UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, November 30, 2011, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Barth, Bozikis, Coles, Echols, Elish-Piper, Houze, Hurt, Kowalski (on sabbatical), LeFlore, Lenczewski, Lindvall, Long, Mohabbat, Rosato, Rossi, Schoenbachler, Thu, Venaas, Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Blakemore, Bryan, Cunningham, Freeman, Griffin, Hansen, Hemphill, Kaplan, Williams

OTHERS ABSENT: Finley, Freedman, Prawitz, Slotsve, Snow, Sunderlin, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Peters: Let me call the November 30, 2011 meeting of the University Council to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters: Let’s move on to II, the adoption. Can everybody hear me because I’ve got sophisticated technology? Okay, the adoption of today’s agenda, we have a walk-in item under VI. A., and that’s Earl’s report. So, with that addition, is there a motion to adopt today’s agenda and you have to identify yourself for the record?

D. Haliczer: So moved.

J. Peters: Deb Haliczer moved. Is there a second?

R. Lopez: Second, Lopez.

J. Peters: Okay, we got that. Any discussion? All those in favor say, “aye.”

Members: Aye.

J. Peters: We have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2011 UC MEETING
J. Peters: I am going to call for any additions or corrections to the minutes of November 2\textsuperscript{nd}, which were electronically distributed. Hearing none, I’ll call for a motion to approve the minutes of November 2\textsuperscript{nd}.

D. Munroe: I move approval, Munroe.

J. Peters: Munroe moves approval. Thank you, professor.

S. Farrell: Farrell, second.

J. Peters: Professor Farrell seconds. All right, all those in favor say, “aye.”

Members: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed? We have approved minutes of November 2\textsuperscript{nd}.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Peters: Well, I’ve got several things today. It’s hard to believe, but this is the last UC meeting of the academic year. They seem to fly by fast but move very slowly from day-to-day. Next week is finals week. That’s hard to believe, and graduate commencement is on Saturday, December 10\textsuperscript{th} followed by two undergraduate ceremonies on Sunday, December 11\textsuperscript{th}. So, I want to thank everyone for their good work in getting these graduates to their degree. I’ve presided now over many NIU commencement ceremonies in my time at NIU and I think last year I calculated the number of hands that I have shaken and the number of respiratory infections that have been occasioned on me. But, it’s worth it because, to me, that’s the most satisfying time of year and I know that for you that participate, when they walk across that stage and get that credential, that is what we’re here for. So, thank you again for that. I don’t have a report on those thousands that are going to graduate, but it’s pretty substantial, about 1100? At least that’s not official.

The second thing, last week was a difficult time for NIU and the DeKalb community, when a senseless and tragic act of violence in the northwest section of DeKalb took the life of one of our precious students, Steven Agee, II. He was a senior sociology major, a campus leader, who was on track to graduate, I think, in May. Yesterday afternoon, our students, and thanks to the students, some of them are here, our student leaders, they organized a beautiful tribute to Steven, which was attended by many hundreds including his immediate family, his parents, and his brother, and his close associates, and he had many here on campus. Many of you were there, I see your faces and I saw them in the crowd. As I participated and I heard the tributes and the remembrances, I really did sense a quiet but powerful connection amongst all in the audience and a resolve to move forward and to grapple with this escalation of violence among our young people worldwide and in this nation. I sensed that, a coming together. In my comments, I gave my personal pledge that NIU would do all I could each and every day, and we’ve done a lot, to address this issue. But it’s not enough to say, I believe, it’s not enough to say that violence is a societal problem and that no community is immune, including our own. It’s not enough to say that. This is – I’ve thought about this a lot – this is a complex issue for which there is no one
answer or solution, and we must all be involved as we move forward. I’ve been so gratified in recent months with the level of attention and cooperation that has existed between our university partners. We’ve been quietly meeting a lot, that is the City of DeKalb, Sycamore, DeKalb County, the State Attorney’s office, and, of course, our law enforcement agencies, all of them. And they’ve worked diligently to make our community as safe as it can be. But, clearly, we need to do more and we will do more. So, today, I’m asking all of you and all the members of our NIU community to help in your own way and from your own particular disciplinary expertise, to help us develop some innovative solutions to the societal problem that we can implement in our own community. And we need to do that, and I assure you that I will be asking and I’ll be listening, so thank you for all of that.

Now, moving on, tomorrow, we will bring to our Board of Trustees meeting, our annual December meeting, and among the many issues on their agenda will be a resolution that will direct me and therefore I will direct the provost and he will direct somebody and direct you. That’s the great thing about being president, you can delegate. There will be a resolution that will direct me to review the 1993 Role and Mission Statement of the university. It hasn’t been looked at since 1993 and, you know, it’s like your annual checkup: whether you need it or not, you better get it, in anticipation and preparation for our higher learning mission reaccreditation process. I’m going to talk about that a little bit today, and I want to initiate formally today, the campus conversation on our reaccreditation process and demonstrate the need to update our Role and Mission Statement as part of that process and, of course, Provost Alden, Ray Alden, he has overall responsibility for this, and we’ve relied over the years on Vice Provost Virginia Cassidy who couldn’t be with us today or I’d have her do this. So, my presentation will be imperfect backed up by Ray Alden, but we need to move forward on this.

So, first let me give you some context as I see it. When I first came 12 years ago, we were in the midst of our decennial reaccreditation, and I’ve been through a lot of those, wrote a couple of them, and self studies as, you know, it’s pretty cut and dry, a lot of work, lot of work, in that a university of the stature of NIU is not in danger of losing its accreditation. So, you went through and it’s a participatory process. Beginning five years ago, seven or eight years ago, things began to change in the country, particularly when Margaret Spellings was the Secretary of Education, and there was concern that the regional accrediting agencies, which really, that’s our life blood, they’re the ones who determine whether or not the degrees that we grant and the certificates are within the public interest. That’s our major protection against fly-by-night operations that give degrees on the back of matchbooks. So, it’s very important to us. They’re bureaucratic. They drive us crazy, but accreditation is extremely important, as it is to your specialized accreditation, whether it’s the College of Law, ABET in Engineering, I think we have 26 different specialized accrediting bodies that really certify what we’re doing is of quality and meets the public interest. While there was a tremendous backlash in Washington about whether or not universities and other educational institutions were doing what they were supposed to do and particularly that they weren’t measuring the outcomes of their activities. There was some attempt to federalize the accreditation process, so you can think of a kind of a super Department of Education for higher ed. I think the strength of higher education is that it’s decentralized and one size does not fit all. It doesn’t create a uniformity, which I think, at the higher education level, is a detriment to creative thinking and innovation. It stifles it. So, that was a pretty tense moment. I was a little bit involved in those discussions. Anyway, as an end result, the regional accrediting agencies have maintained their traditional role. However, they got the message, and there has
been a change in all the regional accrediting agencies, and we are in HLC, which is the old North Central Region, now it’s called Higher Learning Commission. There’s a focus on outcomes and measures and assessment and matching what your role and mission statement says to what you do. So, they parse, they’re going to parse every word of that Role and Mission Statement, and they say if you’re going to produce globally intergalactically prepared students, you have to demonstrate that you’ve done that. So, that necessitates, and it’s required that the Board of Trustees be involved in certification of that role and mission. So, I know I went on a little bit, but normally, when I was a faculty member, the last thing I thought about was accreditation. I was focused on grading papers and doing my research. All right, so this is very important. I’m pleased to say, though, that we have a group of people who are going to take this challenge on and it’s going to be a long process. I’m going to talk a little bit about that process and end up with talking about role and mission.

