UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES  
Wednesday, April 27 2011, 3 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 Web site under Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.


ALTERNATES PRESENT: Sarah Adamski for Collins, Charles Cappell for Sagarin, Scott Peska for SPS

NEWLY-ELECTED MEMBERS PRESENT: Downing, Lopez, Munroe, Rollman, VandeCreek, Walker

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

ABSENT: Bozikis, Brandt, Castle, Cummings, Freedman, Green, Jaffee, Kaplan, Mirman, Newman, Peters, Prawitz, Richmond, Robertson, Rosato, Schoenbachler, Slotsve, R. Smith, Snow, Waas, Yamagata-Lynch

I. CALL TO ORDER

R. Alden: As you can see President Peters is not available. He sends his regrets and wanted me to remind everybody that he will have an event at his house a week from tonight. I believe it starts at five o’clock.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

R. Alden: There is one walk-in change to item VIII. B. What is at your places replaces what you already had in the packet so it’s the updated version.

B. Lusk: moved the adoption of the agenda with the one walk-in item. A. Gupta: was second. The agenda was approved without dissent or abstention.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 6, 2011 UC MEETING
(sent electronically)

J. Kowalski: made the motion. J. Bruce: was second.

The minutes were approved without changes and without dissent or abstention.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

R. Alden: The next item is the Executive Session and I need to remind everyone that the Executive Session is for voting members only. So if you are not a voting member, I’ll have to ask you to excuse yourselves until the Executive Session is over.

J.D. Bowers: made the motion to go into executive session for purposes of considering the evaluations of the Executive Secretary and the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor.

S. Willis: was second.

The vote to enter executive session was unanimous. There is a separate transcript of the executive session.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Recognition of University Council members whose terms are completed, who have been re-elected and who are newly elected – Page 3

R. Alden: I don’t have any prepared announcements other than the fact that everything that has been talked about in previous meetings has not really changed because we haven’t seen much enlightenment from Springfield. I guess, Dr. Williams, we got a little bit more of the money we are owed, but we are still owed how much?

E. Williams: About $56 million.

R. Alden: About $56 million with a little over 60 days left in the fiscal year. As far as the cuts go, we don’t have any more insights other than there probably will be cuts next year. The best guess is around ten percent which translates into about a five percent base cut. What they are doing with pensions is anybody’s guess. I wish I could give you more insight.

I wanted to read the names of the individuals who have completed their terms on the council because I think it’s important to recognize the work of individuals who have served. Please reserve the applause until the end of each group.

Among the faculty who are completing their terms, Terry Bishop, Rebecca Butler, Cecil Smith, Brigid Lusk, Ayhan Lash, Patricia Henry, Amy Newman, Jana Brubaker, Kerry Freedman and
Barbara Jaffee. I thank you all for your service.

Among the students who are completing their terms, Teresa Bozikis, is that a correct pronunciation, I guess she’s not here. John Bruce, Eric Calmeyer, James Carter, Dennis Collins, Kate Green, Arlieta Hall, Deldric Henderson, Alan Hurt, Cameron Lythberg, Austin Quick, Jaemin Robertson, Ryan Smith, Mike Theodore, Joshua Venaas and Nick Wians. And I should note that Lexie Weber could not complete her term due to her untimely passing earlier this year, so we wanted to acknowledge her as well. So thank you all students for serving.

Among the supportive professional staff and operating staff members who have completed their terms, Debbie Haliczer, Jay Monteiro and Andy Small. We would like to thank you all for your service.

Those individuals who have been re-elected among the faculty are Abhijit Gupta, Alan Rosenbaum and Kendall Thu. Thank you for being willing to serve another term.

Then we have newly-elected faculty and we should acknowledge those individuals: Charles Downing, David Walker, Rosita Lopez, Greg Long, Donna Monroe, Sean Farrell, Tomis Kapitan, Leanne VandeCreek, Peter Middleton and Charlotte Rollman. If any of those individuals here with us today, please rise and be acknowledged and for those members who are staying on, please mentor these individuals if this is their first time on University Council. I know some of them are doing additional terms so they don’t all need the mentorship but I appreciate everybody’s service.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES


E. Hansen: I suggest that you look at the last line of the third to the last paragraph there where it says suggestions were made to have a stronger statement under what conditions could tenured faculty be laid off. If you haven’t seen the memo that I got today from the Faculty Advisory Council, I think we posted it, is that right Alan?

A. Rosenbaum: Posted on the Faculty Senate website.

E. Hansen: Referred to a report from SIU that the university had imposed a contract on the faculty that included a mechanism for laying off tenured faculty members. The report is posted on the Faculty Senate Blackboard Community and Earl offered to provide a copy to anyone requesting it from him.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Ferald Bryan – no report
C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham – no report

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – Pat Henry, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Laurie Elish-Piper and David Goldblum, Co-chairs – report – Page 6

**L. Elish-Piper:** There is a report in your packet that is actually a statement of budget priorities that synthesizes the things that our committee has been talking about and getting feedback from faculty and staff throughout the year. And we wanted to put together this statement of budget priorities to have something concrete that would represent the input that our committee would like to provide. I’m not going to read all of it to you, but I will go through and summarize each point.

