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 under Agendas, Meetings & Transcripts.


B. Anderson attended for P. Dawson; T. Fisher attended for T. Tollerud.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

ABSENT: Akyemgi, Baker, Baldwin, Banks, Bishop, Bond, Boughton, Burrell, Butler, Castle, Cesarek, Elish-Piper, Freedman, Greene, Gupta, Holly, Morris, Newman, Robertson, Schneider, Schoenbachler, Schools, Seaver, Sorsby, Stephen, Thompson

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: called the meeting to order at 3:07 PM.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

E. Hansen made the motion. D. Valentiner was second. The agenda was accepted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 7 (sent electronically)

K. Thu made the motion. T. Latham was second. The minutes were accepted as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Brought the UC up to date on his activities on behalf of the university. He was in Indianapolis in conjunction with his role on the NCAA executive committee, where he attended a tribute to Myles Brand. Myles put in place a tremendous academic reform protocol in the NCAA; academic progress reports, graduation reports, and tried to put academic integrity back into the process. He praised athletic director, Jeff Compher and our steering committee for steering us through a hopefully successful recertification which happens every ten years. The recertification review considers academic integrity, gender equity issues, student athlete well-being, and compliance. He noted that we’ve had eight semesters where our student athletes have
had a GPA of 3.0 or above and, last year, won the MAC Institutional Academic Achievement Award.

President Peters: reported that Trustee Manny Sanchez was confirmed by the Senate. He praised the good work of Manny Sanchez and referred to him as “a tremendous asset”. The BOT is supportive of the concept of tenure and the concept of sabbaticals and they’re concerned about salaries and benefits. He noted the restoration of the MAP grants but also concern that the source of the money has not been identified.

**President Peters** discussed the fact that the Harper Bill, which would have granted four-year degree authority to Harper College, did not pass and praised the development of the collaboration between NIU and Harper to develop the Bachelor of Science in Applied Management and expressed his intention to continue to work on our relationships with the community colleges. Last Saturday was community college day at Huskie Stadium, and he invited eight community college presidents to attend.

Regarding capital funding, we did get authorization and appropriation for Cole Hall – 8 million; Stevens Hall – 22.5 million; the planning money for the Computer Science/Technology Center – 2.9 million; and deferred maintenance funds of 5 million. These projects were authorized and are now awaiting the sale of bonds and the release of the funds so the state has to find a way of finding the money. They do that by floating bonds, but there’s a law suit holding up the sale of bonds. The other problem is that part of it was to be funded by video poker in bars, gas stations, wherever you play video poker – but a lot of communities are opting out.

**President Peters:** described the state budget situation as troubled and noted that the state is behind in paying its obligations, including money owed to NIU. There’s a backlog of bills and under-funded obligations today totaling 10 billion dollars. Despite these problems, he characterized NIU as “doing OK” and stated that he would like to release funds for salary increases but cannot do that until the budget situation stabilizes. He discussed the fact that the situation is worse at other universities and expressed gratitude for the fact that there is trust between the university and employees at NIU.

**President Peters** introduced Ken Zehnder who has taken over for Kathy Buettner, and serves as our liaison to State and Local Government. Ken spends a lot of time in Springfield. He is the person that is constantly monitoring our legislative bills, and is working with him on trying to make sure Cole Hall and the other priorities are funded.

**President Peters** asked **Provost Alden** to update the council about the Vice President for Research search.

**R. Alden:** reported that airport interviews were held last weekend with six candidates and that the field has been narrowed down to three. The HR process has gone through and they are trying to schedule campus interviews before the end of the semester, targeting the week after Thanksgiving and possibly the following week. Notices for open forums with the candidates will be announced. He thanked Jim Erman for agreeing to continue as interim for a second year. This was above and beyond the original call of duty that the Provost Office had for him and he’s been a great steward of that office.

Lemuel Watson has announced that he’ll be stepping down as Dean of Education. He has agreed to stay on until the end of the academic year while the Provost Office conducts a national search. Right now the Provost Office is forming a search committee within the colleges as well as some
outside constituent groups, and we will be going to a search firm. He thanked Lemuel for his service over the last several years. He will continue on as Executive Director of the P-20 Center as well as a professor in the College of Education.