Anyway, here’s five minutes of a primer on accreditation. There’s a two-part process to accreditation. First is compliance with the criteria and that’s done by self-examination and a self-study and then a visitation of an off-site team. The other part of it is a consultation where these outside accreditors meet with us, and it’s a dialogue and they give us suggestions on how to achieve our goals. So, two-step process.

So, let’s focus on some of the tasks that are immediate. One is a self-study process. That means writing a big document, and in consultation with Provost Alden, Doris McDonald from English has agreed to chair the HLC steering committee, putting together a steering committee and I won’t go over that, but it’s all the right people from all the right shared governance committees are going to be on this steering committee. Now, each member of the steering committee is going to coordinate a subcommittee of faculty, staff, and students to provide evidence that we meet each of the higher ed. learning commission criteria. So, this is really a participatory shared governance process the way we build this. Briefly, here is the criteria:

1. Mission. They assess your mission. The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly, and it guides the institution’s operations. Go on websites and do role and missions for universities and black out the name of the university and you can’t tell the difference. They’re pretty common. They have the three: We teach, research, we do service. We do it in a diverse way, you know, I mean it’s all there. I don’t know if that will get us there, but those things will be in our mission statement I’m sure. So that’s #1, mission.

2. Ethical and responsible conduct. The institution fulfills its mission ethically and responsibly.

3. This gets to the guts of it, academic programs – quality, resources and support. Does the institution provide high-quality academic programs wherever and however its offerings are delivered? Now, that’s quite a change because it isn’t the traditional lecture discussion seminars. It’s wherever and however, so it’s in Naperville, Rockford. Is it delivered electronically, so however you deliver it, is it quality?

4. Then, the fourth criteria is academic programs, evaluation and improvement. Here’s where we’re going to have to work, to document we do this. We got written up in the last
accreditation, not because we didn’t evaluate and have outcomes, it’s just we didn’t document it well. So, the institution demonstrates responsibility for quality of its educational programs, learning environment, support services and evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

5. Then, the fifth criteria is resources, planning, and institutional effectiveness. The institution’s resources, structures, processes are sufficient to fulfill the mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future. I know the trustees have picked up on Great Journeys and Vision 2020, and that is going to be the thing that is going to guide, I think we’re okay on the plans for the future, we just have to operationalize them and achieve them.

Okay, I know this is a primer, but the last thing I want to do is give you, all right, we’re at the starting line, now what’s the finish line and what do we have to do. The starting line is today or it’s really already happened. The finish line is spring of 2014 with the HLC site visit. That’s when they come to town. But, between now and then, a lot of work. This fall, we already selected the chair and the steering committee, they’re organized. I won’t talk about that today. In the spring of 2012, this coming spring, we’re going to, they’re going to meet, develop their strategy. We’re going to meet our higher learning commission liaison, the appointed individual who’s an expert in this. We’ll be working closely. There’s a big meeting of the higher learning commission that this group will attend so they get trained on how to do this. And then we’re going to begin to review the evidence. Then, from summer 2012 to summer 2013, next year, review the evidence, draft responses to the criteria, and discuss and rewrite our self study. Then, the fall of 2013, we make the self study available for public comment, prepare the final version and submit it. In the spring they come. We have a pretty good committee. Ray, do you want to add anything to that? I tried to be quick but not comprehensive.

**R. Alden:** I think just the fact that there are, I think, 9 or 10 people on the committee and each one of those will be heading up a subcommittee made up of other people, so this is a fairly expansive process that involves the whole university community. And some of the questions that need to be addressed in the criteria, as we understand them, still need to be talked about on this campus, not the least of which is the mission. But other things such as student learning outcomes, how do you know the difference between one at a doctoral level and one at a master’s level and one at a baccalaureate level and so forth. So, there will be a lot of opportunities for talking and through shared governance groups, primarily prompted by these steering committee subcommittees that will be going out and asking different groups for information.

**J. Peters:** And it has to blend. That would be blended into our shared governance academic planning committee. We’ll have representation in the assessment panel. It has to because assessments can be such a big part of this. So, as the governing body and everyone is involved, students, staff, faculty, I’m officially announcing and launching this. Then, tomorrow, we will be charged to do the role and mission and you’ll be hearing more about that. Originally, the trustees thought we could get them for their approval, a new role and mission, a revised role and mission statement by March. And I indicated to them I’d been through a few role and mission journeys and the journeys are never three months. So, we’ll give a report, if they pass the resolution I
think they’re going to pass, there will be a requirement that we report to them in March. They will give feedback and then at their May or June meeting, whenever that is, that is when that will be accepted. So, that’s going to be a fast track situation. Ray already has a plan for that.

So, enough of that. Lastly, let me update you on the veto session which ended anticlimactic. There are some things that are important in the veto session. There was no overall pension reform passed. They passed a pension reform bill that plugged rather egregious exceptions to pension that permitted individuals who had only limited amount of time in one of the five state retirement systems to collect inordinate benefits. That passed. That had very little to do with Senate Bill 512, which was not brought, but will be brought, in the spring. And I can tell you that, again, I know Steve Cunningham has spent all of his time on it and continues. And we are working on that issue in the interim. So, I don’t have a report for you, only to say there was no resolution of it and they’re going to continue to work on it, as they should and as they have to.

There were a couple other things that were relevant. They did fix up this fiscal 2012 budget, which is a relief in that, not us, but there were state agencies that were going to go dark and many people laid off but they fixed that up. They did fix up a shortfall in the Monetary Award Program. They added $33 million, which is very good, so there will be no shortfall in what was appropriated. So, we’re very pleased with that and those are the things that are relevant and by giving you a little budget update, first on the budget, today Dr. Williams informs me that we received the disbursement from the state of $6.3 million for last year, for fiscal 2011. So, we have an outstanding balance, and it will be up on the website, of $13.8 million with the promise that it will be fully paid by December 31st, which is their mandate, unless they do something about it. And we expect it, right Eddie, but you know, do this? Pray if you do, do that if you don’t.