First of all, the committee wanted to acknowledge the careful fiscal management and leadership provided by our University administration during the difficult budget times. While we hear about colleagues at other institutions in our state and across the country who are experiencing furloughs and program cuts, we’ve been able not to go that route and we wanted to publically acknowledge our appreciation for that leadership. We realize that, unless we receive the money owed to us by the state of Illinois, that situation may be likely to change.

We came up with five broad areas that represent the budget priorities that we would like to put forth. The first one is to prioritize the teaching mission of the University giving our highest focus to student learning and welfare.

Secondly, we want to acknowledge the importance of our faculty, staff and student employees in making sure that we continue to meet payroll.

We’re concerned about having to divert our limited funds away from campus infrastructure and we’re concerned about the potential situation that might rise from the deferred maintenance situation with larger problems coming down the pipeline. We realize why those decisions have to be made but we are concerned about the operation of campus, the physical facility and so on.

Item number four, we are concerned about employee pension and benefits programs. We realize that most of those decisions are being made outside of NIU, but we request that the administration continue to keep us informed because we feel very strongly that fighting to maintain adequate pension and benefits including tuition waivers for the children of faculty and staff employees is important. That was raised by a number of constituent groups when we were putting this together. So we realize that, while those decisions are being made outside of NIU, we
want to put forth an official statement that says without having appropriate pension and benefits it’s going to be difficult to retain and ultimately to recruit the high quality faculty and staff that we need here at NIU.

And then item number five, we strongly support the administration’s decision to try and concurrently continue to build for the future. We realize that with the limited funding it’s not easy to do, but two examples that our committee wanted to note were the decision to sell bonds in order to update the housing available to students. We feel that those types of decisions are critical because we need to be able to recruit and retain students. In addition to that, we also support the strategic planning process and the money that’s been invested there in building for the future because we feel that, in order to continue to fulfill our mission, even in light of the dwindling resources, we need to take those types of steps moving forward. Our committee would actually like in presenting this statement to possibly put it forward as a motion and to see if the group would be interested in accepting it to make it perhaps more official than simply a report that might get buried in the minutes somewhere. So I don’t know if I can go ahead and make such a motion at this point?

L. Elish-Piper: I’d like to move that we accept this statement of budget priorities.

P. Henry: Seconded.

R. Alden: Okay is there any discussion?

R. Feurer: We just had a departmental meeting today in which we were informed that two of our instructors are not, at this point, being renewed. So as of last week this seemed a little bit different to me than it does today. I think that we really need to make a strong statement about keeping faculty instructors on board. I guess I have a clear concern that when the state budget is ruling a lot of these resource allocations that they only contribute 20 percent yet it seems that it is defining how we go about things to a large degree. I just think that there has to be some stronger statement about how we manage things especially under My NIU. In the case of these two instructors, they have pretty clear enrollments for the fall, yet we don’t have a clear idea that they are going to be retained. And our department came away with a pretty clear feeling of concern that there are certainly other things that we can think of cutting besides instructors, the instructors who serve our students and are a part of the recruitment plan for our department.

K. Thu: I just want to get clarification on the actual motion. Is this a motion to accept the committee’s report which means it represents the position of the University Council?

L. Elish-Piper: That’s what we did in Faculty Senate and so I was following the route that we had taken there. So yes, I believe that’s what I was anticipating.

R. Alden: called the vote which passed without dissent or abstention
You will find our report on page 7. We were asked to review the composition and duties of the Nature Preserves and Research Committee which is supposed to be done every four years. We did that and, in the process of that, there were some questions about the function of this committee and the existence of the preserves. I did some work and thanks to Eddie Williams was able to find out definitive information about the preserves and their condition and prominence. I also conversed at great length with the Institute for the Study of Environment, Sustainability and Energy which would be very happy to take over the oversight of these preserves. And so it is the recommendation of the Rules and Governance Committee that this committee be deleted from the committees book and its duties be turned over to the Institute for the Study of the Environment, Sustainability and Energy and so I would make that as a motion.

A. Gupta: was second.

The motion passed without dissent or abstention.

R. Alden: We will make that change to the committees book.

I. University Affairs Committee – M Cecil Smith, Chair – no report

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair

   1. University Council election of 2011-2012
      Executive Secretary of University Council

A. Gupta: As chair of this Elections and Legislative Committee, I propose this: Pursuant to Article 3.2 of the NIU Constitution and Article 2.1 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, I am pleased to offer for election to the office of Executive Secretary of the University Council, Professor Alan Rosenbaum. I make the motion to accept his nomination, to close the nominations and to approve his election to this position.

