UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES  
Wednesday, October 6, 2010, 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 website under Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.

Present: Alden, Bennardo (also for Lenczewski), Bishop, Bozikis, Bowers, Brandt, Brubaker, Bryan, Butler, Calmeyer, Clayton (for Small), Coles, Corwin, Cummings, Cunningham, Dawson, Elish-Piper, Freedman, Freeman, Griffin, Gupta, Haliczer, Hansen, Hemphill, Henderson, Henry, Holly, Houze, Hurt, Kaplan, Kowalski, Lash, Latham, Lee, Lusk, Mirman, Mogren, Mohabbat, Monteiro, McCord, Neal, Richmond, Rosato, Rosenbaum, Russell (for Thu), Sagarin, Seaver, Shortridge, Smith, M C., Venaas, Von Ende, Williams, Willis, Yamagata-Lynch

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

Absent: Castle, Greene, Hall, Jaffee, Kite, Lenczewski, Newman, Peters, Prawitz, Robertson, Schoenbachler, Slotsve, Small, Smith, R., Snow, Thu, Vohra, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Provost Raymond Alden substituting for President Peters who was out of town.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

R. Alden: The agenda has no walk-in items so could we have a motion to adopt the agenda as it stands? The Agenda was moved, seconded, and approved without dissent.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2010 UC MEETING (sent electronically)

J. Kowalski made the motion; T. Latham was second. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

R. Alden: I don’t have extensive comments. I will say that President Peters plans, at the next University Council, to talk more about his Vision 2020 and what that process will be. Hopefully by then working groups will have been formed. We had the four-year degree plans posted on the Web. I think it is good for the students to be able to see how to get out of the university, for any given program, in four years and hopefully that will help keep them on track but it’s just part of what we’re trying to do to increase student success.

We also have a search on going for General Counsel and I would like to acknowledge Ken Davidson’s long service. Ken, we appreciate everything you’ve done as General Counsel. He will be retiring at the
end of the calendar year and we have a search process underway. Jennifer Rosato, the Dean of the College of Law, will be the chair of that committee and I know Alan is serving on behalf of the Senate and so we look forward to that process taking place over the next few months. President Peters has engaged Parker Executive Search because, as you probably all know, General Counsels are a unique breed, someone who is both a lawyer and understands the academy is sometimes a challenge to find and we hope that having a search firm will help us find the very best replacement for Ken as he enters retirement.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

R. Alden: We have a Consent Agenda and the Executive Secretary wanted me to note that the two items are largely dealing with title changes going into the Committee Book and the APPM but the first one is going to committee and the second, if you approve the Consent Agenda, will be a final action.

A. Article 11 Grievance Procedures for Faculty and Staff – Update of title, “Associate Vice President for Administration and Human Resources.” Refer to Rules and Governance Committee which is already working on the proposed changes submitted by the SPS Council and sent to Rules and Governance at the previous Council meeting. The plan is for them to consider updating the title of the AVP as they are revising the article.

B. Intellectual Property Committee membership – Update “Vice President for Research & Dean of Graduate School” to Vice President for Research & Graduate Studies: President of NIRF” and update “Assistant Vice President for Technology Development and Transfer” to Manager of Technology Transfer Office.” This update will be noted in the Committees of the University book, as well as the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, Section I, Item 6.

S. Willis made the motion; B. Lusk was second. The Consent Agenda was approved without dissent.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – Pages 3-6

E. Hansen: The first meeting of the year was at IIT in Chicago. We have a new chair who’s on the faculty at the University of Illinois, Champaign/Urbana and I had sent a memorandum to both this body and the Faculty Senate explaining what went on at the meeting. Over time and excluding pensions, there has been about a $440 million reduction in state support for higher education. We have 100,000 eligible applicants for MAP who can’t get any support and the state has $4.7 billion in unpaid bills. So it’s the same old story that we’ve been hearing for a while. We have a new chair, (Interim) Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Don Seven. We asked why the previous chair stepped down and we got no answer.

Walter McMahon, University of Illinois at Champaign/Urbana where he teaches economics, spoke on “A Strategy for Cooperating in the Funding of Higher Education.” He did a study in the U.K. and the U.S. that showed that the more people that have college degrees, the greater the economic value to that state or that country, and the higher productivity that they have. He gave us a funding of higher education PowerPoint presentation, “The Strategy of Cooperating and Serving the Public Good,” and that will be posted on Blackboard. We, as the Faculty Advisory Council, are working with one another long distance trying to come up with ways to communicate effectively. In essence, we’re trying to get to the constituents in the state that have
children that are going to college at one time or another. They’re the ones that are going to have to talk to the legislators about funding.

