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

R. Alden: Okay, President Peters is out of town today so I’ll be taking over for him.

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

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? Second? Okay. All those in favor of the agenda say aye. Any opposed? Any abstained? Thank you.

The agenda was approved as written.

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

R. Alden: Okay, the next item is to approve the minutes from the September 8 meeting. Can I have a motion to approve? Okay. A second? Okay. Any comments or corrections? Hearing none, all those in favor of approval of the minutes say aye. Any opposed? Any abstained? Okay, thank you.

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

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

R. Alden: Okay, now is typically when John has his comments. I don’t have extensive comments. I will say that he plans at the next University Council to talk more about his Vision 2020 and how that process is going to go and hopefully by then have which working groups he will have formed and so forth. We also had the four-year degree plans posted on the Web which I think 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 and now be on a six- or eight- or ten-year plan, but it’s just part of what we’re trying to do for student success.
We also have a search going on for General Counsel and I would like to acknowledge Ken Davidson’s long service. Ken, are you back there? Yes he’s here. 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 for that 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 so we hope that having a search firm will help us find the very best replacement for Ken as he enters retirement. And again, we appreciate all of his service.

And that’s about all I had for my comments.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

R. Alden: We do have a Consent Agenda and Alan 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 actually going to committee and the second whatever, if you vote on the Consent Agenda, will just be a final action. So could I get a motion to approve the Consent Agenda? Anybody? Okay, since Consent Agendas by nature are not things that you typically discuss unless someone cares to take an item off the Consent Agenda, I don’t see anybody raising their hand so all those in favor of the Consent Agenda say aye. Any opposed? Any abstained? Thank you.

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.

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.

The Consent Agenda was approved as written. S. Willis made the motion; B. Lusk was second.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

R. Alden: Okay, reports. We have Earl Hansen to give a report on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. Earl?

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

E. Hansen: The first meeting of the year was at IIT in Chicago and 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. In cursory, over the time excluding pensions 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, 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 Sevener. We asked why the previous chair stepped down and we got no answer so I made a comment it’s probably the minutes from the last meeting.
Various issues directed toward college, careers and citizenship and that they want to look at the high school kids, high school juniors, and are they ready to go to college. Are they – it’s not like an ACT test or anything like that. It has more to do with measuring their social skills and their ability to study and learn and so forth.

That pretty much runs the gauntlet of it although we did have one speaker that was outstanding. I will post his items on the Blackboard if you want to look at them and that was Walter McMahon, University of Illinois at Champaign/Urbana where he teaches economics. His topic was “A Strategy for Cooperating in the Funding of Higher Education” and he did a study in the U.K. and the U.S. that showed that if you have – the more people that have college degrees, the greater the economic value that is to that state or that country, the higher productivity that they have. Why we had to have a study to learn that, I don’t know, but we have one and he passed out some information and 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 too. Most of these things, if you go to it you can get it – we did a brainstorming session. We came up with a number of different items that we’re supposed to get input on and it’s in the minutes there and 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. Questions?

R. Alden: Okay, thank you.

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

R. Alden: Next a report from the Board of Trustee meeting. Todd?

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. Under “Reports of the Committees and Board Liaisons,” I’ll just point out a few of those that 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.

Trustee Vella reported to the Board of Trustees that Northern Illinois Research Foundation was highlighted in some of the key areas where the Proton Treatment Center, External Audit and a report on intellectual property.
On the President’s Report, he 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. In the area of “Competition” 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-profit are becoming direct competition for the university here at 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 into formulate his Vision 2020 initiative and that he had charges Drs. Alden and Williams to create a commission or task force to investigate and report on a Strategic Salary Plan.

Under “Benchmarks” President Peters noted that Student Recruitment and Fiscal Sustainability – he further elaborated that the benchmarks included areas of: Optimal Enrollment, Percentage of High Achieving Students, and Degree Related Productivity. Under the Peer Institution Review Strategic Goals, those were key areas that were tied to funding and that NIU has become less dependent on the State of Illinois. They currently fund 23 percent of our operations. He noted that NIU is a centered research institution in Illinois and is beginning the more entrepreneurial approach that would be central to our future success. He also acknowledged that faculty and staff have been asked to do more with less without reward and he asked the Board of Trustees to support him in looking for new and approved ways to retain faculty and staff so much that he felt personally compelled to chair the task force that he’s implementing.

You can see the time lines of September 2010, November 2010 for the task force to start to define its membership and begin work on a proposal that will be submitted to President Peters with some type of conclusion by May of 2011 when the task force would submit its final report.

The last part of my report then includes the Board of Trustee actions. You can see those listed. I would recommend that if you have further questions, you refer to the books that are provided to the Board of Trustees. They provide the most accurate and detailed information. Thank you.

R. Alden: Any questions? Okay, thank you.

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

R. Alden: Next we have a report on Resources, Space and Budgets. Laurie Elish-Piper?

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 and you can see in your report the specific sub – 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 pretty extensively about the specific roles and responsibilities of the committee and we came up with a plan on – in terms of providing input in terms of planning to coordinate that through the Vision 2020 process so that our committee can be actively involved in offering input and taking 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.

That is basically the highpoints of our initial meeting. We have another meeting scheduled in October so hopefully we can get that report submitted in time for the next meeting. Questions?

R. Alden: Yes, Sue?

S. Willis: Yes, 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-issue bonds. Is this not a departure from the usual procedure that generally we had appropriated capital funds?

R. Alden: The last time they actually had a capital budget I guess was a decade ago so I can’t comment on that. I do know that they appropriated – they approved it essentially – but they did not provide any funding for it or they provided minimal funding, enough for the start-up plans so I assume that the issue of bonding is something that we expect as a possibility for a source but until we see the money we don’t know, you know, when or where or how much that project would be. Dr. Williams, you want to comment on that? Maybe you have more insight on it than I do.

E. Williams: No, you did very well. The only thing I would add is that no, this is standard. The state has several ways to fund capital projects that are appropriated. We’ve gone the hurdle as the Provost indicated. 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 general money that way – capital bonds – so – and we’ve been told that those appropriations will probably follow a capital appropriation, so it’s just as the Provost said.

R. Alden: Yes?

P. Henry: Yeah, I was sort of similarly puzzled because as I was reading over the minutes, I noticed that, I mean, 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 and I’ll turn it over to the expert here. Dr. Williams?

E. Williams: The state statue 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.

**P. Henry:** Have they done that before?

**E. Williams:** Oh yes.

**P. Henry:** But for capital funds?

**E. Williams:** Yes. 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. Is that correct? Okay, unless there are some other questions.

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

A. **Proposed University Holidays for 2011** – Steve Cunningham – Page 1

**R. Alden:** We have an item of New Business, the proposed holidays and Steve Cunningham, do you want to comment on that; present that?

**S. Cunningham:** Sure, thank you. 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.

**R. Alden:** Okay. I assume this is an action item and we need a motion on that or – do I have a motion to approve the holiday schedule?

**J. Kowalski:** I move we approve the 2011 university holiday schedule.

**R. Alden:** Okay, do we have a second? Any comments? Any questions? Okay.

**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.


S. Cunningham: Thank you.

The 2011 holiday schedule was approved as written. Kowalski made the motion; there was a second.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

R. Alden: Are there any comments or questions from the floor? Yes?

P. Henry: Quickly, were we going to have some discussion over the Blue Ribbon Panel that was up on Blackboard?

R. Alden: I’d be happy to –

A. Rosenbaum: That’s the Senate; that’s not Council.

P. Henry: Oh, that’s the Senate. Sorry.

R. Alden: I can still talk about it if you want. Basically the Blue Ribbon Panel was a – came out of the Dean’s Retreat this summer. We have – we’ve 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 the state. And the President is on that committee so for two reasons, and the two reasons that I remember from the retreat, the first being, you know, if we don’t have a work load policy at the university level, we’re somewhat more vulnerable than if we do I believe for these kinds of mandated actions. I think the main one, however, from my perspective, is 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 some sort of a draft of a policy that is flexible and fair and equitable but defensible should it ever be needed for those purposes. And so that’s what the – this starting point was. 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 work on kind of being a writing committee drafting a policy that then could be vetted by the campus to say this makes sense as kind of the broad rules of the game. And then, of course, the colleges and departments would have more specific types of working – work load definitions that are unique to their given discipline. So that was the genesis of it, you know, partly because of external forces and partly because we just don’t have one and it’s kind of probably the single topic I hear the most grumbling about. Yes?

A. Lash: Yeah, my name is Ayhan Lash. I’m from Nursing and Health Studies. 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. Again, this is something 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 kind of beyond reproach and hopefully that’s what we got.

**A. Lash:** Can I follow up just briefly – so 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. Which and, of course, they’re listed as faculty on our personnel process anyway.

**A. Lash:** I see.

**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. Any other questions, comments on anything? Okay. Hearing none – yes?

**A. Rosenbaum:** You need a mike.

**J. Corwin:** I didn’t have the opportunity – my name is Jim Corwin – I didn’t have the opportunity to go through. I did see the list on Blackboard. Are Presidential Research Professors, Presidential Teaching Professors, etc., are they represented at all on this list?

**R. Alden:** I really – we didn’t look at it from that angle so I honestly don’t know.

**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**

**R. Alden:** Okay, hearing no other questions or comments, could I have a motion to adjourn? Second? Anybody oppose that?

Motion and second were not audible.

The meeting adjourned at 3:32 p.m.