So, that didn’t say anything about this year’s budget. We’re watching that payment cycle closely and I’ll tell you the reason, for a lot of reasons, but a primary one is you’ll remember in my State of the University address, I said I was committed to do all I could to provide a salary increment package for this fiscal year; but that, I said at that time, that it was largely dependent on receipt of last year’s complete appropriation. So, we’re inching our way closer to that decision. So, this is to let you know, at this point in the year, that it remains my top priority and I’m working on it diligently. And every time we get a little more money, that makes that decision easier to make. Of course, we have to have trustee approval and anything we do, when we do, will have to be retroactive. But that’s as it was the last couple years. That’s what we’re thinking right now, and I’m an optimistic person and I’m optimistic but we’re watching that very, we’re getting very close to that decision. Ray or Eddie, you want to add anything to that?

Okay, so we, I think there is some contest, athletic contest, that’s going to happen Friday in Motown and I’ve been waiting 12 years for a football championship. Maybe this is our year, but I am equally proud again, most proud of our graduates come the 10th and 11th, but our men’s soccer won the Mid-America Conference Soccer Division and our women’s volleyball team is in the NCAA tournament. So, I’m very proud of those kids and what they do. Okay, with that, that kind of concludes my remarks. I know that was an awful lot.

V. CONSENT AGENDA
VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – walk-in

J. Peters: All right, let’s move on to our agenda. We have no consent agenda, but we have a number of reports, and we have a walk-in report from Earl. Earl, do you want to make comments or just take questions?

E. Hansen: I’ll make a few comments and then I’ll take a few questions, but the report is pretty much summarized itself. On the last page is what came out of our meeting, which was a letter from the Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Education to Dr. George Reid, chair of the performance-based funding steering committee. That pretty much covers all of the jargon that was thrown into the notes that I have here for you, which I put together prior to the letter coming out. When we were at the meeting, the question came up on the public caucus was considering Governor State University’s proposal to go from an upper division school to a four-year school, and that causes an issue with the community colleges in the general area where they’re at. That’s just a point of information for you. They also discussed the Pennsylvania report that you got a link to last time, talking about Illinois and our issues here in regards to the performance-based funding and issues like that. I also have a link on the back page, on the third page for performance-based funding, and that takes you to the Michigan newspaper and the State of Michigan implementing their performance-based funding. It’s one of 17 states that’s in this mix on this thing. The one thing that we’re seeing, and it bothers us as a group, is we’re not having much lead time to prepare and to come up with the various numbers of indicators that are going to be used to determine what is a good, well are we meeting goals, what are those goals, are they objective, and hopefully in the next meeting next week, that’s going to be brought up because that will be in Springfield, and that’s one that one would look forward to. One of the questions that was raised was the existence of 3+1 degree programs between certain community colleges and certain four-year institutions. When I was asked, John, by the group down there what I knew about the 3+1 between Northern and College of DuPage, I told them absolutely nothing. They’re going to ask me again.

R. Alden: They have a nursing degree completion program with College of DuPage. I don’t know about technology. Promod, is the technology program at College of DuPage, I just don’t remember.

P. Vohra: This is with all the community colleges who have associate in applied science programs, they can _____ with our industrial technology program under 3+1 program. The provision is that we give 23 credit hours for the technical component of their associates in applied science and then they can transfer 66 hours as normal credit. So, they can transfer up to 89 hours and then they have to take 31 hours from NIU to be able to complete their degree. This has existed, I think, for the last four years, and it’s a very successful program.

J. Peters: Does that help, Earl?

E. Hansen: That helps me, but they threw in dance. They didn’t say anything about our technology program. They talked about a 3+1 in fine performance arts. I knew about this one, but…
J. Peters: Well, I’m not sure if he knows much about dance, but I know he sure is a great percussionist, the dean here…

E. Hansen: Didn’t mean to do that to you.

R. Holly: We have been working with the College of DuPage for a little more than a year now, and they have not called it a 3+1, they’re looking for 2+2. We’re not even quite there yet, but we’ve been working with them and they understand there’s a quality difference between what they’re able to provide to their students and what we’re providing to our students. But they’re very amenable to seeing our side of things and we’re working on it.

J. Peters: If memory serves me correct and Anne knows a good bit about this, I was taken aback a couple of years ago on these, what you call the 3+1, when we found out that there were, there were some universities outside the state that would take 90 hours of community college and then they’d top it off with online last year. Prestigious universities by the way were into this business.

A. Kaplan: The University of Indiana does that and has for some time.

J. Peters: I didn’t want to identify the culprit.

A. Kaplan: Well, I think the larger issue really is, it’s all part of the pressures on community colleges to offer more and more education close to home, particularly what started as a way of serving students who are place-bound because of work or family responsibilities is morphing into a service for students who simply cannot afford a residential education. You probably remember we mounted a fairly major legislative effort a few years ago to discourage the development of four-year programs on community college campuses, particularly at Harper, and we did all right with that, but the community college pushback on that issue is to go for the 3+1 while we’re trying for 2+2. And, basically, there’s something to be said for both sides. If you’re a community college administrator, you are faced on a fairly regular basis with a fair amount of pressure from the people who pay community college taxes to provide more education in the district. And on top of that, they like to rent space; and if you, as an institution, will bring your program there, they will be happy to rent you the space for it. We, on the other hand, have an interest in maintaining our claim on the region and getting to these students who may or may not transfer to Northern faster, would prefer that the programs be 2+2. I think, you know, to the extent that this can be resolved, it requires a close and civil working relationship with the community college players where we describe what we can do and they describe what they want, and we hope to meet in the middle. Our experience has been that, if we can get the faculty on both sides together, things work out pretty well because, in fact, they tend to work through the curriculum and figure out who does what best and we move on from there.

J. Peters: That’s been my experience. First of all, the NIU criteria is that we’re willing to try and fill these educational gap programmatically, but we do it in a collaborative way; and we do nothing without the approval of any academic program, without faculty involvement and approval. What we found works best is putting faculties together, our faculty with community college faculty in an area, and they work it out, or not, but usually they work it out.
A. Kaplan: But usually they do.

J. Peters: And that’s the way it has to be.

E. Hansen: Two other issues that came up and found in the fourth paragraph: After the caucus meeting, we talked about 3+1 degrees and then we had an issue on procurement complaints due to state regulations and the University of Illinois was not able to purchase some research equipment because of the over-passing of time periods when the grant money ran out before they could get the okay, and they were trying to work on that. I have no idea if that’s an issue on our campus or not. The other one that they talked about was the extent to which remedial education is using up student MAP funds, which brings us back to the P16 thing that we keep getting pushed in higher education to deal with – students that are remedial and when they come to us. We can’t solve the program if they don’t come to us with some kind of educational achievement from high school. So, that’s one of the other issues that keeps getting kicked back and forth with us, and that will probably come to the forefront next week. That pretty much sums up the whole thing.

J. Peters: Those are all the right issues. Okay any questions?

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – report – Pages 3-4

J. Peters: Shall we move on BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs. We have a written report only.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – report – Pages 5-6

J. Peters: Al Rosenbaum is going to give a report on BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee.

A. Rosenbaum: Actually Greg Waas wrote the report, which is in your agenda. There really isn’t anything of note to report other than what’s in the agenda, so, I’m not going to waste your time by reading it. So, if you have interest in telecommunications voice trunking services, you are welcome to read all of that in the report on pages 5 and 6.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – report – Page 7

J. Peters: Moving on to VI. D., Legislative Audit, Todd Latham, I think you’re going to answer questions.

T. Latham: Yes, the committee started off by welcoming a new member, we see Trustee Iasco as the Chair of our committee. We then were provided by Vice President Buettner, a report of the 97th General Assembly, and President Peters has kind of given us another update here today. We received the internal audit report. I’ll just point out probably the last sentences that are most informational about the types of audits that take place by that office, just to give you an idea of
what they look for. We also then had a presentation that was branding and recruiting, being currently completed by NIU, and some discussion about the use of social media to attract students as well as parents to the university. We reviewed some of the literature and looked at some of the measured outcomes through that process. The last item that the committee discussed and fielded that day was a presentation by our General Counsel, Mr. Blakemore. He gave a PowerPoint presentation essentially to the Board of Trustee members about changes to the Illinois Open Meeting Act.

J. Peters: Okay, questions?

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – Karen Brandt, Chair – report

1. Guests in Class Policy proposal – Page 8

J. Peters: All right, now we’ll move into the Academic Policy Committee and Karen Brandt, I think, has an item to bring.

K. Brandt: Thanks very much. We brought this academic policy to you last, in our last session and my understanding is that there were some suggestions for us to wordsmith a little bit and clean up our language. So, what we’re bringing to you today is the revised policy, which you can see is in, it’s in bolded. What we tried to do with this policy, just to give you some idea of our rationale behind it, we know that we tried to keep the integrity of having the instructor having control of the classroom. So, you should be able to see that language in this policy. However, we also were concerned that there may be, hopefully not, but there may be an occasion where the instructor is inappropriate or in some way threatens student safety. So, we also put that language in here as well. We are requiring, though is that if the department chair supervisory personnel and security are coming into the classroom that they must notify the instructor prior to coming in. So, I would like you to please look at this policy and any questions?

J. Peters: So we need a motion and a second to discuss.

K. Brandt: I move to approve.

J. Peters: All right, is there a second?

C. McCord: Second.

J. Peters: There is a second from Dean McCord. All right, now discussion.

R. Lopez: I have a question. Just for clarification, what is being proposed is the revised in the bold lettering is what you would like to have accepted today?

K. Brandt: That is correct.
R. Lopez: So in the case that there is an instructor, and I’m just kind of throwing this out there because it actually has occurred where we’ve had some concerns with what the instructor might be doing in the class. If we have to ask for permission prior to class, according to the way I’m reading this, maybe I’m not notifying the instructor, that instructor might not want us there. So, if there’s a security concern, I have concerns with that last sentence.

K. Brandt: It was our intent, we took out that word, “permission,” because what we’re suggesting is that the instructor cannot deny permission, cannot deny entrance to supervisory people and security. However, we also wanted to have them notified in the case that say supervisory personnel wants to come in to a particular class where the material being talked about is sensitive or personal to the students where it would be inappropriate at that particular class. So, that was our intent. I don’t know if it reads like that to you.

R. Lopez: Actually, I just read it again and I saw the word permission. This is simply notifying the instructor of their intent, so I read that better. I sort of got it mixed up. But, is that for security duties, is that always, what if they’re not able to notify prior to? What if there’s just, could this be something that will come back as a problem from, you know, by the instructor presenting, “I wasn’t notified so therefore I have an issue with somebody coming into my class, even if it was for security duties.” It’s just a thought that I’m thinking that might be a problem.

K. Brandt: One of our thoughts was that there are going to be times, in terms specifically when we discuss this about security, there will probably be times when the security issues and safety are going to override any kind of guests in the policy classroom. So, we didn’t address that because we thought that there would be an overriding security in terms of the university that security is going to do what they need to do to protect students and instructors.

J. Peters: Okay, Promod?

P. Vohra: Well, if that is the case, then that should be mentioned very explicitly. Last time I had mentioned that in 99.9 percent of the cases, that this would not be a problem. But, there could be rare occasions when the content of the class could be in question and the behavior of the instructor or a particular student may be in question in that situation, you may want to go into the classroom on a surprise basis. You may not be able to notify or may not want to notify the instructor. This would be a rare case, but you don’t want to rule out the possibility of somebody going in as a surprise check and taking care of a situation that is unwarranted and unneeded.

C. McCord: We, as we debated this in the committee, we were trying to strike a balance. We recognize that there’s a very natural desire for instructors to have control over their classroom and to not feel that they are subject to, if you will, I’ll say it a little more dramatically than I really need, but unwarranted intrusion. On the other hand, we tried to recognize the reality that there can be situations where you need to see what’s going on. There is no language we could construct that parsed out every possible eventuality and noted every contingency where you might need to do this, you might need to do that. In succinct language, this was sort of the best balance we could come up with trying to balance the concern of the instructor and the concern of the institution.
J. Peters: Okay, Austin?

A. Quick: I guess after looking at this from last time, the only word that I really agree with here is the word, “must,” like if we could amend that word, it would say, “should make every attempt if possible,” or I definitely if it’s possible, but it kind of covers both of those. It’s just that word, “must,” because then that’s always something you can go back to and say, “Well, I wasn’t notified prior to,” depending on what the situation is. Then, we don’t have to go through and rewrite the whole thing but just change that one word to what we’re looking for. Can I make a motion to amend this?

K. Brandt: Well, actually, I’m sorry Austin, if you take a look at the policy that we submitted prior to this one, I believe your recommendation was to take out, “should,” because it was too ambiguous and to put in, “must,” so we did do that. The other thing that I would just suggest, yeah, I don’t know, the intent to be present prior to class really does not have a timeline on it. It doesn’t say that you have to notify somebody a week ahead of time, it doesn’t say that you have to notify them, oh, 30 seconds before you enter the room, it just says that you need to notify them.

J. Peters: Okay, yeah?

N. Bender: I would just like to say, the word, “intent,” like she was just saying, if we’re talking about the security of the classroom, if I was putting myself in the place of a security officer trying to go in the classroom for some reason, I’m going to have an intent to go in the classroom, I’m going to need to go in the classroom and that may just be a play on words, but the intent means that you predetermined you need to go in that classroom, and you would have time to notify somebody most likely. I think you could play words with this all day long and you’re never going to get to what is exactly going on, but if you have the intent to go in, I think you would have time to notify. If you have the need to go in, nobody is going to care. That’s all.

J. Peters: Where are we? Dr. Williams?

E. Williams: I don’t know if I could add anything to the discussion, but I do have some concern in the security situation whereby there may be an investigation, there may have been some tip or lead and it may be that in following that tip or following that lead, it may be necessary to be as, do not make any prior notification and then what we would have then is someone being very upset because security violated this particular policy, and I think that there has to be, I know everyone is saying, “Oh, if there is an immediate need, then they march right in or do whatever, whatever, we want them to do that,” but the policy doesn’t really, does not really provide for that. I think that we may want to put in a phrase, and I’m not good at these things, but some kind of phrase which allows in those very, very, very special cases for security especially to be able to do this without violating a university policy, and that’s the problem. We want to have policies that will work and we don’t want to upset people, but there could be that occasion and we would not want that falling back on security, “Well, you didn’t follow the policy,” and so forth. I don’t know if, “must notify whenever possible,” or something, I’m not good at language, but there are people here that are very good at that. But we must, I believe I would suggest that we try to make room in this policy for that provision.
K. Brandt: Let me ask you one question. What if, if this would meet what you’re saying, what if we took out the last line, you took out the, “or security duties.” What that would do is say that supervisory personnel must notify the instructor and we’ve already said in the line before that or the line before that, some place in there, both security and supervisory people are not guests, but we just do not say, if they’ve got a really, if security has got a really good reason, you can just come in. Would that meet what you’re…?

J. Peters: So it would just say now, for those present, “for supervisory duties, must notify?”

K. Brandt: Yes, that’s what I’m wondering, if that better meets the tone of what you’re suggesting.

J. Peters: You’re the maker of the motion. Promod, you want to say…?

P. Vohra: I think the suggestion that the last line should be stricken all together serves all the reasons that were given before the change of policy. That will accommodate all the requests that have been made. The whole line, the whole thing.

J. Peters: Well, I think that is, you know, the way you normally handle this was with an exception clauses, right. We have seen these things, and our lawyer left, but you would say, “except in cases of,” and then you’d have, “except in cases of immediate danger or threat,” I mean there’s classic language and then you qualify it. The other thing is though, is there ever a security issue that isn’t lead to, you know, so let’s work with the language of right now what’s on the table is the amended language of the maker of the motion.

E. Williams: And I think you directed that question toward me as well as the body, but I think that what you propose would work from the security perspective, which is what I’m concerned about.

K. Brandt: And meaning that we take out the word, “or security duties?”

J. Peters: Yeah, “/or security duties,” stricken.

Unidentified: …duties would.

Unidentified: Duties must stay.

Unidentified: Oh, I’m sorry, and/or security, right.

Unidentified: and/or security.

A. Rosenbaum: Is that only for the first or next to the last sentence or are we going to do something with that last sentence as well?

Unidentified: Just the last sentence.

A. Rosenbaum: Just the last sentence?
Unidentified: Yeah.

K. Brandt: Do you want me to read the revised?

J. Peters: You’re going to have to strike, “or security duties,” in the previous sentence then.

Members: No.

J. Peters: Oh, okay, that’s right. The president does make a mistake every now and then.

A. Rosenbaum: So this would mean that security people would never have to notify the instructor? That doesn’t seem to be consistent with what we were saying either, either in the senate or earlier here. So, it clearly, as Dr. Williams is pointing out, we don’t want to restrict it so that we always have to be notified, but under certain circumstances, the professor should have a right to know that there is a security person coming into the classroom, unless it’s an emergency situation. So I like Dr. Peters’ suggestion that we add an exception for emergency situations but that we leave the security notifying the instructor under most circumstances.

J. Peters: Well, we’ve got the maker of the motion making the motion. Go ahead, Chris.

C. McCord: So I was actually going to formally propose that as an amendment to the language present, which is to change the last sentence to read, “Those present for supervisory and/or security duties must notify the instructor of their intent to be present prior to class, except in emergency situations.”

J. Peters: All right, so that’s a motion.

A. Rosenbaum: Friendly amendment.

J. Peters: Is there a second?

A. Rosenbaum: No, it’s a friendly amendment. We have a motion on the floor.

J. Peters: Oh, it’s a friendly amendment.

C. McCord: Well, I will be as friendly as you like.

J. Peters: Karen has to either accept it or not accept the friendly amendment.

K. Brandt: Yeah, I accept that.

A. Rosenbaum: You accept that?

K. Brandt: Yes.
A. Rosenbaum: And the seconder, does the seconder have to accept that?

C. McCord: Actually, I was the seconder, so, I would be to second myself. I’ll even third myself if it helps.

J. Peters: All right, so that’s accepted as a friendly amendment. So, now let’s read it.

K. Brandt: “Guests in the classroom must have the permission of the instructor. When deciding whether a guest is appropriate, the instructor should take into consideration the effect the guest will have on the learning environment. Guests do not include those who are present on behalf of departmental and/or security supervisory or security duties. Those present for supervisory and/or security duties must notify the instructor of their intent to be present prior to class except in emergency situations.”

J. Peters: All right that is the friendly amendment. That’s where it is now. Discussion? Dr. Williams?

E. Williams: I’m sorry to be a pest on this, but the concept of what is an emergency bothers me and if, in fact, there is an investigation going on or there is simply a tip, I don’t know if that would be considered an emergency and that’s why I worry a little bit about the dean’s friendly amendment.

M. Theodore: I was in the committee where this was and I sort of saw this happening and I think we’re kind of worried about getting too specific in this in a situation where we cannot really get too specific. So, I’m wondering if it would be, if there’s any objection to getting rid of the, “except in emergency situations,” and going back to the original last sentence and just putting, “whenever possible,” in the beginning, “those present for supervisory and/or security duties,” because I don’t think we’ll be able to list out enough specific situations where it will occur to meet all the exceptions that we can have and all the objections that there are. In that aspect, vagueness in this might be our best friend. So, I’m wondering if anyone would object to, “whenever possible,” being at the beginning of that last sentence, the original last sentence?

J. Peters: Well, you will have to put that as a friendly amendment to the maker.

C. McCord: So, that it would soften, if you will, it would broaden slightly, instead of saying, “except in emergency situations,” it would essentially say instead, “that whenever possible, notify?”

M. Theodore: Yeah, yes, unless there was any objection to that.

C. McCord: I think I agree that in that environment, it probably also makes sense to change, “must,” to, “should.” “Whenever possible, those present for supervisory and/or security duties should notify the instructor of their intent to be present prior to class.” I’ll say that works for me.

K. Brandt: Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: You have a very vague, you know, what is, “whenever possible?” You know,
people could say, “I think it’s possible.”

M. Theodore: I think that’s the issue is that we cannot really get specific on this because the moment we make it specific, an instance will come up that it will end up going into that.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, but now you may be adding a toothless statement there that whoever wants to come in can just come in and say, “Well, it wasn’t possible.”

J. Peters: Okay, let’s get some order in this. Deb Haliczer?

D. Haliczer: Hi. If you wanted to go back to the one where we said, “except in emergency situations,” and change the word to, “security sensitive situations,” would that be expansive enough to include Dr. Williams’ concerns for investigations or pending situations but not necessarily an immediate emergency? “Security sensitive or security situations?”

J. Peters: Well, we would have to know whether that was acceptable to the maker and whether Dr. Williams sees an issue there for good process.

E. Williams: Again, what I would say is this: If, in fact, there is a need for security to do anything in a classroom or whatever, I truly believe it would be fully justified in terms of their doing it, which means that if the question were to come up under a, “whenever possible,” well, why was this possible, I would expect that there would be a definite response and rationale for the actions taken. So, I don’t think it would be just willy nilly or just up in the air. I think that if, in fact, there is a justification for it, it will be there and it certainly is something that could be justified if asked.

J. Peters: So, what are you supporting?

E. Williams: I am supporting a short meeting. I like the language, “whenever possible,” and again, I say that if, in fact, it happens and there is no notification and the question is brought up, then I’m sure that security will have a justifiable reason for their actions and for not notifying the instructor.

A. Rosenbaum: Could I just ask for an example of a situation that you’re concerned about where there would be a tip of some sort, but it not be an emergency situation?

E. Williams: It could be only that a tip could come in about something and we want the instructor in the class to move in the ordinary way and manner and no one being very upset or nervous or anyone feeling like there is something that may happen or whatever. So, I think that that could possibly happen.

A. Rosenbaum: Wouldn’t that be an emergency? In other words, if you get a tip that something is going to happen in the classroom, would that not be an emergency?

E. Williams: Well, it could or could not be, depending on what the tip is.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, that’s why I’m asking for an example of a tip that would not be an
emergency.

**E. Williams:** A tip could be about a whole series of possible classrooms or a whole series of things that may be coming up or someone who’s upset with a personal matter that may or may not show up at the classroom. I’m not into that business, but I do know that these kinds of things do occur. Every incident is not an emergency.

**B. Sagarin:** The problem with a weakening of the language, which I believe the, “whenever possible,” would do, is that instructors that are teaching courses where the tenor or content of the conversation would change or need to be curtailed if there were security personnel in the room, those instructors would really like some assurance that, in most cases, they will be notified if there is a security person in the room. As somebody who teaches a course of that sort myself, I’m comfortable with the necessity of an emergency situation, making an exception. I’m less comfortable with the idea that somebody could define this being not possible to assure me ahead of time. So, I’m comfortable with that emergency situation or security sensitive type of exception. I’m less comfortable with weakening of the last sentence with a “whenever possible.”

**J. Peters:** What is the language that we have on the table right now?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Emergency situation.

**J. Peters:** It is the….

**A. Rosenbaum:** Exception for emergency situation.

**J. Peters:** Exception, that’s what we have on the table right now.

**K. Brandt:** Yes, except in emergency situations.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Call the vote.

**J. Peters:** Call for the question? Call the question?

**A. Rosenbaum:** 1-Yes, 2-No, 3-Abstain.

**J. Peters:** We’re voting on, read what we have, because this is an important issue.

**S. Farrell:** I’ll call the question.

**K. Brandt:** “Guests in the classroom must have the permission of the instructor. When deciding whether a guest is appropriate, the instructor should take into consideration the effect the guest will have on the learning environment. Guests do not include those who are present on behalf of departmental and/or University supervisory or security duties. Those present for supervisory and security duties must notify the instructor of their intent to be present prior to class except in emergency situations.”

**J. Peters:** Except in emergency situations. All right, 1-Yes, 2-No, 3-Abstain. Voting is open.
A. Rosenbaum: Press 1, 2, or 3.

J. Peters: Press 1, 2, or 3.

A. Rosenbaum: And you can change it until we close the voting. Unless, anyone needs more time?


A. Rosenbaum: What’s the vote?

Yes – 29
No – 13
Abstain – 0

J. Peters: That’s affirmative. It passes.

A. Rosenbaum: The last item is we want to place this in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual.

J. Peters: So, does that require a vote?

A. Rosenbaum: Does that require a vote?

J. Peters: To place it in the Academic Policies and Procedure Manual? All right, so we need a motion to place this change that we just made in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual as is practice.

F. Bryan: I think there is precedent.

A. Rosenbaum: I’ll move that we place it into the manual and that we leave it up to the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Committee to determine where it will go.

T. Latham: Second.

J. Peters: There’s a second, Todd. Any discussion? All those in favor say 1-Yes, 2-No, 3-Abstain, 4-It’s Miller time. All right, vote. The voting is now closed.

Yes – 31
No – 11
Abstain – 0
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J. Peters: All right, where are we now, we’re up to G. Todd Latham is going to give the
T. Latham: We started off the meeting with an overview of the True North Campaign. One of the concerns was that the second sentence where the question was about how much of the money donated was specific to faculty support. We found out that five percent of the total allocation was dedicated to salary supplements, grad assistantships, travel funds, chairs, professorships, etc. Then, the last part was 11 percent with the scholarships. That's really what the committee was looking at, just to see how some of those funds were provided to the university and how they were actually used.

The budget update was really covered by President Peters again, I'll skip that. I'll point out the last part was just a status under C. Facilities, that Cole Hall is looking really good. It looks like it’s going to be open on time. The first-year housing project is a nice beacon of light on Annie Glidden. It looks to me like it’s almost done, but it’s probably not, but it looks very sharp. Grant Tower C is renovated and occupied, and our campus beautification efforts continue.

The next report is on the following page on page 10. President Peters at the November 8th meeting gave us a pension update. Provost Alden identified to us some 24 continued proposals and 28 new ones are the strategic planning process and that we were going on to the Provost working groups and strategic planning and then onto the deans’ retreat to make funding determinations. We discussed some of the pension reform issues and the impact that it might have on employees, workload on the campus as a whole. One of the issues that came up is how it might affect our recruiting efforts of new faculty.

Under current enrollment, we received the update that we’re approximately at 23,000 students and how that fits in with the interest to increase it under Vision 2020 to the optimal level of 27,500 and that basically 500 students is, I believe, approximated to an amount of $10 million of tuition money. So, you can see how much of an impact the loss of students would have on our revenue streams. We also discussed the demographics of the Illinois high school graduates and how that landscape is changing and how that might impact us here on campus as well as the students that we would recruit. We discussed the major recruitment efforts that have taken place in respect to campus safety, campus technology, and our residence halls.

The last item, V., we talked about some of the variable that we’re competing against with respect to other institutions. Those areas that were identified that we continue to work on and develop are our residence halls, our technology, our opportunities for our students with engaged learning with faculty, online learning, and then finally, general education programs that are modern and flexible. Thank you.


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

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Greene, Chair – no report
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J. Peters: Okay, we will move now to Student Association, Austin Quick.

A. Quick: Thank you. First off, we want to thank – I spoke with Elliott before I came (he had to head home to be with his family) – but I want to thank the faculty and staff and the university as a whole for coming together for Steven. He was a staff member of ours and will be deeply missed. But we definitely, there was a sense of pride a little bit more excitement today in the office. People were a little happier and it was definitely exciting to be a part of the community yesterday and it meant a lot to our community yesterday. So, thank you very much on behalf of Elliott and the entire staff of the Student Association.

Onto some pressing issues, I brought up at the last meeting and also at the Faculty Senate meeting, the issue that the Student Association and the students have found of there being a lack of a grievance policy for students. And I’ve looked at a couple different options since I met with the steering committee and since I spoke with the Faculty Senate. And one of the options we had talked about was to look at other universities and what type of grievance policies they have. We have researched that and looked at other universities and the thing that we actually liked better than that – than creating our own grievance policy – is something that we worked very well under as students, is the Student Code of Ethics and the Code of Conduct and what is required of us. As you know, it was put out at the beginning of this year. There are certain things that we abide by as students at this university. It came to my knowledge that we have a similar thing for faculty, staff and operating staff and supportive and professional staff as well, the Code of Ethics that was approved, it looks like 2001-2002 various times through this body.

What we would like to see, instead of creating a grievance policy is to create a little bit better language within the Code of Ethics that’s already in place and to implement some form of mechanism to hold those people accountable under those various areas. So, just as the students when they come here, they automatically are told to abide by those Code of Conduct that are for us, we would like to see the same thing for staff of this university and faculty as well.

So, I guess I brought it to this body to see. I had spoke with Dr. Rosenbaum to see what you would all think of creating something like that. Originally, it was a grievance policy but again, after looking at it further, we would like to do something of a, like I said, you have a Code of Ethics already on the books, but kind of, maybe working with the language a little bit and then creating some type of mechanism to hold staff members at the university accountable, that they abide by their own policies that are already in place.

J. Peters: Okay.

A. Quick: I don’t know where that, how we move on that one. Do I make a, we don’t, we originally talked about it, and I spoke with Dr. Rosenbaum was, for those of you that don’t know, in the past, they’ve tried to create a grievance policy and it failed. It never went anywhere. It was sent to the committee through the Faculty Senate, I believe. We wanted to bring it to this community as a whole and see where you would like to go with it but again, the students really would like to see something be put in place to uphold certain requirements of the faculty and staff, just as we do as students here as well. So, I don’t know if that is something that gets then voted on here to go, to be sent to a committee to work on, if there is an ad hoc committee that is created or how that works, but I’m bringing it to you for action today.
A. Rosenbaum: You could make the motion to send this to University Affairs and let the University Affairs Committee determine whether or not it seems worthwhile to modify that or develop a policy that refers to that in some way.

A. Quick: I so move it.

J. Peters: All right, so there is the motion of the lack of a student grievance process to the University Affairs Committee, specifically to look at the current grievance process to see if it can’t be broadened to accommodate, is that what you’re saying?

A. Quick: Not to use the grievance policy. We were actually moving away from that, but looking at this Code of Ethics.

J. Peters: I’m sorry, the Code of Conduct, the Professional Conduct section.

A. Quick: Correct.

A. Rosenbaum: But you’re looking for someone putting teeth into it.

A. Quick: Teeth into it so I mean, right now it’s just here and if someone doesn’t abide by it, what actually happens if they don’t? There’s nothing in it that says, there’s no enforcement mechanism in there.

J. Peters: So that’s the motion. Is there a second?

Unidentified: Second.

J. Peters: All right, there’s a second. All right, discussion. Yes?

Unidentified: Since we have the ombudsman here, I wonder if, Tim, you could speak to policies that are in place for students. I mean, there is no mechanism for them addressing grievances at the university?

T. Griffin: Depending on how you define the word, “mechanism,” students can certainly express their concerns directly to the faculty or staff member, and they can direct their concerns directly to the department chair, a faculty member, or a supervisor of a staff member. Is what I just said written anywhere? No. Does the department chair or the supervisor therefore by policy have to entertain or respond in some way to such a concern? No. So, from some students’ perspectives, there is no mechanism for expressing such concerns.

A. Rosenbaum: But there are mechanisms for sexual harassment, for discrimination, and for grade appeal.

T. Griffin: Yes. But those are not stipulated, although arguably, sexual harassment would be incorporated into the current Code of Ethics statements, the other two arguably are not.
Unidentified: Okay, thank you.

J. Peters: Okay, any other comments or questions? All right, so you know the motion is, this is to send it to University Affairs Committee and presumably Austin would meet with those people and tell them what the students’ concerns are. All right, 1-Yes, 2-No, 3-Abstain. Vote. You know, we need to get a big board. Voting is closed.

Yes – 31  
No – 6  
Abstain – 3

J. Peters: All right, it’s sent to committee.

A. Quick: Great, thank you. The last thing that we have, and I just wanted to give you an update, we’ve been working, both Elliott and I and numerous other students, with the bond fee revenue committee and one of the things I just want to make you aware of that we’re fighting for right now is our recreation center that all of you as staff members also have access to. I, personally, I have a membership, I know it doesn’t look that way, but I have a membership at FitWorkz, and I pay my $20 a month, but so I actually spend very little time in our own recreation center. But through this last few months of looking into this, Elliott and I have gotten a few tours by Sandy Carlisle, the director of the recreation center and to say that I was surprised was an understatement. We have equipment in there, treadmills in there from the 1990s. We have equipment that is pushed off to the side because it’s not usable. We have problems with wires all over the floor. There are a lot of problems over there and one of the things that we did last year was we gave $100,000 on top of what we usually fund to the recreation out of the student fees. we gave to the recreation center to purchase new equipment. I know that a few, some monies has been made available through the reserves, but one of the things we’re fighting for right now is to get, both as a community, to put some spotlight on the fact that we need to invest in these areas. Obviously, the building is going to need some improvements eventually, but for us, it’s just, we don’t hear students saying, “well the paint is peeling.” They complain that well, the treadmill doesn’t work. We had a student come in our office, this is where it all started, a student came in and said, “I was running on the treadmill and it stopped,” and then we went to Sandy and she said, “Yeah, well it’s been there since 1997.” We got a list of all the equipment. They have tennis shoes that there are, some type of shoes that they rent out to people that are over 20 years old. I mean, there’s some definite need there and we talk a lot about and we’re definitely excited to see the improvements on this campus in the three years I’ve been here, to see that building over there rise up out of the ground and see all the improvements on campus, but this is an area where the students and also this affects all of you since you all, I’m assuming a lot of you use it, it needs improvement. So, we would like to see the support of this body and the faculty and staff to support us finding more resources in this tough economic times to put more money into our recreation center, because it is very, when students come to this campus and they look around, they look at where they’re going to eat, where they’re going to sleep, where they’re going to exercise, and we want to make sure that people go into our facility at a campus this large and see that we have the adequate resources for them. I don’t know if it’s, in looking at what Sandy has sent us, it looks like over the years because of budgetary problems, they’ve pushed things off in the cycles when they were supposed to be replaced and we just really have to get a hold of that and make that a priority from this point forward. So, that was more of a report than any type of
looking for any action.

**J. Peters:** Well, you paint such a wonderful picture, I’m not going over there to look at shoes.

**A. Quick:** You can come to FitWorkz with me.

**J. Peters:** Maybe our vice president for student affairs wants to comment, that’s in his portfolio.

**B. Hemphill:** I think, just like the rest of the institution, there are a lot of issues that we have to prepare to respond to, but we’ve also made significant investments when the funds have been available. So, I know that there’s been equipment purchased every year, but there are still situations in which this is something that we have to look at. We have to make sure that we’re monitoring it closely, but we do it depending on resources and we’ve just been in some tight times as a university. So, we’ll continue to look at this and monitor this very closely. As we can have additional resources made available, we’ll definitely invest it in that because we know. One of the things that wasn’t mentioned is it’s highly utilized. I think last year, we had a little over, what was the number?

**A. Quick:** 420,000.

**B. Hemphill:** 420,000 actual students go through that facility. So, it’s a high-use area and so we understand the passion of the students around this and it’s something we’ll continue to look at.

**A. Quick:** And to add on, just for a brief moment, with this bond fee meeting that we’ve been going to, it’s not just the recreation facility, it’s also the student center. We’ve been working closely with Mitch, the director of this facility, which I can’t pronounce his last name, Kielb, and making sure that they have the adequate needs and resources to them as well since this is a highly used student building. The biggest thing is we have at least what we’re building in the Student Association is a pride for this campus. We feel that we’ve got it in us, we just need to invest a little more. We understand that times are tough, but we would like to see a little more attention made in those areas. And we know that we’re making improvements, but we definitely want to make sure that we keep reminding people that this is something that needs to be done, especially for when Dr. Peters doesn’t go over there so you can use in the future. We’ll go on the treadmills together, you and I.

**J. Peters:** Well, I must say that now I know you’re over there, I’m going to come and watch this. Well, it sounds as if you have had the opportunity to make this case and I don’t, it sounds as if the vice president for student affairs, obviously is cognizant of this and we have a lot of strategic fiscal plans that we try to do and this has been in the mix and need to find a way of giving it some more attention.

**A. Quick:** Yeah, we are one of, well, I just had the discussion the other day with one of the trustees and we’re one of the only schools on the map that doesn’t have a rock climbing wall. That’s one of the areas…

**J. Peters:** A what?
A. Quick: A rock climbing wall, I didn’t know that was a thing.

J. Peters: I wonder what the liability is on that.

A. Quick: Does Dr. Williams want to comment?

E. Williams: I’ll give you some history. Actually about 12 years ago, we had a climbing wall as part of our requests, capital requests, and the trustees voted it down.

J. Peters: It’s a liability issue? Rappelling towers and all that have become…

E. Williams: It was more than 12 years ago.

J. Peters: Yeah, it was not on my watch. I’m all for climbing walls.

A. Quick: Well, that’s what we’ll name after you Dr. Peters after you leave.

J. Peters: Okay, are you done?

A. Quick: I’m done.

J. Peters: I love that guy.

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – Page 14

J. Peters: All right, where are we now, Andy Small, Operating Staff Council. Do you need a rock climbing wall?

A. Small: I tell you, that’s a tough act to follow, I will say that. We don’t have quite as exciting things going on with the operating staff right now but just a couple quick things to make it brief. We are currently looking at our bylaws and our constitution. We are revising those documents and as such, we will probably bring some corrections to the University Council to incorporate into the University Council Constitution as changes in our situation occur. Other than that, you can read the things that we’re trying to get done here. The one thing I did want to do is publically thank Jim Lockard and Representative Bob Pritchard for attending our forum last month about the pension reform situation, very well attended. Thanks for any of you who did have the chance to come and attend that particular forum. We plan on trying to do that again in the spring as more information becomes available.

J. Peters: Thank you Andy. Any questions for Andy?

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – report – Page 15

J. Peters: Todd, you’re going to do our SPS Council report?

T. Latham: Yes, I’ll take us home for the meeting, I’ll finish up. At the SPS Council, it’s been an interest of our members to bring forward representatives from other university committees to
speak to us about their activities. One of the issues that has become a concern is campus parking. So we brought John Gordon who is in SPS as well as ____ and John serves as the chair of that committee. We had discussed and this is really a report of bullet points I see as I prepared, but I just wanted to let you know some of the issues that we’re concerned about as SPS on this campus. Funding and projects, we want to know what’s going on, where improvements will take place, what we can expect, as well as parking needs. We had some concerns about parking garage safety, about the speed which people travel in the parking garage, as well as going from and to their vehicles. We had a discussion about green initiatives through the campus parking office. For those of you that aren’t aware, we have a purple lot at the Convocation Center that’s a discount rate. We talked about improvements to that location, some type of shelter and rearranging some of the bus schedules to make sure that employees that want to use that certainly could. We’ve been in partnership with the Operating Staff Council about a tiered parking system that would take into consideration employee pay and how fees might be structured to complement them as well as a parking scholarship for those that couldn’t afford the parking cost. Then, the last conversation we had was regarding handicap parking on campus, the use of that as well as possible abuses that might be taking place.

We then invited Vice President Cunningham and Assistant Vice President [Celeste] Latham to attend our council. We’ve had some ongoing concerns in respect to human resource functions and services provided to employees, so we as an area in which we must report our time that we spend each day and report it each month. I’ll be doing mine when I leave the Council meeting today. We’ve had some concerns about the timeframe and some of the repercussions if you can’t file your report on time. We had open and honest discussions about pension updates, how that might affect us and some of our views on how the university might respond to a mass exodus from the university, some type of comprehensive plan to assure us that workload would be of concern and that would be monitored and regulated. We’re always looking to update our SPS job descriptions. To us, it’s important that we look at that as well as our evaluations. Not only that compensation time but especially how we’re doing as employees, they give us future guidance. We discussed the possibility of a webinar clearinghouse for training as our SPS members have indicated that training funding has been cut and become very difficult. We’ve asked the university to look at reviewing some training that might be available as well as making sure that those are safe, secure, and appropriate sites to train our employees. We’ve looked at our SPS salary survey as everybody else has at the other councils are concerned about what other SPS or AP make across the state. We’ve asked about employer recognition system that might be implemented. We’re very concerned about the SUCSS audit, how that might change some of our SPS positions back to civil service positions and how that might impact the mission on the university and our ability to recruit and retain our employees. We have had an ongoing battle to make supervisory training mandatory at the university to assure that supervisors are given every tool that they need to be effective supervisors to oversee our employees. The last issue is we have a difference of employee benefits between our regular and temporary SPS and we’ve been working to get some benefits improved on their behalf.

The last item is we had a discussion about the purpose and use of the NIU One Card as that came up in respect to the fees and whether or not that actually is a university identification card or it has other privileges associated with that that are independent. The last we did was elected a new member as one has left the university and needed to replaced.
J. Peters: All right, any questions? Very thorough report, active group.

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

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

J. Peters: All right, the hour is late. Anything else to come before the house?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

J. Peters: Motion to adjourn?

Members: So moved.

J. Peters: We are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.