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 – Todd Latham – report – Pages 7-8

T. Latham: Thank you. The meeting began with Chairman Strauss welcoming new and returning students as we begin the academic year. He also expressed his gratitude to the faculty and staff for their support of our core mission as a student-centered university and research institution. President Peters noted that the IBHE had accepted the proposed ground lease that would permit the 1,000-bed freshman dormitory project to be developed with the public/private partnership. Mallory Simpson reported on behalf of the NIU Foundation that it had closed its True North Campaign in which it raised 163 million dollars from 59,000 alumni and friends.

President Peters began to highlight his Vision 2020 in which he noted that under the item area of “Students are Changing” that NIU was being recognized as a friendly university to military veterans and non-traditional adult learners. He noted that NIU continues to receive competition from public and private institutions within the state but also pointed out that out-of-state universities, online universities and for-profits are becoming direct competition for Northern Illinois. Under “Changing Landscape” he indicated that the Great Journeys Strategic Plan, Baccalaureate Review, and the Strategic Management Enrollment Plan were key parts of what guided him to formulate his Vision 2020 initiative and that he had charged Drs. Alden and Williams to create a commission or task force to investigate and report on a Strategic Salary Plan.

He identified September 2010 and November 2010 as tentative dates for the task force to start to define its membership and begin work on a final report that will be submitted to President Peters by May of 2011.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Kerry Freedman, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Laurie Elish-Piper and Jozef Bujarski, Co-Chairs – report – Pages 9-10

L. Elish-Piper: We met on September 13 and the reason we wanted to meet so early was to take seriously one of our charges which is to provide advice regarding budgetary matters and so we were able to meet with Dr. Williams and he explained the budget that would be presented to the Board of Trustees and offered us an opportunity to ask questions as well as to provide input regarding those budget requests.

Additionally, Dr. Virginia Cassidy attended the meeting and shared with us some information on program priorities which we felt would be of interest to the faculty and staff and those three program priorities are outlined in the report. They are the preparation of teachers in STEM fields, an increase in off-campus student enrollment, and health sciences.
Additionally, when the committee met, we learned that NIU has indeed received money from the Capital Budget for Stevens Hall, the planning process, but that the actual money for building would come from state-issued bonds so I guess we’ll stay tuned on how and when that would happen.

We also talked extensively about the specific roles and responsibilities of the committee and we came up with a plan for providing input in terms of planning to coordinate that through the Vision 2020 process so that our committee can be actively involved in playing a key role in that process. Then we also plan to, of course, continue to hold regular meetings in the advisory capacity and also to be able to communicate that information back to faculty and staff.

We have another meeting scheduled in October so hopefully we can get that report submitted in time for the next meeting.

**S. Willis:** I am perhaps a bit naïve about how these things work, but I’m a bit bemused by the funding for the Stevens Building, that we received some initial capital funding for planning but the rest of it is supposed to come from state-issued bonds. Is this not a departure from the usual procedure that generally we had appropriated capital funds?

**R. Alden:** asked Dr. Williams for a comment.

**E. Williams:** The only thing I would add is that this is standard. The state has several ways to fund capital projects that are appropriated. We’ve gotten over the hurdle of getting the project appropriated. Now we need money to support that appropriation. The state can look within its own general revenue sources or another thing that they do routinely is issue bonds, state bonds, and generate money that way. We’ve been told that those appropriations will probably follow a capital appropriation.

**P. Henry:** Yeah, I was similarly puzzled because as I was reading over the minutes, I noticed that President Peters had talked about monies for the dorms being raised through bonds but that for classroom buildings it was a different thing and this I take it as a different kind of bond than the kind of bond that’s being used for the dormitories?

**R. Alden:** Yes, I believe that’s true.

**E. Williams:** The state statute gives the authority to the Board of Trustees, our Board, to issue bonds for non-instructional facilities, and so when we talk about those kinds of improvements to residence halls and the like, we’re talking about the authorization of our Board of Trustees. And in discussion with the Resource, Space Committee, we went into how the state funds its own projects so the state issues bonds itself, the State of Illinois, nothing to do with our Board and those dollars are used for highways, for prison improvements and other state projects. Among that list would be our Stevens project, instructional facility. So they’re different bonds issued by different entities. This is the standard way they raise money.

