong consideration. It is imperative that the citizens of this state talk to their representatives about the funding of higher education.

**P. Henry:** In terms of communicating with students, rather than having faculty communicate with students in our class, is there some way we can organize talking to student groups?

**E.Hansen:** The question is excellent. We didn’t do it with the MAP grants, the students did it. Simply because they saw that they were not going to get funding. They were being told they were not going to get funding for six months. Perhaps we need to talk to the student organization so that they can get the word out.

**J. Peters:** There is a broad-based higher education coalition that is holding a lobby day on April 21 in Springfield. And then the day after that on the 22nd is a collegiate student lobby day. I think we are sending a bus down. And so the students will be going down and of course, our students are pretty well organized, they’ve got their messages. But knowing that their faculties are supportive to them is extremely important.

**R.Sorsby:** We have been working with the student organizations and student groups on campus to get more students to come down. We had a pretty good turnout for the MAP Grants and we are looking for an even bigger turnout of students to go down to Springfield with us.

**J.Peters:** And Alan, on behalf of the Faculty Senate sent a letter. This is the most important thing. Maybe it is symbolic. But it is extremely important. Often times you hear, and this is not any specific legislative action, this is in general, you will hear this comment, “why we haven’t heard from any presidents” or “we haven’t heard from any faculty.” Or “we haven’t heard from any students.” So it is important that you get on the record just like our Faculty Senate is on the
record, our students are going to be on the record. I’m on the record. And so I know in a large part it may be symbolic, but you have to be there, and you have to make your case, and it has to be recorded that you made your case. And keep on making the case, because legislators need constant re-education.

**K. Freeman:** It might not seem appropriate to raise this issue in classes but I would argue against that idea. I think that in every subject area in a university, issues of leadership in that discipline and in general should be addressed. And this, from my perspective, is a question of leadership. And also democratic participation should be an issue in any subject area at any institution and this is about participatory activity.

**A. Rosenbaum:** At a few of the faculty groups that I have spoken to it became apparent that a lot of faculty members aren’t contacting their representatives. It’s not only getting students to do it but also getting the faculty to call their representatives as citizens and I don’t know how many of us are actually doing this.

**E. Hansen:** What was discussed at the luncheon was a need for people that are contacting their representatives to make sure that you vote. Because they are going to go back and check your name to see if you actually are voting before they pay attention to you. That’s what I heard from members that deal with the people in Springfield.

**R. Alden:** IBHE made very clear to us that when you communicate by email or letter, give your home address so that a staffer, often the first level of screening knows that this truly is one of their constituents. If you are not, even if you put your name it goes in the trash can because you are not really considered a constituent until it is confirmed that you are really in that district.

**J. Peters:** And just remember that you have all taken and passed the state ethics test. And you are all well schooled about this sort of activity and what you can do and what resources you can use. In other words, use your own. If you have any questions about what you can and cannot do, because everything should be done properly, call Ken Zehnder, our state lobbyist and check with him.

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

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Gregory Waas – no report

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

E. BOT – Ferald Bryan – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – Kendall Thu, Chair – report (pp 8-18)

**K. Thu:** The Academic Policy Committee was given the charge of reviewing Section 2, Item 14 of the APPM which is the Student Evaluation of Instruction Section. We are required to review that section every five years. So the committee met and the first thing we did was to insert the language from the resolution that was passed by the University Council last spring. As many of
you will remember, last spring we unanimously adopted a resolution which allowed for the voluntary use of electronic or on-line student evaluations of instruction. We inserted that language into number 3, administering and procedures. It reads, “On-line student evaluation of courses is permitted but not mandatory.” And then, as we did that, the committee recognized that the rest of the narrative in this section was paper-centric. So we went through and we altered the language to make clear that both electronic, and paper, evaluations are appropriate.

You can see where those changes have been made on page 10 to 11. So our committee recommends the adoption of those changes by the UC.

**K.Thu:** I move that we approve the policy with the wording changes.

**C.Thompson** was second. The motion passed without dissent.

**K. Thu:** The second thing that we examined was the issue of developing a standardized question that would be used across departments, across campus, across divisions. To answer that question, we sent out a survey to all departments, division and college heads to see whether they have at least one general evaluation question. The raw results of that survey are listed on pages 13-18. I thought folks would be interested to see how we are doing that.

We got 23 responses to 44 questionnaires. And the results indicate that we are all doing a very good job in terms of actually fulfilling our requirement to have students generally evaluate the course and the teaching. But, as you can see if you sift through, the way each department does it varies. And so it was unclear to us, what if any standardized question we could use. In addition to the fact that it raised a number of questions as to what kind of general question would be empirically valid to capture the range of diversity in courses and topics. We did not have the expertise in our committee to figure out what sort of question or questions would be viable.

We are suggesting that next year’s Academic Policy Committee perhaps could take that up or perhaps get better expertise and better data on whether one or more standardized question would serve this purpose across campus.