A. Update on Baccalaureate Review – Jeff Kowalski (Pages 2-12)

J. Kowalski: The steering committee for the Undergraduate Baccalaureate Experience Review worked with a task force including 40 students, faculty, staff, and administrators at NIU. This was an outgrowth of the Strategic Planning process at NIU that identified a need for undergraduate curriculum review. At first, it was decided that a vital component of that would be to review our General Education Program but it was also realized that we needed to discuss how the undergraduate experience was both realized and accomplished in the major and disciplinary concentrations as well as in co-curricular activities. We wanted to devise a process that would be inclusive and so the steering committee and task force members set up a process last spring where we gathered together with various constituencies on campus and off campus to conduct focus groups, where we asked participants to respond to some six different aims regarding the undergraduate experience, what we expected undergraduates to know or be able to do. The survey was conducted online and about 929 individuals participated. At the conclusion of this process, we arrived at three principal goals that we call the three Cs: critical thinking, communication and context. Several people have contacted us about the issue of creativity, creative thinking, creative activity, innovation and suggested that this should be given emphasis in the final report. We encourage everyone to read the full report on the NIU homepage and provide input to the committee. The goal would be to produce a final document by the first part of the spring semester.

R. Alden: congratulated the task force for accomplishing so great a task in so brief a time. He noted that because 40% of our students are coming as transfers, it’s absolutely critical to think about how to incorporate all of these values and goals and competencies in a broad variety of our experiences, both at the lower division and upper division level, as modules, as ways of thinking, as ways of assessing in every course. The goal is to come up with a very holistic approach where each of our graduates has a certain set of skills and competencies and for us to be able to demonstrate it through assessment.

President Peters: reinforced the importance of this mission and expressed his strong support for it. He thought that we have tremendous responsibility to stand up for general education, liberal arts education, and creative thinking.

P. Henry: thanked the committee and was also very pleased to see that Foreign Languages were mentioned as something that should be part of the communication set. She also noted a lack of emphasis on course content.

R. Alden: stated that he assumed the focus of this process was on what is common across all majors regardless of the content of any particular major.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen - report. (Pages 13-14)
**E. Hansen:** reported on the recent meeting of the FAC which was held at NIU. He praised President Peters for addressing the FAC and stated that this is the first time in his three years on the committee that they’ve had a president come in and discuss the state of higher education. It was an outstanding representation for this institution and widely acclaimed by the body that was there, and that included many people from a number of institutions around the state. A question was raised at the Faculty Senate meeting regarding the placement of a faculty member as a voting member on the IBHE. He noted that the Faculty Advisory Committee has put forward two names.


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


E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Kendall Thu, Chair – no report.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Barbara Jaffee, Chair – no report.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Rebecca Butler, Chair. - Report (presented by Nancy Nuzzo substituting for Rebecca Butler)

**President Peters:** asked **A. Rosenbaum** to brief the UC on the issue of the policy for clinical faculty.

**A. Rosenbaum:** stated that impetus for this is the fact that NIU is engaging in a number of initiatives with health related agencies resulting in the anticipated addition of non-traditional faculty members that are just involved in clinical activities and teaching, but not research. These will be non-tenure track positions that are primarily funded by soft money (grants and contracts). Provost Alden asked the UCPC to form an ad hoc committee to look into the way other universities handle clinical faculty appointments. That committee was chaired by Sue Willis who is here today to answer questions regarding the committee’s procedures and processes. This work was done last year during the spring semester and it is coming before us now as a recommendation for the addition of a clinical faculty appointment policy to be placed in the Academic Policy and Procedures Manual. Nancy Nuzzo who is representing the committee will introduce the motion.

1. **Clinical Faculty Appointments** – Nancy Nuzzo (Pages 15-16)

**N. Nuzzo:** The Rules and Governance Committee introduced the motion “that the policy on clinical faculty appointments be forwarded to the APPM Committee”. The motion was not seconded and discussion ensued.