**R. Alden:** I think one distinction is for the non-instructional, we have to provide the revenue source to pay back the bonds. In the other case it’s the state that does it.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Suzanne Willis, Chair – no report

I. University Affairs Committee – M Cecil Smith, Chair – no report
J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed University Holidays for 2011 – Steve Cunningham – Page 11

S. Cunningham: Every year we utilize the available floating and closure days along with the scheduled holidays that are available to the President pursuant to Board regulations and we allocate those in the best way possible to maximize closure periods during holidays and, of course, during the end of the year, the winter recess. And that schedule is before you. It does have the concurrence of the staff councils and President Peters has authorized it. So after the Council concurs with it, then we will proceed to distribute that to the campus as the 2011 Holiday Schedule.

J. Kowalski: I move we approve the 2011 university holiday schedule. The motion was seconded.

A. Rosenbaum: Steve could you just explain what the nature of a floating holiday is and administrative closures? Are these things that people will have to use any of their time for or are these all paid holidays and closures?

S. Cunningham: No, they do not require of use of benefits by employees. The Board regulations authorize the President to allocate certain days as paid leave days for employees throughout the year and those – there are certain scheduled holidays such as December 25 and so on, New Year’s Day and then there are a set of floating holidays that can be allocated anywhere as well as then administrative closure days and Northern allocates all of those to the employee holidays schedule every year.

The 2011 holiday schedule was approved as written.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Henry: Are we going to have some discussion of the Blue Ribbon Panel that was mentioned on the Faculty Senate Blackboard?

R. Alden: Basically the Blue Ribbon Panel came out of the Dean’s Retreat this summer. We have been watching a number of states go through kind of centralized control over things like productivity and work load and, quite frankly, pay for productivity is a discussion in this state. And the President is on that committee for two reasons the first being, if we don’t have a work load policy at the university level, we’re more vulnerable than if we do I believe for these kinds of mandated actions. From my perspective, the thing that I hear most complaints about is unevenness or an inequity in work load between different departments, different colleges and maybe even different individuals within departments. And so it was discussed in the Dean’s Council Retreat that we needed to have a committee come together consisting of faculty and chairs to come up with a draft of a policy that is flexible, fair, and equitable but defensible should it ever be needed for those purposes. And so we got a number of nominations from the colleges. We asked the people whether they were willing to serve on it and I think as of yesterday, we got the final person saying that they would. And so that committee would be a writing committee drafting a policy that then could be vetted by the campus to say this makes sense as the broad rules of the game. And then, of
course, the colleges and departments would have more specific work load definitions that are unique to their given disciplines.

A. Lash: Could you tell us how the members were elected? You say you received nominations; I wasn’t clear.

R. Alden: Each of the colleges selected individuals I believe from their senates and councils. We asked each college to – depending on the size of the college – to select one, two or more individuals and my only guidance is that I wanted people who were well-respected in their colleges. Somebody who was beyond reproach and hopefully that’s what we got.

A. Lash: Did you have any composition in mind? Half faculty, half administrative or it didn’t matter?

R. Alden: When we originally designed it, we wanted to have a slight majority of faculty but since work load is primarily in the realm of chairs and directors, we had a significant representation from that group as well. And, of course, they’re listed as faculty on our personnel process anyway.

R. Alden: So again, this is basically a writing committee. I plan on vetting this through the UCPC. I’ve told Alan that I would send it to get input from the Senate so it’s not a closed process. It’s a transparent process in my mind.

J. Corwin: Are Presidential Research Professors, Presidential Teaching Professors, etc., are they represented at all on this list?

A. Rosenbaum: There is one.

R. Alden: Apparently there is one.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Alternate Policy – Page 12
B. Annual Report – Office of the Ombudsman
C. Annual Report – University Benefits Committee
D. Annual Report – Undergraduate Coordinating Council
E. Committee on Initial Teacher Certification meeting minutes, May 7, 2010
F. Committee on Advanced Programs for Certification in Education meeting minutes, April 5, 2010
G. Athletic Board meeting minutes, June 16, 2010
H. Academic Planning Council meeting minutes, August 23, 2010

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion and second were not audible. The meeting adjourned at 3:32 p.m.