That ends our report and we need to recommend that this report fills the obligation for a five-year review.

Note: no motion was made regarding further evaluation of the question of a university-wide item for evaluation of instruction.

**G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Barbara Jaffee – report**

**B.Jaffee:** You have my report as a walk-in. It is brief enough that you can take a look at it now and you can answer any questions you have about it.

**H. Rules and Governance Committee – Rebecca Butler – report**

1. Bylaw 8 – [Sabbatical Leave Policy](#) changes
J.Peters: And now, we have two related resolutions from Rules and Governance. One requires a change in Article 8 of the Bylaws [Sabbatical Policy]. This will be a first reading and a second reading is required.

The other is a parallel recommendation to the Graduate Council regarding research and artistry grants that does not require a second reading, and can be voted on today.

A. Rosenbaum: This comes out of the Faculty Senate motion last year. The Faculty Senate raised some concerns that the ordering of sabbatical leave requests and also Research and Artistry grants at the department level was not always respected at higher levels in the university and so the Faculty Senate made the resolution that the department ordering of applications in those areas be maintained and if they are not, that the reasons for changing the order be given both to the department and the faculty member. This was approved by the Faculty Senate. It was then sent to the University Council. The Sabbatical Leave Policy is one of the bylaws and so it requires a bylaw change. Rebecca Butler is the chair of our Rules and Governance and she will talk to us about the issue and what is being recommended.

R. Butler: The current wordings of the Sabbatical Leave Policy for the college and for the university are on page 2. And you can see on page one that we have inserted a statement and it is essentially the same statement for both the college and for the university: that any changes in the ranking that do affect the funding of sabbatical leaves should be explained to the affected department and applicants in a timely manner with specific reasons. So if the College Council made a change, they would need to explain why they made a change in ranking and the same would apply to the university level. Then on page 3, you will see a third piece, that we could vote on today, which addresses Research and Artistry grants. It is the same sort of statement. This one is only a recommendation because we cannot tell the Graduate School what to do.

J.Peters: Should these be three separate votes or should we consider as one the Sabbatical Leave Policy Statement for college and University?

R. Butler: I think those could be considered together. But we could vote on the recommendation to the Graduate School.

B. Jaffee: I have a question regarding the phrase, “Changes that affect the funding.” I seem to remember in earlier discussions that it was just changes in departmental rankings. Rankings could be changed at the college but we would not know if it affected funding until it goes through University Council. It would be hard to reconstruct what had happened once it went a couple of steps down the road.

P. Henry: Sometimes we don’t know about funding until considerable time has passed and the timely fashion about informing when the changes were made would be lost, I think.

R. Butler: Following some discussion, R. Butler accepted a change of wording to: “any changes in departmental ranking of sabbatical leave applications shall be explained in writing to the affected department and applicants in a timely manner with specific reasons given for the ranking changes.

P. Vohra: Does it only apply to college council in terms of providing the feedback or does it also apply to UCPC if they change the ranking?
**R. Butler:** It would apply to both.

**J. Peters:** Suggested changing the language for the Research and Artistry grants, consistent with the language of the sabbatical leave policy and bringing it to a vote.

The motion was made by **J. Kowalski**, the second was by **C. Thompson**. After some discussion regarding the appropriateness of approving the research and artistry component before the sabbatical leave component (which requires a second reading), it was decided that they are separate motions and even if one didn’t pass, the other stands on its own. The president inquired whether the second reading of the sabbatical leave policy could be waived and was informed by the parliamentarian that it could be waived with a 2/3 vote of the body. The president called the vote on the Research and Artistry recommendation and it passed without opposition.

**J. Peters:** called for a motion on waiving the second reading of the sabbatical leave policy changes.

The motion was made by **J. Kowalski** and seconded by **B. Burrell**. It passed without opposition.

**R. Butler:** Made a motion to approve the suggested changes in the wording of the sabbatical leave policy as noted above.

**J. Peters:** Suggested re-reading it

**R. Butler:** Okay, it is “any changes in departmental ranking of sabbatical leave applications shall be explained in writing to the affected department and applicants in a timely manner with specific reasons given for the ranking changes.” That would be both for the college, Article 8, Sabbatical Leave Policy, and also for the university which is also Article 8.

**J. Peters:** called the vote and it passed without opposition.

I. University Affairs committee – Carol Thompson, Chair – **report** (p 19)

**C. Thompson:** you have before you the calendar for 2019-2020. Our committee met and looked at this and we said yes to the calendar and it follows pretty much what we have been doing recently and we recommend that we approve the calendar for 2019-2020 as shown.

Motion to accept the calendar made by **C. Thompson**, seconded by **P. Henry**. It passed without dissent.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**IX. NEW BUSINESS**

**IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR.**

**X. INFORMATION ITEMS**
A. Academic Planning Council meeting minutes, February 22, 2010

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The motion to adjourn was made by K.Mohabbat seconded by P.Henry.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.