I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Peters: I’m pleased to call the Wednesday, April 3, 2013 University Council meeting to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:12 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters: Our first action is adoption of today’s agenda as written. There are no walk-ins or corrections. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda?

D. Haliczer: So moved.

R. Lopez: Second.

J. Peters: All those in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed? We have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 27, 2013 UC MEETING
(distributed electronically)
**J. Peters:** Next item, approval of the minutes of February 27 which were distributed electronically. I’ll call for any additions or corrections. Hearing none is there a motion to approve the minutes of February 27?

**Z. Bohn:** So moved.

**M. Theodore:** Second.

**J. Peters:** All those in favor say aye.

All: Aye.

**J. Peters:** Opposed? Okay we have minutes approved.

**IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**J. Peters:** It’s a distinct pleasure for me to yield my announcement and my time to our new president, Doug Baker. And the new first lady is with us, Dana Stover. I invited them today. Alan and I invited them to see shared governance in operation. They have some things to do but the new president would like to make a few remarks and will take questions and I’ll moderate. President Baker.

**D. Baker:** Thank you, President Peters. Can I stand up? Is that okay in this forum so I can see you all? Well, thank you for having us. This is my wife, Dana Stover. Dana is currently the assistant dean in the College of Business and Economics at the University of Idaho and has been there for a couple decades. And I’ve been at the University of Idaho for eight years as the provost and executive vice president. Prior to coming over, I was at Washington State University for 24 years. For those of you that know the geography of that part of the country, they are eight miles apart. The University of Idaho campus actually touches the Washington border so you can zoom over to WSU in just a few minutes. And we have great collaboration and there are more than 30,000 students in the area. That’s a company town. We really appreciate that collaboration and have great opportunities to work together.

Collaborations are really important at that level and they are important in faculty and governance, obviously, with the administration and faculty. I came up through the Faculty Senate ranks actually at Washington State University and filled a lot of committee roles and was on a faculty appeals board that looked at governance and grievance issues and then ultimately was voted to become the chair of the Faculty Senate. I learned a lot. I’d been at the university for a long time before I took that role and really thought I understood what was going on, but I found out I knew a little piece of the institution. I didn’t know all the great things across the university. Filling these kinds of roles teaches you so much about how a system works. That was invaluable in my personal development.

After I did that, I took on a role that was maybe somewhat unique in Washington and that was the faculty legislative liaison. Each of the universities in Washington has a lobbyist, the liaison, and would work the state legislature. There was a council of six faculty lobbyists in the state and
I was part of that structure. We put together common ideas across the state on critical issues to us. It was always funny. There was a certain pecking order in terms of who legislators would listen to in Washington. The people they’d listen to the most were the student lobbyist and then the faculty lobbyist and then the university lobbyist because they felt like they were getting the straight story from students and what was important. And the students can really be catalytic if they have warm relationships and open relationships with legislators, as can faculty. That’s a little bit of my history at Washington State.

At the University of Idaho, our faculty governance structure is fairly intense. We meet weekly which is a lot of meetings but it’s an important 90 minutes each week for us to get together, at least in our culture, and share. And so I give a report each week as the provost and executive vice president and we have great dialog in those meetings. And that’s really allowed me to develop a culture and a relationship with the faculty.

One of the things that we both struggle together with is getting the governance structure communicating out with the broader faculty and staff and students of the university. It’s easy to have learned conversations in a meeting like this, but then how do you bring everybody else along afterwards. That’s something we continue to struggle with but are making some strides in terms of using new media and other venues to get the word out. I look forward to working with all of you and developing that community and collaboration and moving forward on energizing this institution.

I want to thank President Peters and Barbara for their 13 years of work. They’ve built a tremendous foundation here at the university with all your collective help. I’ve met with students the last few days and they are impressed with what you provide for them and they also have some good ideas on how to do things better. All of us do, and this is an opportunity to energize that and build on the great foundation that John and all of you have built.

On behalf of Dana and myself, I just want to say how thrilled we are to be joining the university and can’t wait to get on board so thanks and any questions, I’d be happy to entertain any and, of course, I’ll be back and answer them when I know a little bit more. If none, Dana and I are going to run off to our next adventure. Do you want to speak for a while? I keep offering her the opportunity.

J. Peters: Last night Barbara and I had the pleasure of having dinner with, I call them the double D’s, and it was foundational. One reason is because Dana is from Lincoln, Nebraska and I knew quality immediately when I saw it. But I will tell you that I am very, very pleased to hand this great university off. This is a great fit for all of us and I look forward to great things. Thanks for accepting.

D. Baker: And just one last thing, at lunch, we had a luncheon with the search committee and you were ably represented on that committee so I want to thank you for all of your input and the co-chairing of it. They worked hard and it was a broadly representative group. And they thought about the institution as a whole and not parochially from their area. I think you were well represented. They obviously made a great choice, right? I guess I have a biased opinion about that but it really was a good group. Part of attracting a good candidate is having a good process.
If you go through a process that’s not well organized or it looks parochial or people don’t know what they are doing, you get turned off. You don’t want to join that kind of organization. This was the other end of the continuum. It was very well run. It was very well represented. The questions were good. The deportment of everybody there was impressive and it showed us the community and its many strengths. So, just my thanks to the search committee and your able leadership. Thanks.

J. Peters: Thank you and good luck with the rest of your day.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Pages 3-4

J. Peters: Let’s move to Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. Sonya, I saw you yesterday at the IBHE meeting. There you are, Sonya Armstrong.

S. Armstrong: Hi, I’ll make this brief. This is a report from the March 15 meeting. A couple things I’ll highlight on this report: First, there is a vacancy for one of the assistant director positions in academic affairs. The deadline has now passed so this is yet another staff position that we probably all ought to be following. The public four-year caucus continues to work on white papers. Two topics that may be relevant for us: One is faculty activity and productivity reporting, and the other is the value of higher education. So, if anyone has any contributions to make, please send them to me. We had some visitors; I think one important visitor was Senator Daniel Biss who talked about Senate Bill 1900. We’ve heard a little bit about this in other forums, that’s the open access journal bill. Then finally on the second page of the report you’ll see a list of some current active bills that involve higher education that we probably all want to be aware of and be following. I’ll take any questions.

J. Peters: Yesterday we had an IBHE meeting which you’ll probably report on at the next meeting and we had an in-depth report on the legislative issues, pension. And you will see in the next day or two, maybe next week, that the presidents of the universities and the chancellors have come together to support a set of principles and an approach to pension reform that we feel is appropriate. So watch for that. In terms of legislative update, there’s one or two issues that are out there that are of concern. Of course, there is conceal-and-carry that is going forward and the university presidents unanimously supported an exemption for universities as sensitive places that would give us the prerogative to ban weapons and that’s moving forward. We’ll see where that goes. There are many, many bills out there. I think the one that is of concern to us, there’s a bill once again to eliminate the dependency waiver for employees for dependants. Of course we think this is a particularly inappropriate piece of legislation since it’s a contractual thing and it’s a great benefit to the state and to employees to attract good employees to university. So we are in the season now of monitoring and being ready to act at any moment so we may be calling upon you for some help. Okay, thank you, Sonya. Okay, if it’s germane to the IBHE report, if not at another point in time.
D. Cho: On the second page, I saw waivers of out of state tuition and I’d like to ask if you have further information or if there is any way that I can get more information.

S. Armstrong: I can certainly send you some information on that, but basically the context of that is establishing perhaps a reciprocity agreement wherein students from neighboring states would not have to pay out-of-state tuition and maybe even beyond just the neighboring states. Apparently this is going on in other states where some Illinois students are moving. That’s the context of that but I can certainly send information if you give me your information.

J. Peters: Okay, does that answer your question? Okay good, very good. Sonya, you’re done.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – report – Pages 5-9

J. Peters: All right, Andy Small has a report on Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – board committee.

A. Small: Thank you, President Peters. Good afternoon everyone. It’s my pleasure to give you a quick report on the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees. If you’d like to follow along, it’s on pages 5 through 9. The main points I believe that people are interested in probably on page 6 and 7 are the sabbatical approvals. If your name is on the list, you were approved for a sabbatical coming up, so congratulations on that. The fees for courses then are discussed. There is some narrative on that. I’d be happy to answer any questions that anyone might have. Requests for new minors, request for new emphasis and request to delete an emphasis, are outlined on the last pages there. The oral English proficiency annual report was given. It was reported that 48 departments, no one had any student complaints. I think that’s very good for our university. I’ll be happy to answer any questions if anyone has any but that concludes my report.


C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – report – Pages 10-13

J. Peters: I think Alan has the report on the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee.

A. Rosenbaum: The Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee report that you have on page 10 and 11. Most of those items were carried over to the Board of Trustees as were a few of the things Andy was talking about. In our subcommittees ______ recommendations to the board and then the board reviewed those and asked that we pass those so I’m not going to talk about most of these in context of the Finance, Facilities and Operations report but I will talk about some of these in context of the Board of Trustees report where they were actually ____. The only one I’m going to talk ______ is that approve a new sound system for our Huskie Stadium and also an LED ribbon board. I’m assuming that the ribbon board is one of those things that goes around the whole stadium and enables them, I think, to sell advertising, is that accurate?
**J. Peters:** Well, we are a poor university. We have a ribbon. It won’t go all the way around.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So anyway it did include that and I’ll cover most of the other things in the Board of Trustees report.

**J. Peters:** Okay thank you, Alan. Questions on the finance and facilities?

D. **BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – [report](#) – Page 14**

**J. Peters:** Hearing none, we’ll move to D. No we won’t. We will move to D., but it’s a written report only. Todd is not here or is Rosita giving that report? Sorry, Rosita, you’re giving the report.

**R. Lopez:** Okay, thank you. The Legislation Committee received a presentation by Christian Spears, deputy director of athletics on the NIU and NCAA athletic compliance system. It was very well received. They reported on areas of compliance, eligibility, violence and waivers, those type of areas. In addition, there was an update of Board of Trustees bylaws as they relate to the functions of the Executive Committee. We received the first reading. This update specifically addresses the composition, powers, duties, responsibilities, and limitations of the Executive Committee. The FY2012 financial audit was also presented to the committee and a 90th General Assembly report and budget was provided to committee members for review. And, as Dr. Peters shared earlier, more will follow on pensions and conceal-and-carry in the very near future. That’s the end of my report. Thank you.

**J. Peters:** Okay, are there any questions for Rosita? Thanks for doing that for Todd.

E. **BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – [report](#) – Pages 15-16**

**J. Peters:** Okay, now we move to E. and Alan is going to give the full Board of Trustees report on pages 15 and 16.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, the Board of Trustees met on Thursday, March 21. Chair Muerer started out by asking if anyone had filed for permission to speak to the board. People from the community can come in and ask for an opportunity to speak before the board and they are usually given five minutes. That also applies to people from within the university. We usually don’t get many people requesting to speak before the board, but this time we did. That person was Paul Sauser who’s a landlord in the community who apparently owns something like 500 rental units that rent out to students. He expressed some concern about the potential policy or the pending policy of the university that would require sophomores to live on campus in the dormitories. And his concern was that this would be a negative financial impact on landlords in the community. And so he further was concerned that if landlords lose revenue, they will not be able to keep up their properties. Then we would have lots of boarded up properties which would make the community look bad and would not be a good recruitment tool for the university. But then he went on to mention – and giving him some credit for fairness – that, when he was an
NIU student, he moved off-campus for his sophomore year, but then moved back his in his junior year and his grades went up. So he moved into the apartments and exactly what the university’s point is in requiring students to live on campus the second year. We feel that it would be better for their grades and that would increase our ability to retain them in the population. He, I guess, worked both sides of the aisle on that one.

Among the items that the chair approved, they approved the FY 2014 fee recommendations. Every year the fees and room-and-board rates are all reconsidered. President Peters has traditionally asked the group doing this to keep the fee increases under three percent, and again, they were able to do that. So the fee recommendations this year will increase an average of 2.77 percent for students who pay the health insurance. It’s a little higher for students who opt out of the health insurance. The board also approved the room-and-board rates. Housing rates increased an average of 1.9 percent, whereas the board rates increased 8.3 percent. The board rates have not gone up in several years and this is mainly due to an increase in food prices. Since we don’t grow our own food here, when food prices go up, so do the board rates. The average increase was 3.08 percent. The board also approved the distributed learning fees. If we are going to expand the amount of credits that we try to offer online, then we have to have fees associated with that and so they approved that. They also approved the College of Law excellence fee and increased it to $120 per credit hour. This is why lawyers charge so much when you actually get into the profession. The board approved all requested sabbatical leaves as Andy mentioned so that is a very positive thing. We always appreciate that the board supports the sabbatical policy. It is at some peril. I think there is a lot of pressure on boards to not approve sabbaticals because the rest of the world has trouble understanding these. President Peters calls these professional development leaves which is a much better way of putting it. Other people view this, as you know, they imagine the faculty sunning themselves on the beach or something instead of working, whereas this clearly is very important to increasing the excellence of our faculty. And Provost Alden has repeatedly shown reports indicating the productivity of faculty on sabbatical leave. We’re very appreciative of the board’s continual support of our policy. They approved all the sabbatical leaves so that’s excellent. They also, this is more curiosity than anything else, they approved two honorary degrees. One to Her Royal Highness Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn, of Thailand and this marks the first time that NIU has given an honorary degree to the member of a royal family. That’s kind of exciting. We’re also going to, they also approved the College of Law issuing a honorary degree to former governor of Illinois, James R. Thompson. Those two honorary degrees will be given in the May graduation I believe.

J. Peters: Law is in June. Law is a separate graduation.

A. Rosenbaum: And the board also approved the promotion of Bill Nicklas to vice president for public safety and community relations. Some of you may know Bill. He has done a great job for the university in a number of different positions over the last year or so. It’s a well-deserved promotion. Anyone have any questions about anything in the report? I’d be happy to try and answer them.

J. Peters: A lot was done at that meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: It was a very big meeting and it also had two executive sessions I think. The
board was actually in there between like nine o’clock and maybe five or six o’clock at night. The meeting itself was enormous, but a lot of that was in executive session.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Sean Farrell, Chair – no report
G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Paul Carpenter, Chair, no report
H. Rules and Governance Committee – Melissa Lenczewski, Chair, no report
I. University Affairs Committee – Kathleen Coles, Chair
   1. 2022-2023 academic calendar – Page 17

J. Peters: Okay, let’s move to standing committees and I know Kathleen Coles, chair of the University Affairs Committee has three items for our consideration.

K. Coles: Thank you, President Peters. The University Affairs Committee, as you indicate, has three items for the council today. The first two relate to the academic calendar and I will discuss those together. One is a measure that comes up every year. As you probably know, the bylaws require that we approve the academic calendar ten years in advance. The University Affairs Committee has reviewed a draft of the 2022-23 calendar, which is on the screen there, and is submitting it to the council for approval. In connection, do you want to vote on that first?

J. Peters: No, go ahead.

K. Coles: In connection with the review of that calendar, though, we were also charged with taking a look at the guidelines and principles for establishing it. Those were initially established in 1978 and there’ve been a number of revisions since then by a number of authors and, in the process of revising, a couple of the revisions didn’t actually make it into the guidelines. One of those related to years in which August, the last Monday in August is very late in the month, so that if you kept to the regular guidelines we would run into a real crunch in December trying to get exams finished and so forth. There had been earlier a motion to put in a provision to account for that and start classes a week earlier in those years. So that had never made it into the official guidelines so it has now been placed in the revisions or the revised version. The Honor’s Day provisions had also been approved in the past and weren’t in the full set of guidelines. They had to be pulled out of another source. So we’ve included those and then we’ve also just made housekeeping changes to the language to try to conform the style a bit and make it a little bit easier to read for those of us who have to read and apply the guidelines to the calendar. I guess I forgot there’s also a minor change in the language about the College of Law calendar which does not follow the university calendar except to the extent we honor the same holidays. None of those are substantive revisions. They all reflect current practice as far as I know. We also submit that to the council for approval.

J. Peters: We need to take them one at a time.

K. Coles: Probably.
J. Peters: We need a motion on 1., the ten-year calendar approval on page 17. Is that your motion?

K. Coles: Yes, I move to that we adopt the calendar.

J. Peters: In the discussion when Alan and I and Ray, the provost, get together to discuss this, a question came up. Why ten years in advance? We were befuddled as to why. Does anyone know why ten years in advance? I came up with, what’s that game where you make up an answer, Pictionary or something. I made up an answer that because we used to print the catalog and it was expensive to change the printing of the catalog. No that was maybe the fatal error slipping into rationality there, but does anyone know why ten years? Someone blamed admissions.

A. Rosenbaum: I blamed them.

J. Peters: You blamed admissions.

A. Rosenbaum: I didn’t really blame as attributed to them.

J. Peters: Kelly do you want to defend that? Okay, anyway, we are looking into that.

D. Cho: Second.

J. Peters: There is a motion and a second. All those in favor of the ten-year calendar approval.

Members: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed?

2. Revision to Guidelines and Principles for Establishment of Academic Calendar – Pages 18-22

J. Peters: You move 2. the revision of the guidelines?

K. Coles: I also move that we adopt the revised guidelines.

Z. Bohn: Second.

J. Peters: There’s a second, discussion. All those in favor of the revision to the guidelines.

Members: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed. All right, now 3.

**K. Coles:** Our third item is part of the charge of the University Affairs Committee. The ombudsperson serves three-year terms. The University Affairs Committee is charged in the first two years to conduct an annual evaluation. In the third year, there’s a special committee appointed that reviews whether the contract should be approved and the University Affairs Committee does not conduct an evaluation.

We haven’t had a new ombudsperson for a long time so this year we were faced with conducting an evaluation of Sarah Klaper who barely had time to get started in her office and has not yet prepared her annual report because it’s not due until the end of the semester. That hopefully won’t be an occurrence very frequently but, in the course of looking at prior proposals by the 2010-11 University Affairs Committee, and discussing it among ourselves this year, we agreed that there’s also been a problem with the types and volume of information that’s available to make these evaluations. Even when Tim was here, there were only six responses I think in his last UAC review from members of the community about his performance in office. There was a proposal back from the 2010-11 committee to have a required self-evaluation which has been done informally since then and to try to institute a survey process of users of the ombudsperson’s office.

This year though, we also considered whether it was really necessary to have an annual review. It seems to make more sense to us, for a variety of reasons, to have a mid-term evaluation by the University Affairs Committee in the fall of the second year of each three-year term and that would be followed in the third year by the other review process for renewing the contract. It’s hoped that that would sort of reduce some of the evaluation fatigue, I call it, from those who respond to our requests for comments. It would enable us to look at a more recent annual report rather than only having one that’s almost a year old when we do it. That has been proposed in the revisions to 19.4 of the university bylaws for which this would be the first reading. I think the changes are self-explanatory so I’m going to stop there and see if anybody has any questions.

**J. Peters:** So it is a bylaw change as a first reading. We need a motion and that’s the motion I take it? We need a second.

**D. LeFlore:** Second.

**J. Peters:** All right, is there a first reading discussion?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Unless someone else wants to go first. I mainly have a question. My first question is: I think that when you think about this in terms of a specific person, like Sarah who is by all accounts doing a very good job, the idea of doing these evaluations seems tedious. But, where is our protection in this if we, let’s say, get a new ombudsperson and that person is doing a terrible job and we want to give feedback on that in the first year? So this sort of takes that out of our hands. And the second consideration I think is: Everybody seems to get evaluated on an annual basis so we evaluate our faculty and SPS personnel advisor on an annual basis. We evaluate faculty on an annual basis. That’s pretty standard. So why would we want to exclude the ombudsperson from what everyone else experiences. Those are my only comments.
K. Coles: I agree that the first point is a downside of this change. I don’t understand part of the process myself. I guess I assumed that if there were complaints about the ombudsperson that the president would have the ability to take action even without the evaluation, but I don’t know that that’s the case. So I guess that’s a question that I’ll throw back.

A. Rosenbaum: How would those comments get to the president though if no one was soliciting or it would have to be someone …

K. Coles: Well, I guess I should also say is what we’re hoping to do is to have an ongoing survey process where users of the office are asked to, they don’t have to fill out, but they’re asked fill out a survey. And we’d like to set up the ability to have those surveys turned in to an administrative official. They need to be anonymous. We have to think about confidentiality issues but that person would keep records and could alert the committee, or whoever, if there starts to seem to be problems that need to be dealt with. We haven’t worked out the details of that, but that is in the works to try to deal with the issue.

A. Rosenbaum: So, would that be part of, that wouldn’t be part of this? We’d be approving this and then coming back to it later?

K. Coles: No. There is just a general reference to the surveys. I think this would be imposed by the University Affairs Committee, itself, in doing the reviews.

A. Rosenbaum: That answered my question but I think the issue still remains that that might be a reason why we’re not doing it.

K. Coles: All right.

J. Peters: A fix up might be a provision for an extraordinary review outside the cycle based upon some input.

S. Klaper: Just wanted to comment that Tim Griffin used to do those surveys, but he had them returned to the ombudsperson’s office and then included that material in his annual review. And so the change would be then, what university affairs is discussing, is to have the surveys returned to an external body, university affairs or somebody and then that would be the alerting mechanism possibly.

J. Peters: All right, any other comments on first reading?

K. Coles: Is there a request that we have an amendment for an extraordinary review process?

J. Peters: Yeah, are there any directives back to the committee for second reading? What about if you take this under consideration and perhaps come back with some language?

A. Rosenbaum: Maybe if we can get a sense of the body. Do people feel that they are favorable towards this? Or are people concerned that we need to retain the right to review during the first year and that the ombudsperson should be reviewed every year? If the body is not in favor of
that, we can just leave it as it is as a first reading and we have to have a second reading anyway.

**J. Peters:** So, it would be a straw vote. Show of hands for all those who are comfortable with the revisions as proposed. All those who are concerned.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, why don’t we send it back to the committee with the suggestion that they reconsider those comments that have been made and decide whether or not they want to make any adjustments or whether they want to bring it back to the body as is?

**J. Peters:** You can bring it back as is or make an adjustment.

**K. Coles:** Just for clarification, would there need to be another first reading if we revise?

**A. Rosenbaum:** I think we can accept as a friendly amendment.

**J. Peters:** That’s the reason for a first reading.

**K. Coles:** All right, we will discuss it at the next committee meeting next week.

**J. Peters:** More work. Okay, all right, good.

**F. Bryan:** Is there a motion on the floor?

**A. Rosenbaum:** We don’t vote on first reading.

**J. Peters:** And then you discuss it and if there is need for more, we just did what a first reading is supposed to do. You could waive the second reading and go right to, but in this case, the committee has work to do.

**J. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and James Zanayed, Speaker – report**

**J. Peters:** All right, now let’s move into some reports. Student Association, I think Delonte is giving it today.

**D. LeFlore:** Good afternoon, everyone. First of all I want to start off on behalf of the student body to congratulate Dr. Baker on his appointment to be the 12th president of Northern Illinois University. We are excited for the new leadership. We are excited for the new opportunities and continuing to move NIU in a forward direction. With that being said, I am also excited to turn over my hat as well as being a student body president. Just last week we elected the 45th student body president, Jack Berry. He will take office I believe the third of May. I get out before you, so I’m excited about that. The team is eagerly trying to assemble their cabinet and they will continue to look forward to working with administrative staff and faculty to continue to enhance the quality of life for students here.

My next thing that I wanted to talk about in dealing with our elections is, we had a referendum on the ballot that talked about the importance of campus recreation and out of the and if I’m not
mistaken the 1200 or so votes, 1400 and something students’ votes that came out, which is
definitely an increase from last year, we had 937 students who said that campus recreation
should be a priority on the list of institution to addressing. And that continues to reiterate the
importance of us needed to address campus recreation and as a funding mechanism and
enhancing the recreation space itself.

The next thing that we wanted to talk about is the amnesty policy that we’ve been eagerly
working with different constituents among the university as well as DeKalb community. We just
received a five-page letter from DeKalb’s attorney gently saying that they are not interested in
pursuing an amnesty policy. And so what we’re doing now is taking that answer and bringing it
back to the table to figure out where do we go from here and how can we continue to try to get
some of these initiatives taken care of, whether it’s the institution providing opportunities here at
NIU and continuing working with DeKalb and express some examples that it would fall into
place for students and not the extreme example they provided in their answer. We are continuing
to address that. We will be meeting this Friday.

Last, but not least, we had a student representative, our director of government affairs, Nick
Bender, who met with Senator Dick Durbin today to talk about military student service and I am
going to yield to him to talk about that for a second.

N. Bender: For those of you who know me, I’ll try and keep this under 45 minutes. I’m just
kidding. Real quick, just a brief summary, Senator Durbin was on campus today to talk to
military student services and several veteran students who are on campus about some of the
challenges we have as veterans coming into the civilian world or college and how we can try and
curb that curve that we may have as a result of our active duty or inactive duty or whatever it
ends up being. We talked a little bit about the MSS, the military student service system that we
have on campus right now and how it works. We are 26th in the nation, 28th in the nation, so
we’re pretty darn good in my opinion as far as how we treat our veterans. We’re definitely on the
right side of that. We talked a little bit about personal challenges that we have and how we can
possibly change some things to help military students and a little bit about some bad stuff that
happens with for-profit universities exploiting military benefits and how we can combat that in a
professional forum as a university. That is it. Thank you for your time.

D. LeFlore: Are there any questions?

J. Peters: It was really a thrill to have the majority leader on campus today. He has been a good
friend to NIU over the years and what a pleasure it was for me to be able to introduce Senator
Durbin to our new president. And we had a wonderful talk about issues that are of concern to us,
basically on campus about military students. He praised what we do for our over 800 veterans on
campus. And we had, for your interest, another talk about a subject that’s dear to his heart and
my heart, and that’s gun control and the status of conceal-and-carry in the state and federal
legislation. Then we had a very good discussion about federal student aid. One of the things that
Senator Durbin is very concerned about is the role of for-profit universities that have not a very
good track record of abusing federal aid and then not graduating their students. He said to us,
you only need to know three numbers. It’s 12, 25 and 47. Twelve percent is the number of
students, co-secondary students that make up federal aid who are from a for-profit institution, so
12 percent. Twenty-five percent is the amount. So 12 percent, eat up 25 percent and 47 percent is the percentage of student default loans. Forty-seven percent of all students who default on loans come from proprietary, for-profit institutions. He was pretty hot about it and I am too because it seems to me that money should go for non-profit institutions like ours rather than for-profit institutions. I’m sorry, DeLonte. I infringed on your time but I had to get that in. Okay, any questions on any of that?

R. Lopez: Well, just before you go on, can you tell me what the 25 percent was again?

J. Peters: Twenty-five percent, in terms of the number of students who get aid, federal post-secondary, 12 percent come from the for-profits, but they take up 25 percent of the total dollar and then 47 percent of all students who default are from for-profits – 12, 25, 47 as Senator Durbin says, that’s all you have to know about the problem. I may run for Senate in my….

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – Page 25

J. Peters: Okay, Andy Small you’re going to report on Operating Staff Council.

A. Small: Thank you, President Peters. A couple of quick things: All of those who nominated operating staff people for the Outstanding Service Award, we truly appreciate that. That announcement will be coming out shortly with our banquet towards the end of May. We look forward to that. Also we have a workplace issues committee and you may have heard me talk about tiered parking in the past. We appreciate the work that the parking committee has done on that and, if you know someone or are in that situation yourself, where you can make a case for special needs, you can apply to the parking committee on an appeals form and they will take a look at considering to either reducing or eliminating your parking fees at this point. So if you know somebody who is one of those special-need type situations, please direct them to the parking committee, they might be able to help them with their parking fees on campus. The last thing I’d like to draw your attention to: Last year you may have remembered Pat Siebrasse. Pat Siebrasse came to our University Council meeting a 50-year employee here at NIU. Absolutely incredible, 50 years. She is actually going to retire at this point and I think walk away from us. That particular farewell party for Pat is Thursday, April 11, from 3 to 6 p.m. I believe it’s in the Chandelier Room over in Adams Hall and there are remarks at 4. So if you want to take part in that very prestigious event for probably one of our only 50-year employees at NIU ever in the history of NIU, please make sure you mark it on your calendars to attend for Pat. With that, that concludes my report, I’ll be glad to answer any questions if there are any.

J. Peters: Questions for Andy? Let’s all try to make that retirement party.

A. Small: Fifty years, isn’t that incredible?

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – report – Page 26

J. Peters: Okay, the Supportive Professional Staff Council report, Todd isn’t here. There is a written report only on page 26. Donna you…?
D. Smith: I can answer questions that anybody has.

J. Peters: Okay Donna can answer any questions.

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

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, Article 14.6.4 Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum – ACTION ITEM – Pages 27-28

J. Peters: All right, then let’s move into unfinished business. We have proposed revisions on NIU bylaws. This was a grammatical fix-up. It’s on page 27-28. We’ve had two readings. We need a motion, a second and a vote.

D. Smith: I’d like to make the motion.

J. Peters: We have a motion.

M. Lenczewski: Second.

J. Peters: We have a second. Discussion?

A. Rosenbaum: We do but we need to do a count first to make sure that…

J. Peters: We need to make sure we have a quorum. It’s a bylaw change. What is our number we need?

A. Rosenbaum: 40 or 41?

J. Peters: We need 40, so press 1 if you’re alive and eligible, right?

A. Rosenbaum: It wasn’t open yet. What do we do Pat?

J. Peters: Now is it open? It’s open.

A. Rosenbaum: Press 1 if you’re here. Just tell us what it is Pat. What is it? All right reset it.

J. Peters: Don’t press until given the word.

A. Rosenbaum: Go, press it. One. What is it? 39. Did everyone vote?

J. Peters: Do we have any legitimate alternates here?

A. Rosenbaum: Is there anyone who didn’t vote who doesn’t know that maybe they are a voting member?
J. Peters: Okay, do we have a quorum? 41. Mayor Daly, would you re-set so we could vote? Are we ready to vote on the third reading? Do we have questions? A 1 is in favor of the proposed bylaw change, 2 is no and 3 is abstain. Let us know when we are ready. Ready, vote.

A. Rosenbaum: 1 is yes, 2 is no, 3 is abstain. An abstain is the same as no. Do we have it? Do we have 40 yes votes? It passes.

J. Peters: All right it passes.

??: No it doesn’t

J. Peters: We have someone who is inert who is not voting.

??: There is only 38.

A. Rosenbaum: I thought you said we had 41?

P. Erickson: We have 41 total votes, but we do not have 40 in favor. Thirty-eight voted yes, two voted no and one abstained.

A. Rosenbaum: So it fails. We need 40 yes votes to pass it. Can we do it again? Can we do it again, Ferald? Is that allowed? Someone who voted no would have to make a motion to reconsider. Did anyone vote no that’s willing to ask for a reconsideration vote?

??: Alan, when you took roll, Pat put it up quick and then put it away, somebody pushed 3 on the first question where you said push 1 if you are here. So somebody might not understand the technology.

A. Rosenbaum: All right who doesn’t understand the technology?

J. Peters: You can call for a quorum call to determine whether we, in fact, had a quorum because the vote may have been illegitimate. How about that?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you’re saying we can vote again?

J. Peters: Someone could have a quorum call to see if it established that there was a quorum. If there are not, what do we need 41?

??: We need 40.

A. Rosenbaum: Henceforth, this will be known as the Peters exemption. We are going to do this again?

J. Peters: All voting members raise your hand. We are going to do a count.
A. Rosenbaum: All right, we have enough people. So are we going to re-vote this?

???: We cannot.

Pat: 41 people voted.

???: We cannot revote unless somebody makes the motion.

J. Peters: All right, so it failed.

1 – YES – 38
2 – NO – 2
1 – ABSTAIN - 1

The motion failed.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS


J. Peters: Okay, we have an item of new business which is a proposed revision to our bylaws again. This is a first reading and it’s a revision to the academic personnel process and to the Academic Policies and Procedures manual. It’s a first reading. It’s on pages 29 through 31. Can anyone frame this for us.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, Chris McCord.

J. Peters: Do you want to comment on it? Where did this come from?

A. Rosenbaum: It came from the Faculty Senate.

C. McCord: So this addresses faculty joint appointments. This is a type of appointment that is becoming increasingly important to the university as we try harder and harder to diversify our offerings and fully leverage our faculty strengths. We have a number of people who hold joint appointments of various types. What this particularly speaks to are people who hold joint appointments between two units within the university, whether it might be somebody who holds an appointment between two departments or between a department in an inter-disciplinary center. In that environment faculty, this is an issue about faculty rights and responsibilities with regard to tenure. As an employee, as a personnel process for other purposes, we have pretty good processes in place. But for tenure, the question of how the tenure decision operates for faculty holding joint appointments, some of the language that has been present in university documents has struck me as problematic for people holding joint appointments – that it essentially said that
if an individual holding a joint appointment, if one of the units decides that they do not wish to
 tenure that person, the other unit can petition to take them on fully or they can be told that, for
 budgetary reasons, their position can no longer be funded and they can, therefore, be eliminated.

That sort of jeopardy seems to put people in joint appointments at a really heightened risk when they
come here. And I’ve requested that the Faculty Senate consider striking that language in order to
basically remove that sort of added threat, that added risk that people coming on joint
appointments might face. It simply strikes that language. It does not seek to replace it with
anything else. We’ve within our college, within the university level faculty senate, there’s been
close reading of these policies and the sense is that it’s not that we need to say something else
instead of this; we simply need to stop saying this. So the proposal is to strike language that
basically allows a unit to opt out of the joint appointment and then leave the other unit with the
obligation to either fully fund the joint appointment or let the person go, not because they don’t
want to tenure them, but because they simply can’t afford them.

A. Rosenbaum: And, again, Dean McCord brought this to our attention really to protect faculty.
The Faculty Senate concurred and passed this and is sending it along for University Council
approval.

J. Peters: All right, so we need a motion. Can we get a second?

A. Rosenbaum: I’ll make the motion on behalf of the Faculty Senate.

J. Peters: Is there a second?

R. Lopez: Second.

J. Peters: Now discussion? This is a first reading. All right, do we have enough to waive? I think
people left. We don’t have a quorum so we don’t want to jeopardize a waiver of the second
reading.

A. Rosenbaum: Well since we knocked down one a housekeeping measure, I don’t think we can
risk something like this.

J. Peters: All right so this will come back our last meeting. Okay thank you.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

J. Peters: All right, comments and questions from the floor? I’m glad our new president wasn’t
here the whole time.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

J. Peters: All right, you see the information items. I remind you that after our last meeting we
have our annual reception which will be somewhere in the building. Sometimes we hold it at the
residence, but for some reason there are boxes piled up in the residence and no one can move
around.

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, Graduate Council
L. Minutes, Honors Committee
M. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
N. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
O. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
P. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
Q. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

J. Peters: So with that shall we stand adjourned to our next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.