S. Willis: was second.

The motion passed without dissent or abstention.

R. Alden: Congratulations.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Approve Article 11 revisions – Page 8

R. Alden: Is there anybody here that doesn’t know whether they are a voting member or not or whether they are representing someone officially who isn’t a voting member? Okay, we’ll need to have all voting members raise your hand now because there is a question of quorum on this issue. So could we get a count on the number of voting members in the room? The voting members were counted and exceeded the required number for a vote on a Bylaw change.
S. Willis: I move that we accept Article 11. What is in your packet is the article, as amended and as discussed previously. So this would be the final wording of the version that we would be voting on.

D. Haliczer: was second.

R. Alden: called for the vote which was 43 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstentions. This passed with the required 2/3 of the voting members of the UC approving.

B. Student Conduct Board and Community Standards and Student Conduct Advisory Board
– John Jones – Page 25

R. Alden: The next item is the walk-in language which is in front of you on the Student Conduct Board and Community Standards and Student Conduct Advisory Committee Board. This new language is in the hand out and we, as I understand it, we vote to accept this, but we can’t change it. If we choose not to accept it, it can go back to the board for recommended changes or consideration of recommended changes, but this committee can only accept or not accept the wording. If we can have it accepted by the board now, I don’t know whether you can speak on behalf of the board or not.

B. Hemphill: I cannot speak on behalf of the Judicial Advisory Board but those are things that we can take back and we’ve already gotten some feedback so we’ve already been able to address some of those already.

R. Alden: I need a motion to accept the new language as you have in your walk-in packet.

J. Bruce: So moved. P. Vohra: was second.

S. Willis: I had a question just right at the beginning here where it says Student Conduct Board, where it says “five supportive professional staff and operating staff members, etc. and then it says “approved by the University Council regarding SPS.” I’m not sure what that means.

B. Hemphill: Actually you can strike “regarding SPS.” A part of the discussion that was going on was which group should have responsibility in terms of approving this. Would it be University Council or Faculty Senate? One of the recommendations and one of the comments that came from the SPS Council, specifically Mr. Latham, is that SPS staff or Operating Staff do not have a vote on Faculty Senate and, therefore, they felt that this is something that should come before University Council in that they are voting members of University Council. So you can strike the “regarding SPS.”

K. Thu: I just thought we were not supposed to amend it at the meeting?

B. Hemphill: That’s something we’re going to take back. Any comments you have, we’re going to take those back to the Advisory Board.
K. Thu: Okay, so this will come back to us then again?

B. Hemphill: That’s the dilemma and the challenge that we find ourselves in. This is something that we have to get to the truth because the code has to go to print and so we’ve run out of time and so that’s a part of the challenge as it relates to this.

K. Thu: Maybe we could ask the parliamentarian for a suggestion.

F. Bryan: Is this just a typographical correction?

B. Hemphill: Yes.

F. Bryan: To explain this, the original copy you have in your packet, was considered by the SPS Council and others to make suggestions and we know how difficult it is to amend in large group and we were trying to avoid that, and especially given the speed and necessity of having this printed. So in the process of including these revisions for you today, that’s just a typo essentially and that could be corrected and Roberts recognizes that. That wouldn’t be something that would be considered an amendment; that’s something that should be struck out because it shouldn’t have been in there.

A. Rosenbaum: I have a question on the page that says University Class II Judicial Student Conduct Board on the front of it. Item C. the original language was that for an academic misconduct incident, the hearing panel had three members drawn from the teaching faculty. Under the revision, it has three faculty or staff members drawn from the faculty, supportive professional or operating staff, and I’m questioning whether operating staff and certain supportive professional staff ought to be involved in an academic misconduct hearing. So I would prefer the language that you have down below under academic misconduct where the faculty members are drawn from the teaching faculty component of the Student Conduct Board. I think that’s an important change that I would not like to see us just approve without fixing it.

J. Jones: Actually that was a correction. We identified that prior to this particular meeting. It should read just “three faculty members” only. That additional information that you see in print here is incorrect. It should read similar to what the bottom portion reads.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay so we have another typo that we can accept. If we accept this it will come out with that language?

J. Jones: Absolutely.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I’m satisfied with that.

R. Alden: called the vote. The changes were approved as corrected during the discussion.

IX. NEW BUSINESS
X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XI. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Meeting Schedule – 2011-2012 – Page 30
B. Minutes, Academic Planning Council, March 7, 2011
C. Minutes, University Assessment Panel, March 4, 2011
D. Minutes, University Assessment Panel, April 1, 2011
E. Minutes, Graduate Council, March 7, 2011
F. Minutes, General Education Committee, 2010-2011
G. Minutes, Honors Committee, 2010-2011
H. Minutes, Athletic Board, 2010-2011
I. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee, 2010-2011

XII. ADJOURNMENT

J. Bruce: made the motion to adjourn. It was seconded and approved without dissent.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.