I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Looks like a full house today. Hopefully we have a constitutional quorum. I’d like to call the meeting to order. Welcome.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: First item today is the adoption of the agenda and we have a number of proposed changes to it. Let me go through them. Get your agendas out so you can keep score here. The first agenda amendment is to move Item VII. A., the constitutional amendment, up to the top to make sure we’ve got a quorum and enough people to vote one way or the other on it. Second, we’ve got three walk-in items. One is for me, it’s on the Deans Review Statement and that’s new business. The second is former item VI. H. Review Guidelines for Online Courses, and the third that Alan will do is a Board of Trustees report from the 3/27 meeting of the board and that would be under item VI. G. 2., or old VI. G. 2, until everything shifts down. Are there any other proposed changes? Could I have a motion to adopt the amended agenda?

S. Farrell: So moved.

D. Baker: Second?
R. Lopez: Second.

D. Baker: Okay any discussion? All in favor?

Members: Aye.


III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 26, 2014 MEETING

D. Baker: Next is approval of the minutes from February 26. Any comments on those? I need a motion. Anybody want to move?

J. Kowalski: So moved.

W. Pitney: Second.

D. Baker: Discussion? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: President’s Announcements. Okay there’s a lot of stuff going on. Holy cow! Let’s talk about, and let’s discuss, a bunch of stuff that’s going on. I thought I’d start maybe with a budget update and where we are in the budget. About ten days ago a number of us went down to Springfield to testify in front of both the House and Senate. This was prior to the governor’s announcement of his proposed budget or budgets and I’ll talk a little bit about that. In the House we were up first. We were asked to discuss what we would do with a 12.5 percent budget reduction from the state. Twelve-and-a-half percent was chosen because that’s roughly what the budget cut would be for a half a year if the temporary income tax is not sustained, if it goes away in December as is currently on the books. And so we talked about how difficult that would be and the impact that it would have on us. Other universities did the same thing. Other state agencies did the same thing.

We then went to the Senate. We were at the end of a very long and very contentious Senate appropriations hearing. It had been unusually divisive and it was people with very different prospective of what should be done with the budget. On the democratic side, I think they were feeling like we need to keep this tax increase in place. We need to have the revenue so that we don’t cut our agencies in the state. Republicans felt, on the other side, that with the tax increase there have been dramatic increases in the state revenue over the last three years and that there had been relatively little budget cutting and just increases in taxes. So there are two different world
views and those are vying in an election year. So that led to a fairly heated set of conversations. We were preceded by a number of state agencies, state police, etc. and everyone would get up and talk about: We’re going to have less officers on the road; there will be more fatalities on the highways; there will be people released from prison. Each agency got up and told its stories. And we got up and talked about what a 20 percent budget reduction would be and that’s what we were asked to comment on. And 20 percent out of our university would be very, very difficult. So we told those stories.

And then a few days later, the governor introduced his budget. His budget was kind of a two-budget proposal. The first budget and the one that he and the legislative leaders, democratic leaders in the Senate and the House, seemed to agree on is to maintain the income tax surcharge. In that budget, we are held essentially flat in higher education. No increases, but flat. Now under law and by the way we think that’s a good idea. Now a flat budget is good. In fact, if the Republicans have ideas on how to cut funding in other places in the state budget and maintain our flat budget through some other cost reduction mechanism, I’m okay with that too. But a flat budget in this environment, I would feel okay about. I’d feel pretty good about. So that’s the contestant base.

Now the governor was required to submit a balanced budget and, under the current law, that assumes that the tax increase is going away. So he had to say: Here’s the budget I want, flat for higher ed and other agencies. And here’s the budget under law I’ve got to propose and that assumes it’s going away. In that one, it was a 12.5 percent budget reduction for us. So those are the two vying budgets.

Now the fun starts. I think the current understanding is both the leadership and the House and Senate on the Democratic side are in agreement with the governor and they seem to be rallying for that. So we’re cautiously optimistic that that’s where it’s headed, but you don’t know until the ink is dry. Stay tuned. We go back next week to testify again and this time it will be our reaction to the governors’ budget to the House Appropriations Committee. We’re not currently scheduled to go back to the Senate. Let’s see, any questions on the budget stuff?

Internally, we’re going to have to manage our budgets with less revenue even if we get a flat budget from the state and that’s because over half of our budget comes from tuition and fees and room and board. Fifty-five, 60 percent comes from that and we’re currently, current projections are we’re going to be down 500 to 800 students in the fall. Let’s do simple math. Let’s say 800 students times $10,000 a student. I guess tuition and fees is $13,000 but ten’s easier to multiply, so that’s $8 million right there, right? That’s a lot of money. We were down 700 students this fall. This last fall we were down 700 another 800, that’s 1500 students, that’s $15 million at $10,000 a student. If you include room and board it’s $23,000. Room, board, tuition and fees, $23,000 times 1500, that’s a lot of money. We’re going to have to manage in that environment and we can’t just increase tuition. That’s what we’ve done the last decade. We’re at a point where we can’t raise tuition more on students so we’re going to have to do cost reductions and manage our budgets and we’re going to be able to do that and we’re going to talk to you about those. We’re going to go through a series of processes. We’re instituting new budget processes at the university and I’m going to ask Provost Freeman to speak a little bit about that. She’s been
meeting, she and Nancy Suttenfield our interim CFO, met this morning in a cabinet meeting and discussed some initial processes with them and they today met with the Provost Council with the deans and talked through these issues. So I’m going to turn it over to you two and you can kind of walk us through some of these principles. Looks like Lisa.

L. Freeman: I want to say to everybody that none of us really wants the landscape to be as dynamic as it is and it upsets me just as it upsets all of you to know that the state is not supporting this institution at the level that it should. That some of our best and our brightest contributors to this campus, faculty and staff, are facing a difficult individual decision about their retirement and they feel that this is being forced upon them. And while we’re all struggling with this and our declining enrollments, I’m also asking on the academic side, the deans, the faculty and staff to work miracles to staff their classrooms without all the information they need. This morning at the session with the deans I said: I’m asking you to put the S on your chest and do this with your hands tied behind your back and a blindfold on. And I realize that and there’s a limited amount of stuff that I can do to help. The process that we’re putting forward is largely a strategic process for resource reallocation focused around the expected wave of retirements. And we went through the type of information that we’re going to be using to prioritize the filling of vacancies within the academic division this morning with the dean. Unsurprisingly, the case that they’re being asked to be made to refill positions, is going to be linked to the university’s mission, to student career success, thriving communities, ethically inspired leadership and financial sustainability and to be aligned with the budget priority statement that was developed by the Resource, Space and Budget Committee and passed by University Council. This morning was an information session. We had a PowerPoint that showed the type of data that the Provost’s Office is willing and able to give the deans to help guide their decision making process. I can’t do everything I want. I can’t snap my fingers and make this go away, but we can try to provide the data to support data driven decision making and we’re going to be doing that to every possible extent that we can. The next two Wednesdays of April we will be hearing from the deans about the vacancy priorities that they have developed within their units. We will be, as provost staff, looking at what’s going on in the academic colleges, the libraries, the Graduate School, and our own office, creating sort of a master prioritization list reflecting that back to the deans who lead those units to make sure that they have a chance to feed back on our prioritization and then that prioritized list will go to a joint meeting on May 5 of the Academic Planning Council and the Resource, Space and Budget Committee of the University Council. And we’ll be asking that combined group to really reflect on alignment, not to start over and start to reshuffle all of the position priorities, but to say: Do we think that the academic division has done something that’s consistent with the university mission and the president’s goals and the budget priorities set out by the university and approved by the University Council? I will then be taking that information for the academic division that I oversee as a vice president to the president’s cabinet. My colleagues in the other division, Research and Innovation Partnerships, Operations and Community Development, Marketing and Communication, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, why didn’t I start with the easy one, will be doing the same things and we will be bringing all of those positions to president’s cabinet where we will have a thoughtful discussion about having a prioritization across the university. This is very different than what’s been done before. It’s very position focused because there’s only so much we can get done in 2015 and for FY15 and for FY15 the retirement wave has created a situation where strategic reallocation to fill
vacancies is the best and most important thing to do. But this is paving the way for us to have strategic budgeting across the university related to capital improvements and related to program priorities going forward in FY16 and ‘17. I think at this point I’d like to ask CFO Suttenfield if she has anything to add and then we can take questions now or later if there are any.

N. Suttenfield: Thank you, Lisa, and the reason why I deferred to Lisa to go first should be evident because we are doing our best to manage through very challenging times but being guided by our core mission which resides primarily in the division of academic affairs which is led by the executive vice president and provost. One of the things that Lisa didn’t mention is the reason that the Academic Affairs Division had its discussion ahead of other members of the cabinet and other operating units of the university, is because there is a very long lead time in determining what faculty positions need to be recruited for the fall of ‘15 and so deans and their department chairs are thinking about those things already and they are looking for guidance about how they plan and manage in this area of uncertainty.

But we will be following exactly the same process of managing our vacancies in all of our operating units comprised of my own area, the operating division for Facilities, Human Resources, Community Affairs which encompasses our police department, Student Affairs and all the rest; and we will be making data driven decisions in that area as well. We are asking all of those departments to be thinking about metrics and we’ll be looking at ways that we can eliminate steps in all of our business and administrative processes so that we can become more effective and efficient and help to absorb some of our revenue losses through cost reduction. I think we’re well positioned because we have invested the time at the cabinet level in thinking through guiding principles for how we want to develop an overall budgeting process for our operating and capital needs and longer term for multi-year financial planning, so we have a very strong mission statement. We have a clear set of priorities centered on student career success. We’re doing everything that we can to align our resources through reallocation so that we balance the budget and also address our strategic priorities and I think that positions us in a way that enables us to make both prudent and responsible decisions on behalf of the entire university community.

This will be an evolving process. The process this year is different just because we have so many factors combining for what some have called a perfect storm that have to be dealt with and we’re working through uncertainty as best we can, but I think we’re laying the ground work longer term for a much more rational and strategic process for allocating the resources that we have, reallocating them as circumstances change and when the day comes that we start to see our revenue situation turn around through better retention, better recruitment, and longer term through fundraising, then we’ll have the same process that we can apply for the allocation for new resources. And I’ll stop there.

D. Baker: Questions on the budget process?

K. Thu: Could you give us a sense of when the cabinet level decisions will be made for college hiring plans? And I ask that because, as the retirements are occurring, we have classes that we don’t have staffed and students are coming to us and saying: Is that class going to be offered in
the fall? And we can’t answer the question, but if we could give them a timeline maybe that would help everybody.

**L. Freeman:** I’m going to address the hiring of retirees to teach classes. We have actually exempted that from the approval process. The hiring of temporary people and the rehiring of retirees for instructional staffing purposes is not constrained by any vacancy position or prior approval process. So those decisions which are real stop gap decisions for FY15, for fall of ’14, can be made. The larger questions of permanently replacing faculty, looking at opportunities to replace staff who may have specific expertise in managing vital equipment or doing external programming, those things will come through the vacancy control process and it will be May when those decisions are made.

**K. Thu:** Thank you.

**D. Baker:** And that’s weeks. Okay. And we’ve got to see where the dust settles on the state budget and then get a little bit closer to fall so we know what our anticipated tuition revenues are and then we’ll have a revenue picture and then we can look at the expense side. Others?

**D. Plonczynski:** I’m wondering what numbers you’re using to calculate retirements? What are you, sorry…

**N. Suttenfield:** Unfortunately, it’s all up in the air. We have some big numbers of those faculty that we believe are eligible and might be retiring but, because there are so many factors that affect personal situations and it will in fact be an individual decision for everyone, we may not know until the deadline, which we currently understand to be May 31, exactly how many and where they will be. We can make guesses but that’s about the best that we can do.

**D. Baker:** I can chip in on that just a little bit. This is extraordinarily frustrating. That’s probably an understatement from all of you and particularly those who are on the bubble, so-to-speak, in trying to make a decision here. And it just seems like an unfair thing to have somebody work many years, maybe their whole career in higher education or at this institution, and then on short notice say: By the way, you might have to retire; and, by the way, it’s going to be really hard for you to make the decision. And that’s kind of where we are right now. I think the SURS system has just been hit by a tsunami and they weren’t ready for it, and they are you know they went from individual sessions to now group sessions and webinars and those are filling up and they’re pinned back.

Yesterday I met with the presidents and chancellors of the public institutions in the state and we shared notes. And they’re as unhappy about this as I am. The president of the University of Illinois said that there are 5700 people at the University of Illinois on the bubble. Can you imaging 5700 people at one, I mean this is across the three campuses and their extension network, so it’s a large geographic area with three campuses, but, holy cow, can you imagine pulling that many people out of an institution? It’s very difficult to understand. So, all the presidents were telling the same stories. Each one had their own anecdote about this department, everybody’s retiring, or those kinds of situations. And the asymmetry of the information that’s
being provided. At the end of that meeting as it concluded then the director of the IBHE joined the meeting and it turns out she’s also the director of SURS. So we had a conversation and we shared our frustrations and we’re pretty clear about it and I think she’s feeling like they’re doing everything they can, but they did get hit by a tsunami. They’ve been knocked down and they’re trying to figure out how to help people. I know on our own website we kind of updated the FAQs there. There’s better information now than we had before. We’ve learned some through the process, so if you’re still scrambling I’d say go look there at our website. Now, Deb, where should they go?

D. Haliczer: Human Resources.

D. Baker: Human Resources website.

D. Haliczer: It’s the first article.

D. Baker: First article. Okay. So go look there. Wait for a minute don’t do it right now. Now, Lindsay Anderson is the person that holds that two positions. She’s very bright. She’s new to her position but very bright. She’s doing the best she can, I think. She said that there may be some drafting errors in the legislation. She wasn’t clear what the impact of those would be. She’d get information back to the presidents in short order. We impressed upon her that we don’t have until July 1, our employees only have a few weeks and we have to know now. And so she took that away, I think, in good spirit and was going to do what she can. But I did want you to know that the presidents around the state are working on this issue but we’re running up against the limits of the SURS system and what they’re able to do at this point. Anyway, I hope our meeting was influential with her yesterday and impressed upon it the impact on the universities as a whole, but on all of the individuals impacted, these are maybe tens of thousands of people around the whole state. It is tens of thousands of people around the state that are being forced into this difficult situation. So anyway, I just wanted to share that. We’re working on it. I wish there were some magic answers but at this point it doesn’t look like it. We’ll see what comes out of it. We should hear something here in a couple weeks I would think. Any questions on any of that?

A. Rosenbaum: On a lighter note, I think that the SURS retirement calculator is up and running again so people who have been waiting to see what that looks like, it’s working.

D. Plonczynski: Just a follow-up question, I understand that the money purchase calculation with SURS, and I know this isn’t a SURS seminar, but that’s a major issue. If you have this type of calculation that you can lose that benefit by staying at the university longer I guess what I don’t understand and I’m sure many others here do as well who are on the bubble, how could we lose it? It’s not part of the legislation.

D. Baker: Deb, do you know the answer to that.

D. Haliczer: I couldn’t hear the question. (microphone not on)

D. Baker: How does the money – it’s not part of the SURS pension reform so how could that be
in this calculation?

**D. Haliczer:** Okay, the money purchase calculation is certainly one of the things that’s being changed. And so if that is the advantageous calculation, they estimate that it would be a reduction of between 20 and 30 percent of your potential earnings out into the future on retirement. The other thing is it’s affected our people and we have lots of them who have been here a long time and have reached their maximum contributions, the famous 80 percent. If you are at 80 percent and would be getting over contribution refund, you really need to contact SURS, I think, personal opinion, because that refund is also affected. So there’s so many different individual permutations that if you think that you have been here enough years, if you have looked at your estimator, which on your SURS site it will tell you whether the current calculation is general formula versus money purchase. If it says money purchase, get on the phone and try and get some kind of at least a written estimate because you have to make that decision and be retired by June 1. There’s been missed, sort of a variety of information given out about what is the right retirement date. Some people say as long you retire before July 1 you’re okay. That’s one of the wording issues in the legislation because in some places it says if you retire by July 1 other times it says if you’re annuity begins July 1. So there are a lot pitfalls and the NIU benefits staff have been forbidden by SURS to interpret it which has been frustrating. So the seminars we have, I was going to talk about his later but okay, the seminars are about people who want to process their retirement application so we’re doing that in groups, and right now all the – do you want me to go on to what I would have said at benefits or just put that later?

**D. Baker:** We got to get this vote so let’s do it later. Don’t go away.

**A. Rosenbaum:** If I can just add one thing, I think the question you’re asking though is why is this affected by the pension reform bill And Deborah can correct me if I’m wrong, but I think what they did is that percentage that they figure in the formula is supposed to be adjusted every five years and so normally they would not be able to adjust it right now, but the pension reform bill allows them to adjust it every year and so that’s what’s permitting them to reduce that number this year and that’s why people are being faced with reductions from 6.4 to something like 4.6 or thereabouts. And so people are losing that two percent, but they weren’t allowed to adjust it every year as they were until they passed the bill they could not do it.

**D. Baker:** Okay, we will talk more about pension stuff when we get to Deborah’s piece. It’s tough, we working in kind of murky waters here and it’s hard at the individual level. It’s hard to manage at department. It’s hard to think about how to staff all of our positions in the institution, faculty, staff. Let’s keep our eye on serving the students and doing our scholarly and creative activity around the institution and work as a team through this as best we can. I wish we had less ambiguity but that’s where we are. It will become clearer in the next few weeks. On more positive notes, let me say two positive things and then we’ll get to the election. Okay? The legislature is going to do what the legislature does with our budget and the governor’s going to sign whatever the governor is going to sign. That’s a piece of our budget.

But the majority of our budget we control. That’s tuition, fees, room and board. Okay. And our enrollment’s been going down and we need to turn that around and we have recruitment issues
and we have retention issues. And this fall we started talking about those in the Bold Futures workshops and thank all of you who participated in those. They were amazing this fall. This spring we’ve just concluded another round of ten Bold Futures workshops. Almost 1000 people participated. The first five of those were for veterans from the fall and our warm up exercise was to list the things that you’ve done since the fall Bold Futures workshops. Page after page after page of good ideas. I’m really impressed by you taking up the challenge and working on these issues and those are going to pay dividends and some will be paid this fall but many will flourish over the coming years. So thank you for doing that. We did ten in the last month and again, amazingly good ideas are coming out of them, but our focus was on retention. Since we have a 66 percent retention rate from last spring to this fall, a third of our freshmen left before they became sophomores, half in academic good standing, more than half, that’s an issue we can address. We have students here that we can keep. We lost 1000 students in good standing from last year to this year. We need to change that. Their lives are going to be enriched if they stay and go through the transformative process we provide here. So the Bold Futures workshop this spring has been focused on retention and the assignment coming out of the workshop is to go talk to eight students for each team that we put together and I know many of you in this room are out doing that and we’re going to find out how’s the experience going. What’s impacting you positively? What could we change? Let’s get that information and let’s change. Let’s change the experience for the better.

So we’re going to celebrate that on the 24th, 5 p.m. You’re all invited to a big bold celebration down in the ballroom in this building. It will be a one-hour presentation. We’ll actually have about 100, there’s about a 110 teams, we’re going to have one-page blow-ups of all those 100 ideas. You can wander around. We’ll have four short presentations and then we’re going to have a party and we’re going to have music through the building and kind of like turn it into jazz alley throughout the building and show what a rich, wonderful place this can be and is. One of our concerns about recruitment and retention is place. We’ve gotten a lot of feedback that place can be improved. And so we did that design charrette a month or so ago and, thanks to the S.A., they staffed the last two weeks the gallery downstairs and asked people to come comment. Did anybody go down and look at those? A few of you? Thanks for doing that. Interesting ideas, re-envisioning campus. This was a design thesis not a master plan. We wanted to throw up some ideas and have people go after it and make comments. And the students did a wonderful job staffing that and compiling all that and we’ll get all that put together but there’s some great comments and ideas in there and place makes a difference. If it’s a wonderful, welcoming, cool place, it’s going to help us recruit and retain students and faculty and staff. We’re looking at that side of the ledger as well. So my thanks to all of the people that participated in that and particularly the SA for staffing that and answering a lot of interesting questions. I think they learned a lot in process too. So anyway I feel like we’ve got some momentum there and we can do some bold and really interesting things. And, Alan, you were going to say something about the provost search and then we’ll do the consent agenda.