**S. Willis:** informed the Council that she thought the original impetus came from the Proton Therapy Center, but there are a number of other places around the university where clinical faculty either are, or are anticipated to be, employed. The original item that she sent along had a rationale attached to it which says:
“In conjunction with professional programs such as those in Medical Physics, Audiology, Nursing, Speech Pathology, Physical Therapy, Reading, Family Counseling, Clinical Laboratory Sciences, and educational programs taking place in clinical settings, NIU anticipates employing persons whose primary responsibilities will be in the provision of clinical services but who will also be crucial to classroom teaching and/or clinical supervision of students enrolled in these programs. These positions may be funded at least in part from revenue generated by the provision of services rather than from state general revenue funds. Clinical responsibilities will replace the expectations of scholarship. Clinical faculty differ from clinicians in their involvement in teaching and supervision of students as well as curriculum development.”

D. Valentiner: pointed out that there are some departments that have a history of having clinical professors who do not have the tenure status and it has sometimes degraded into being a mechanism by which some of the teaching load is carried by non-tenured track individuals. He asked if there were any provisions that provide for the protection of the existing faculty positions so that there isn’t a transfer of teaching responsibilities over to these new positions.

There was some discussion about whether clinical faculty would be required to teach more than tenure track faculty with B. Lusk and R. Alden suggesting that they would not.

R. Alden: added that we also have to think about how to populate this Council for Clinical Faculty. The university did that for the analogue research faculty by having distinguished research professors be the body of that committee at least until there was a critical mass of research faculty that could populate that committee. So it may be that we will have to call upon tenured senior faculty in those programs that have a lot of these clinical positions to be part of that council until we attain that critical mass of senior clinical professors. He noted that there are still things to be done logistically but that it’s a good start.

A. Rosenbaum: attempted to clarify D. Valentiner’s comment which was one of no concern for the teaching load of the clinical faculty but rather concern for the possibility that they would replace tenured faculty members in departments and thus take over part of the teaching.

D. Valentiner: agreed stating he was just concerned that what we talk about and decide here now may not preside in later times and may not govern peoples’ decision making later. He thought that the University Council should consider whether there’s some need for protection to protect existing faculty positions so that there isn’t this change in simply how we’re getting our courses taught.

C. McCord: acknowledged that is a question the committee worried about and that these are expressly designed to be non-research positions. And whereas research is critical to the mission of the university, they cannot swap out and simply become a faculty member who fulfills those roles but do so without tenure. The linking of that core research and artistry scholarship component remains solely the province of our tenure track lines and that ultimately is the protection of tenure track faculty.

S. Richmond agreed with C. McCord stating that an added protection would be the need to satisfy accreditation issues.
R. Alden and L. Watson further supported the important role played by clinical faculty and the need to both acknowledge this and also to reward them with the possibility of promotion. Both emphasized the different roles played by clinical faculty and regular faculty as a way of downplaying the danger that clinical faculty would reduce the need for tenure-track faculty.

A. Rosenbaum: supported the comments of R. Alden, C. McCord, and S. Richmond but also noted that this will be making a change that will go forward and be on the books so that if in the future, the university environment changes and we have not built in some these protections regarding these concerns, the things that we’re doing today might be misused.

S. Willis: reported that committee considered this but felt that the fact that these were essentially soft-money positions was a crucial distinction between these faculty and regular faculty and that this was a protection against their replacing tenure-track faculty. She was not, however, opposed to the inclusion of protections.

President Peters: ended the debate, acknowledged the healthy discussion and called for a motion.

P. Vohra re-made the motion that was originally introduced by N. Nuzzo on behalf of the Rules and Governance Committee; Johnson was second. The motion passed by a vote of 21-5.

I. University Affairs Committee – Carol Thompson, Chair – no report.

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

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

B. Lusk: inquired about the next steps for the just passed motion and A. Rosenbaum stated that it would be sent to the APPM committee for inclusion in that document.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM