
VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Barth, Bond, Echols, Foss, Gupta, Heller, Houze, Hurt, Johnston-Rodriguez, Kreitzer, LeFlore, Lenczewski, Neal, Rosato, Rossi, Schoenbachler, Thu, Venaas, Vohra

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Blakemore, Bryan, Finley, Freeman, Griffin, Hansen, Kaplan, Sunderlin, Williams

OTHERS ABSENT: Cunningham, Freedman, Hemphill, Prawitz, Slotsve, Snow, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Holt moved to adopt the agenda. T. Latham was second.

The agenda was approved without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 30, 2011 UC MEETING
(distributed electronically)

J. Peters: There were item Roman III …electronically of the November 30 meeting. I will call for any additions or corrections. First, is there a motion to approve the minutes of November 30?

A. Quick: So moved.

N. Bender: Second.

J. Peters: Now, any additions or corrections? All those in favor to approve the minutes of November 30 say “aye.”

Members: Aye.
J. Peters: Opposed?

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Peters: All right, this is the first meeting of the semester, isn’t it? All right, it feels like its March, doesn’t it? Wait. Well welcome everyone. Tomorrow we have our Board of Trustee Committee meetings, which most of the work of the trustees is done in the committee meetings and not the full board so those are important. But I want to let you know that at 8:30 tomorrow there’s a welcoming reception and a swearing in ceremony for our newest trustee whose name is Wheeler Coleman and you probably read about him in NIU Today or the Northern Star and he is a very interesting individual. He’s an alum of the class of 1983 and then he got an M.B.A. at Notre Dame. He currently is vice president and chief technology officer of Health Care Service Corp. which, I think, is the fourth-largest health insurance company in the U.S. and he’s a pretty interesting guy. He’s going to be sworn in and interestingly he is going to be sworn in by his spouse who is the Honorable Sharon Johnson Coleman, also an alum, who has recently been nominated by the president and approved by the senate and is a federal district judge. So Sharon is going to swear in Wheeler, two great alums. What’s interesting about Mr. Coleman is all of our trustees are very much interested in technology; this is what Wheeler does for a living and he’s extremely interested in the status of our IT systems and our technology and will be an advocate going forward for the adoption and use of technology by the university and he’s just a genuinely very gracious and diplomatic person and we’re glad to have him. There’s going to be nice refreshments too in the morning if you want to stop by if you happen to be near Altgeld Hall.

The agendas will cover such things as the sabbaticals, both receiving of reports and hearing a couple faculty discuss their sabbatical leaves and what they accomplished and then approval of the list for next year. We always do that this time of year. That will formally be approved in March. The committees are going to hear tomorrow and there will be a discussion in Finance and Facilities among other things, the student fee structure, including room and board rates, not tuition. Those are always separate. Tuition is always done in June. But this will be fees, the process that we go through, there are various student committees that bubble up the requests for the various fees and then they presented that to me, what’s today, Monday or Tuesday, they presented to me and so we’ll be discussing those. The full board meeting is March 1, so there’s a little, usually there’s about two weeks’ space, now there’s a little more than that, about a month. The full board meeting is March 1.

A couple other things that you know about but I’m pretty pleased about and want to talk about, the first is, on February 12, that’s a Sunday from one to three, we’re going to have the more-or-less formal community rededication of Cole Hall and that’s pretty much for us and for our local people. The media covered the opening day quite well, but this is just kind of for us. It’s from one to three and there’s going to be – the Anthropology Museum is going to be open with all its ware. It’s a wonderful space, just fantastic. If you’ve not been over there, take a walk through, see the renovated classroom, which is state of the art, and then they have something called the collaboratorium, which is loaded with the most advanced teaching technologies. You ought to take a look at that. Beautiful space, we’re going to thank people and this has been, for many, a labor of love to get this right and I think it’s as good as it can get and very efficient for the amount of money that we were able to get from the state. And there will be a lot of people to
thank, but there’s a couple of drivers in the that I want to mention. One was on the academic side besides the provost was Frederick Schwantez, who just bird-dogged this thing and made sure everything was right from an instructional point of view. And on the architecture program side, Jerry [Jeff] Dower, who did a great job of configuring the old hallway and the front of the museum. When you see it, it’s just so wonderful. And then our media relations people, they got the technology working. I hope it’s working. You never know with technology, but it’s wonderful. We’re going to get a chance to show that off and see how it works and thank people. That’s February 12. Of course I will remind you, and I think the announcements have gone out. February 14, we will have our wreath-laying ceremony and moment of silence at 3:00 at the memorial gardens to remember February 14. It’s hard to believe it’s the fourth year. So those are some things that are coming up that mark the early part of our semester.

On the political side, the government side, today was the State of the State address that was delivered by Governor Quinn and I listened to it. It was a 35-minute address. It was a general speech. Those things that were relevant to education and higher education I just jotted down some bullet points. I haven’t analyzed the whole thing yet. The governor committed to the federal goal and the state IBHE goal, public agenda goal, of a 60 percent rate by 2025 of young people in the state who could get a degree or an associate degree in a community college or a certificate, but some kind of a completion credential by 2025. He committed to that goal as an aspiration. Right now we’re at about 42 percent which, relatively speaking, is not such a bad percentage. I guess that’s the good news. The bad news the percentage, it’s only 42 percent. A lot of that is embedded in the policy language of the IBHE. Okay so he committed to that.

He also had praise for the efforts of lieutenant governor, Sheila Simon. She has been to all 47, 48 community colleges – it’s in the high forties – with the focus on completion and the important role of the community colleges. I read that to mean that community colleges were something the governor wanted to invest in. The governor spent a bit of time in the speech asking for a significant increase in the monetary award program funding, the MAP funding, for so many of our young people in Illinois who graduate from high school and then can use MAP funding to go on to places like NIU and currently, the state, it’s one of the larger aid programs in the country because of the size of the state. But about a half a billion dollars a year, $500,000 in MAP funding and we get a pretty good chunk of that indirectly. About 5,000 students are MAP students. Is that right, Eddie? It’s about over $20 million a year that goes to the students and then to us in the form of tuition and other payments. That half a billion a year, that $500 million, covers about 150,000 students and there are about 150,000 students who want it that didn’t get it. So you can see that there is a need there. The governor came out for that. He also said he wanted to – and it’s something I believe in – I think we all do – he wanted to invest in early childhood learning and something he called 21st century classrooms. And to me I think this is the 21st century classroom: I think that’s where we are going, but he talked about that but no specifics. Actually, there weren’t very many specifics about any of this but you know it was the State of the State address. He did indicate though (he also, by the way, mentioned specifically among capital improvements in the state, a capital investment, that created jobs and got the state moving again) he did specifically mention what he called the repurposing of Cole Hall. So we were mentioned specifically in that regard. The way I look at this, it’s incomplete and this won’t be complete until we hear, I think it’s next week or two weeks, we have the governor’s budget message. Because until we know how’s he going to handle these huge problems with a backlog of bills, the pension obligation problem, and the growing problem with Medicaid payments, I don’t know how any of
this can be accommodated and he did talk a good bit about tax relief. We don’t know how all this comes together until you get to the actual numbers. Now the presidents and chancellors to the public universities have been invited to have lunch with the governor next week and so I’ll report back to you about what that’s about. I think it’s probably a discussion of these education items and what our view was and how can we help support those. Of course it’s hard not to be committed to those kinds of things. All right, so that’s on the political front, that’s what’s happening.

We are in an election cycle and from the point of view of us, just daily operations we’re still behind in our cash flow payments. We did receive some payments right after the break, but I don’t think we’ve received any payments for a good couple of weeks. Would that be correct? Maybe longer so that’s of concern, but we’re moving along, we’ve been prudent. I appreciate all the hard work that people do to keep us going and keep the doors open and the payroll met. Thanks to everybody who does that. So that’s an issue. Again, we’re in an election cycle. The legislature, the governor, must address the backlog in payments which is $8.5 billion estimated and a recent report came out that said if nothing is done this is going to roll into a $35 billion backlog in a few years. In addition to the pension payments, the big variable there is the exponential growth in Medicaid payments, so something has to be done to reform the structure of Medicaid payments in the state and something has to done to figure out this pension. So we’re particularly watching the pension issue; nothing to report. You know the primaries are March 20, that period of time? Austin knows. He knows everything about … the 21st, okay thank you. March 21st is primaries. I don’t expect any real votes until sometime after that. That doesn’t mean people aren’t talking about it. That doesn’t mean people aren’t framing a policy, but it is a pretty tough issue. So that’s what’s happening on the political front.

Let me give you an update on my project, our project, Vision 2020, and how we’re doing. We’re working very, very hard on enrollment and recruitment and hopefully we’ll have some good things to report. We’ve had a lot of activity, but I want to report to you just very quickly today that this past two weeks I’ve made two investments that I want you to know about with the money that we set aside, one time for Vision 2020. One is, this wasn’t exactly Vision 2020 money, but it’s money associated with it and that is we really have heard what is needed; we know what is needed and we’re making a significant investment beginning now for the next year or so, a first investment, in information technology and we’re going to commit a number, it’s around $4 million for two purposes. One is to spread wireless technology throughout the campus and we’ve got a goal to be 100 percent by 2020. The goal of 100 percent wireless is a bit of a misnomer. You really need to be wired where you need it, where the education takes place, where the research takes place and that’s what we want to get done first. That’s one thing we’re going to invest in and the other infrastructure investment will be in cloud computing. Everything is going to cloud computing. I recently read a very fascinating article about this and it goes something like this, if you indulge me for two minutes. Universities are some of the oldest organized enterprises in the world. The first university sprang up around 400 A.D., maybe even before that; and they organized discovery and the dissemination of knowledge and they kept knowledge, libraries. One thing you can say about us, we may be slow and difficult sometimes, but we have longevity. We’re in for the long haul. Even though we will change, I think we’re going to be here, I hope. And the one thing we do is we keep information. In today’s disruptive technology, you want computing and you want communication and technology, but not very many people have thought of how do you keep all that stuff? Well, in libraries we keep
information, so we really need to attend to that because some day, 25 years from now, 50 years from now or 100 years from now, we’re going to need that information for purposes we can only imagine right now. You know cloud computing becomes part of that and so I’m really excited that we’re moving in that direction. This is a moving target. Things have changed so much in computing in my time, having been involved as a Plato programmer at Urbana in ’68 and to see the spread of all this technology, it’s amazing. And also to see the convergence on what we used. Ten years ago I used to say we’re the real world of computing in universities because we’ve got every platform you can think of because that’s the way it has to be. You know, that’s all changing. There’s a convergence in platforms, in operating systems. You know there’s really only three big operating systems now, and so there is economy of scale in that. There are costs savings so that everyone doesn’t have their own systems anymore. It’s moving in a different direction. In Vision 2020, the technology piece is crucial to everything we do, everything we do and we have to make sure that we make the right investments. That’s one investment.

Another investment that we’re making, I made an initial disbursement to Lisa of a half a million dollars beginning this year to make strategic investments based on proposals she’s already gathered to stimulate external funding, to move the needle in external funding. And every dollar of Vision 2020 money has to be accounted for and has to have potential for moving the needle. It’s hard in external funding because you got to have an idea, you’ve got to write a proposal, you have to have an infrastructure, you’ve got to buy equipment, you have to have graduate students or post-docs and it takes a while, doesn’t it? But you got to start and we’ve been doing that and hopefully this will accelerate.

We’ve also made a substantial investment in recruitment as I’ve told you before. In a couple weeks or so we’ll be making some disbursements on academic enhancement programs and we have many good proposals to choose from. That will be coming in the next few weeks within a month. I think that’s it. I’ve covered everything that I wanted to cover. So with that, shall we move on?

V. CONSENT AGENDA

J. Peters: Alright, Roman V, we do have two items on the consent agenda. Is there a motion to approve the consent agenda?

S. Willis: So moved.

J. Peters: Sue Willis. Is there a second?

A. Quick: Second.

J. Peters: Alight, Austin saved the day. Alright, all those in favor of adopting the consent agenda say “aye.”

Members: Aye

J. Peters: Opposed? We have a consent agenda.
A. 2021-2022 academic calendar – refer to University Affairs Committee – Page 3

B. Review and update Guidelines and Principles for Establishment of Academic Calendar – refer to University Affairs Committee – Page 4

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen

J. Peters: We move to reports. Earl Hansen has a report of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE and I think there are two reports it looks like. Earl.

E. Hansen: That’s right. I missed the one meeting and Sonya went and she’s got a report and then I’ll follow with the report of the meeting that we both missed.


J. Peters: All right, Sonya.

S. Armstrong: The December 9 meeting was in Springfield and really not a lot happened at that meeting that’s really relevant after the January meeting. There was some discussion, there were representatives from the IBHE present and also from the ICCB and there was a lot of discussion about the turnover of the staff at IBHE. The bulk of the time at the December meeting was spent talking about performance-based funding and development of the metrics. There was a lot of conversation about what should be those metrics and, at this point, like I said, that’s all kind of moot because that was determined at the January meeting so I’ll turn it over to Earl.


E. Hansen: Due to the weather, neither one of us, we chose discretion ahead of valor and stayed in DeKalb County and didn’t venture into Chicago. What I have presented to you are the unapproved minutes, somewhat synthesized, taking out a lot of the, my personal opinion, irrelevant material that was in the minutes and just gave you some basic functional stuff. The big question is performance-based funding. I think that our administration can probably expound upon that much better than we can because all we hear are percentage points and what have you and then we’ve got issues between the private institutions and then the for-profit institutions and then the community colleges and everybody is into this thing and, as an observer of this for the last year or so, all I can say is we’re dependent upon having students arrive at our doorstep that can actually do college work.

J. Peters: Okay.

E. Hansen: If you have any questions I’ll be glad to field them.

J. Peters: Questions for Sonya or Earl? I think you’ve covered it. You could add that the next IBHE meeting is coming up next Tuesday and performance funding will be on the agenda and they will adopt pretty much the metrics that appear in your material and we don’t know whether
that will appear in the governor’s budget or not. I think the next meeting will have a lot more to report to you on that.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – no report

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

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – no report

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – Page 8

J. Peters: Okay, we will then move to Alan Rosenbaum who has a Board of Trustees report on page 8.

A. Rosenbaum: The Board of Trustees met for their December meeting on the first of December and you have the report on page 10 which is pretty self-explanatory. I’ll just highlight a couple of items. One of the things that the board heard was an overview and timeline for the Higher Learning Commission accreditation process that we’re beginning to prepare for. President Peters discussed this a little bit I think at our last meeting and this is a very important process to the university. President Peters also presented a report which included the request to improve the Center for P-20 Engagement which has been formerly known as the Center for Educational Policy Research and Services. Then the president asked the board to approve NIU’s alcoholic beverage policy. How’d you enjoy the punch today by the way? Good? The policy actually is used – the importance of the policy is – to articulate the criteria that are used in determining whether alcoholic beverages can be served at events that are termed non-student events and this I think was in compliance with a state requirement. We were sort of mandated to do this and the board also adopted a resolution charging the president to develop, sort of in consultation with the various constituents at the university, a revised mission statement. The mission statement will guide the HLC accreditation process so that’s a very important item. The committees have been formed and will give a preliminary report on the mission statement to the board at the March 1 meeting. The board is hoping, I think, to have that approved by the June meeting. So this is a very fast process and, apparently because the mission statement is so critical to the accreditation process, it’s very important for us to get it right and different groups I think will have an opportunity to vet the mission statement once it’s been seen by the board and the president, etc. The last thing the board heard was a presentation by Jerry Blakemore who is the chief counsel and this is part of an ongoing process to revise the Board of Trustees bylaws. So we’ve talked about this before, this is not the first meeting that the board has been working on revising its bylaws. Apparently, it’s a rather lengthy process and so the board continued that process at this meeting. So does anyone have any questions about the Board of Trustees meeting?

J. Peters: Okay, good summary.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Karen Brandt, Chair – no report
J. Peters: Okay, now we have reports from the Student Association. Austin, are you going to give a report today?

A. Quick: Yes, Dr. Peters. I have a few things I just wanted to give you some information about what we’ve been up to the last couple of months now. There is a report in here I would just highlight a few things just for your knowledge. First off the Student Association Senate has passed a number of resolutions these past two meetings in regards to some issues that we’ve seen on campus and I will list a couple of them. One is we passed a resolution for the university to track down and start implementing parking fees or fines towards university vehicles that are parking on university sidewalks and or grass areas that are in violation of current university policy. We feel that with the amount of tickets and things going up in parking fees, it’s important that we don’t spend money on sidewalk replacements for vehicles that are parked illegally. Second of all, we passed a resolution supporting DeKalb’s proposed police station. That was a heated topic, but it ended up passing almost unanimously. There were a few dissenting votes, but it passed and we sent that along to the City Council and to the mayor for their information. We’re currently working with Faculty Senate Supportive Professional Staff Council and Operating Staff Council regarding the faculty/staff code of conduct and student grievance policy. Both Todd Latham and Andy Small and Dr. Rosenbaum have been very helpful in helping make sure this happens and moves along. Two more things, we are currently starting the process for review and audit of the top 15 funded S.A. organizations. Both student organizations – and there are a number of university departments that are currently funded through the S.A. – and just seeing if there’s ways we can say money in the future and cut back on costs there. The last thing that we held, last December, before we left, we held a vigil, a very successfully attended vigil, for our former staff member, Steven Agee, and I would like to publically thank the NIU community for coming out that day, that evening, and showing their support for both Steve and his family but more importantly for us as students and our staff. It’s been definitely a difficult time but it’s another example of when we go through difficult things here at NIU we definitely rally as a community. And we’re working with Dr. Hemphill and his staff to promote a new initiative to create a Huskie family connection type system where we promote one of the things that I think that we do well here is that we do have a community here and we do have a family and how do we market that to our students that are looking at coming to NIU. And I think looking at other universities across the state, that’s one area that we excel in highly is how close knit of a community we are. We’re looking at ways to promote that. But other than that, I have nothing further.

J. Peters: Questions for Austin?

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – Pages 11-13
J. Peters: Alright, then Andy are you prepared to do the Operating Staff Council report?

A. Small: I am, sir, thank you. If you’ll turn to page 11, you can follow along with me if you care to. Our public relations committee continues to work on our constitution and bylaws. As you know, that’s a tedious process and takes some time. So we’re marching through that. The other thing they are working on, of course, is our Operating Staff Outstanding Service Award. You’ve seen the nomination requests in your mailboxes. Please take the time to nominate someone in your area. There are obviously well deserving operating staff people throughout the campus community and if you’d take that time we’d certainly appreciate that. The civil service positions audit, we are going to get a formal report from Human Relations on that particular topic tomorrow at our Operating Staff Council meeting. To make a long story short, I encourage everyone to make sure that they follow the civil service statutes when they hire employees in their area. We certainly don’t want to have any infractions, but at our last audit from the systems office, we received about 50 notifications of opportunities on our campus as far as hiring operating staff people. So we encourage you to follow the civil service statutes when you hire civil service employees in your area. Campus safety, the Operating Staff Council has taken a direct interest in campus safety lately. I’ve attached a couple of pages on the back there, pages 12 and 13. That’s the Mayor’s Task Force for Safe and Quality Housing. That task force recently met. I will continue to promote safety of the campus and continue to bring those pieces of information to the council here. As Austin mentioned, we were supporting the Student Association grievance policy; continue to work with the Student Association there; continue to work with our friend, Todd, and the supportive professional staff collaborative efforts on some issues that you see listed there. The last and final thing, I want to proudly proclaim we have something that possibly nobody else in the campus community has and that is an employee that is coming on their 50th anniversary working here at NIU. Pat Siebrasse from the Department of Family, Consumer and Nutrition Sciences, I believe in the May/June time frame, will be celebrating her 50th anniversary of working here at NIU. I challenge all of you to do that as they say. With that I conclude my report.

J. Peters: There’s not much to say after that. Any questions for Andy on that good report?

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – report – Page 14

J. Peters: Okay, and Todd has the Supportive Professional Staff Council report.

T. Latham: Thank you, President Peters. Our council had a guest speaker that came to our last council meeting. Melanie Thompson is the Director of CAAR. For those of you who aren’t aware, there have been some changes to the CAAR office specifically dealing with its new practice of using a social justice model in respect to disabilities especially invisible disabilities. We thought it was important our council heard about the changes and they’re really not significant changes, but it’s a philosophy that’s been implemented and we learned more about that. So as many faculty, you certainly have all these issues that come up, I recommend that you look at their website, if you have questions, send them to their director. Our council action, we realized that through the increment process in discussions about a merit component that the SPS are lacking in a metric in which that we would have to kind of compare everyone for eligibility. Our council has created an ad hoc committee to further investigate what that metric would look like. The council also passed a resolution regarding the rehiring of any new employees. That was
a two-year process through our workplace issues committee that they finally agreed upon and passed. If anyone would like to see a copy of that, I have it available at the end of the meeting. We dissolved our ad hoc PR committee. One of our goals as council was to make sure that not only students and faculty are aware of SPS, but the good works that we do and our purpose and our place here at the university, so we created a committee to kind of further that information as well within our own employment category of what we do and how we can help each other here. That’s essentially led to some further activity from our communications committee especially regarding a newsletter that we created that we will be sending out to employees to kind of keep them informed of SPS issues. One of the other issues our council passed was recommendations for the SPS Presidential Award for Excellence. Each year we have the honor of suggesting four individuals that are extremely gifted individuals to President Peters to consider for that award. The council passed that action. Our last dialog, of course, was the transfer of SPS positions back to civil service positions. We looked at the positives and constraints of the civil service system including exempt positions and I agree that is something we all have to consider when we look at a position; that we have to be careful about what that position requires and how it should be drafted and how it needs to be approved. That completes my report.

J. Peters: Okay, questions for Todd on the SPS report?

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

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

J. Peters: Is there any unfinished business to come before the house? I can’t think of any.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed changes to NIU Bylaws, Article 8, Sabbatical Leave Policy – FIRST READING – Pages 15-20

J. Peters: We do have two items of new business. The first is the first reading of proposed changes in the NIU Bylaws with regard to sabbatical policy and I believe Provost Alden is going to make a presentation on this one.

R. Alden: Yes, thank you, President Peters. This change arose as a result of the Board of Trustees wanting to have a summary of all sabbatical productivity of people that have come back and have had a few years to actually produce publications and so forth. They really enjoyed the individual presentations of the one or two faculty that gave their presentations and went into depth the value of those sabbaticals. But they wanted kind of a summary report and we have, for the last several years, produced a summary report. This year the report is over 60 pages long and just so you know, our faculty are very productive. Out of the 43 faculty that took sabbatical as of two years ago, there were approximately 389, not approximately, exactly 389 significant works spread between publications, presentations, major curricular revisions and some very interesting other things that you may or may not think about. And if you do the math real quick, that’s about nine significant contributions per faculty member. So again, I think our faculty show that they are very productive. The challenge we have every year is getting people to complete the survey. We started off with a Survey Monkey type of thing on electronics and people decided they didn’t like
that. We have gone to an Excel spreadsheet type of thing and we’re hoping that, as we get more and more of the departments working with digital measures, that it will be just a simple thing that could be dumped electronically very easily after service reports are produced, identifying which of the service activities are associated with sabbatical and hopefully in the future it will be even more easy, or easier I should say to do this. The problem is we always have a few laggards if I can use that word – people who simply do not want to produce their information. We have to go to their supervisor and sometimes their supervisor’s supervisor to encourage them that this is something that, when we produce the letter of award, it says right in the letter of award that this is part of what’s expected – a report after they come back from their sabbatical and then the data on their productivity two years later. Every year it’s the last two or three individuals that takes probably half the time of the staff support trying to get this report together. One of the things we often hear is, “it’s not in the bylaws therefore I don’t have to do it.”

So, we took this issue to UCPC and both they and the Deans Council agreed that we should change the bylaws so it’s no longer just the sabbatical report, but this two year summary of productivity, that we would like the faculty to report on so that we can produce a holistic look at our faculty productivity to the board. And, as everybody knows, sabbatical is a very fragile entity in this country. Many states are doing away with it entirely and I think the more we can show its true significance in terms of allowing faculty to increase their productivity and serve the students, I think the better we are in standing with the board. The changes that have been requested, one is on the bylaws and the other is on the UCPC working rules which are in the APPM, and I will say the changes are fairly minor, but they are focused on this very topic.

First of all, pages 15 through 20 is where the entire bylaw and APPM sections are located, but it’s really on page 17 where we’re talking about the bylaw changes which the first reading is today. The first change is really to take a non sequitur sentence and move it into a more appropriate place in the paragraph that’s just because we’re going to come to make the changes anyway we figure we might as well try and get a little bit more of a flow in that paragraph.

But the second is that last paragraph on page 17 that says that when we, my office, requests this information from the faculty who were on sabbatical two years previously, that it is the responsibility of the faculty to submit their data so that we can produce this very nice report and like I say, it’s over 60 pages and it’s pretty impressive the summary that we have from the colleges. The second item is on page 20 which is the working rules of the UCPC which basically says that, in addition to looking at the linkage at the sabbatical report and something meaningful from a scholarly activity perspective in the original report that is submitted when they originally return from sabbatical, that the UCPC reserves the right that if they do not participate in this summary report, then they can choose to deny sabbatical if someone comes up again and asks. Again, there was I believe both groups, both the UCPC and the Deans Council agreed unanimously with these changes so we wanted to bring it to this group and since it involves a bylaw change it has to have two readings.

J. Peters: Okay, so this is a first reading, so this is the time for comments or questions, clarifications, points not thought through. Yes?

D. Munroe: I just had one other observation and I’m not sure if it’s too minute as long as we’re dealing with this. There is a sentence in that paragraph on page 17 that talks about a copy of the
review, meaning the personnel committee review of the sabbatical leave report, will be sent to the dean and executive vice president or provost’s office. We’ve had some confusion in our college in terms of when that report should be submitted, meaning the PC committee review and wondered if that needed to be clarified here to.

**R. Alden:** Well, as I understand, because I obviously chaired the UCPC when they asked to have that put in, the assumption was when the report was presented to my office since my office is the repository for those reports, that we have a cover sheet that substantiates that some group at the department at the college certify that they have reviewed the report and said that it was equivalent work that was done to what was proposed. So it’s when the reports come forward we expect that cover sheet. And then when I receive that cover sheet then I can put that in with the report and that’s what the UCPC would have available when the names come up again maybe six years hence.

**D. Munroe:** What we found is it produces sort of a timeline issue because of the wording in the bylaws say it needs to be submitted in 30 days, meaning the faculty member’s report. It doesn’t then give time for the PC committee to do that, I mean when do we do it? And so that’s where the concern has come in terms of when to do that review if it’s likely we won’t even see that faculty member’s report until the 30-day deadline.

**R. Alden:** And I think it was, I don’t remember specifically if it was discussed at the time, but it seems to me that it may have been discussed that we didn’t want to prescribe to PC committees when they have to meet, but obviously it would have to be in that same semester. But I have no problem with an amendment of that sort if we are going to change these bylaws anyway. I just don’t want to tie anybody’s hands because some of the colleges, Liberal Arts and Sciences, have significant numbers of these sabbatical reports that they would have to review at the same time that annual evaluation of service reports are being done so I’m not sure what number we would stick in there, but I would assume it would be in the same semester so that we would have the two together.

**D. Munroe:** And I guess that might be our recommendation is maybe could it say within that semester that then the report comes to your office and I’m not good with the language but…

**J. Peters:** Could you work that in?

**R. Alden:** I certainly could but I don’t want to…

**J. Peters:** As part of the first reading.

**R. Alden:** Do we need to have an amendment?

**A. Rosenbaum:** It’s a friendly amendment, yes? You accept it.

**F. Bryant:** Yes, it will be fine.

**R. Alden:** Okay, we’ll work on working that concept in for the next reading. Then we can consider that as a second reading that as well because that’s the concept we’ll try and put in
there.

D. Munroe: Thank you.

J. Peters: Sue Willis. Are you satisfied with that?

D. Munroe: I am, thank you.

J. Peters: Very good, all right Sue.

S. Willis: Okay, I suspect this is not a significant issue, but I thought I would raise it anyway just in case it comes back to bite somebody later on and then we can say, “oh yea we talked about that,” and I just note that the last sentence of the existing Section 8.4.4 says that an individual granted a leave assumes a professional obligation to return to NIU for at least a year, but then you’re asking for a report two years later. As I said, I presume since it says that it’s at your request, that you would then, therefore, not request reports from people who are no longer around, but I just wanted to point that out. That’s all.

R. Alden: I would assume so.

J. Peters: But then again... First reading, we’ve got a friendly amendment.

A. Rosenbaum: I just want to add one thing. The changes, although the UCPC has provided us with the changes to working rules of the University Council Personnel Committee, they can change their policy and that’s just reported to the UC. So that would become policy unless the UC acts to vote that it be vetoed, so these are two separate things. What we are really voting on or what we’re reading is a change to the bylaw the UCPC policy. If we don’t act on that then that becomes policy automatically. What’s on page 19 is not being altered as a result of the bylaw changes. It’s a separate thing. So we have two things here. If people on the UC have issues with the changes to the working rules of the UCPC, then we have to raise that as a separate issue. If we don’t then that becomes policy. The other piece we vote on again second reading.

J. Peters: Okay, Sue.

S. Willis: Sorry to be pedantic, but apparently that’s my job I guess. I guess the only thing I would say about that is: Would it make sense to delay the implementation of the UCPC working rules until the bylaw amendment has passed?

R. Alden: I believe that’s why we recommended they appear together even though one probably could have been directed to the APPM placement steering group. It made no sense to have rules that assumed bylaws that hadn’t been amended.

J. Peters: So it’s built in. All right, so we do have a friendly amendment that will come back to you for a second reading.

B. Proposed changes to NIU Bylaws, Article 3, Operating Procedures of University Council – FIRST READING – Pages 21-22
J. Peters: All right, hearing no other comments or seeing no hands, we’ll move to B – Proposed Changes to Bylaws on Operating Procedures of the Council and that’s an Alan Rosenbaum presentation.

A. Rosenbaum: This will be a very brief item. This is really a housekeeping item. The agenda for the University Council is articulated in the bylaws. The way it is currently articulated doesn’t reflect the practice that we’ve been using so if you look at the headings in our current agenda, those are not the same as the ones that are articulated in the bylaws. These have evolved and so we are simply, since we needed two-thirds vote of the University Council membership in order to pass the Article 8 revision, we figured we’d put it in now because we’re going to have to have everybody here for the vote next time anyway. So all this is, is trying to bring the agenda, as articulated in the bylaws, in line with what we’ve been actually doing. So I don’t anticipate that anybody has some important reason why we shouldn’t change the agenda, but if you do, that’s what that’s about. So I’ll move that we, we don’t have to make a motion on this, it’s just a reading. But that’s what that’s about, we’re just simply bringing you in line with what common practice is or current practice is.

J. Peters: Questions on this procedural fix? First reading, it will come back.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

J. Peters: Okay, quick meeting. Comments or questions from the floor?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

J. Peters: Okay, you will see we have information items for your perusal.

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
E. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
G. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
H. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
J. Minutes, General Education Committee
K. Minutes, Honors Committee
L. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
M. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
N. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
O. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
P. Minutes, University Benefits Committee
Q. 2011-2012 Meeting Schedule – Page 23

XI. ADJOURNMENT
J. Peters: Motion to adjourn, second, all in favor. We’re adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.