A. Rosenbaum: I only wanted to let people know that, of course, the first of our three candidates for the provost position was on campus today and tomorrow and we have open forums tomorrow, there’s the one for the staff and community is at 10:45 in the morning in 315 of Altgeld and then the one for faculty is at 1:30 tomorrow also in Altgeld, no in the Illinois Room here in the
Holmes. Now we understand that some faculty are teaching at that hour or some staff are busy at other hours. Come to whichever one of those forums you want to come to. So, if you’re teaching in the afternoon and you want to still come and see the provost, come to the 11:45 one for staff and community and vice versa. If you’re staff and community you can’t get to the one you’re supposed to go to, come to the one in the afternoon. We really want people to have an opportunity to really put their money where their mouth is. People were complaining about they want open forums and they want to meet these people, well you got them. So now come to those forums and meet the candidates. And one last item, next month is our last meeting of the University Council and, as is our tradition, that last meeting is followed by a reception. The reception this year will be downstairs in the University Suite of the Holmes Student Center. That will follow directly. After the meeting we’ll go down and we’ll have cocktail hour and that’s the way we always celebrate the end of the year for our University Council. Of course, everyone is invited and welcome to stay and for the reception.

D. Baker: Questions for Alan on that? Thanks to Alan for chairing the search committee for the provost and for all those serving in it. I think they’ve done a good job and got a really interesting slate of candidates. Go look at them and give us your feedback.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

D. Baker: Okay, next, consent agenda. Could I have a motion for the consent agenda?

A. Small: So moved.


D. Baker: Okay, any comments? Nope, okay. All in favor.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you. All right here we go.

A. The following four items were necessitated by the elimination of the positions identified in each of the articles. For example, we no longer have a position called VP for Administration (formerly Steve Cunningham’s title). These changes update the Constitution and Bylaws to reflect the correct titles for the individuals intended in the articles. With the agreement of the president, we are considering these to be non-substantive alterations and will make the changes with the consent of the council. Council members taking exception to this procedure can make a motion to remove any or all of these items from the consent agenda and they will then be subject to the normal process for amending the bylaws.

1. Article 2.8.1.1 – Composition of Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Update position title of “executive vice president for business and finance, chief of operations” to “chief financial officer,” and add “senior administrator
responsible for facilities” to accurately reflect current titles and responsibilities.

2. **Article 11 – Grievance Procedures for Faculty and Staff** – Update position title of “vice president of administration” to “senior administrator responsible for human resource services” to accurately reflect current titles and responsibilities.

3. **Article 16.2.1.1 (F) – Composition of University Benefits Committee** – Update position title of “vice president of administration” to “senior administrator responsible for human resource services” to accurately reflect current titles and responsibilities.

4. **Article 16.3.1.1 – Composition of the Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee** – Update position title of “vice president for public safety and community relations” to “vice president for operations and community relations” and remove “vice president for administration” to accurately reflect current titles and responsibilities.

B. **Approve proposed 2023-2024 academic calendar** – Page 4

VI. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

A. **Proposed Grievance Procedures for Students** – Pages 20-25

**SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM**

**D. Baker:** All right so we’ve moved up former Item VII. to be our first item today, the proposed student grievance procedures. This is a second reading and we already have a motion and second so, Bill, are you going to tell us about it? And thank you, Bill, for all your hard work.

**W. Pitney:** You’re welcome. Thank you. I won’t take too much time, but I just wanted to, Pat, if you could go ahead and advance that. If you could just give me a moment to kind of recap a few things related to our proposed article. In February with the first reading, the University Affairs Committee put forth a rationale and the rationale for such a grievance procedure was related to the treatment of our students as well as some of the accreditation requirements. As we saw in that report last February, the majority of our sampled accrediting bodies, indeed require some form of student grievance process to be in place. And that makes sense, because, indeed, most of our accrediting bodies want to make sure there are mechanisms in place to process complaints and report on them so you can have continuous institutional improvement. We also provided an overview of what other public institutions are doing. We found that six of the 13 Illinois public universities have similar process in place to what we’re proposing and, just to highlight, this isn’t a new issue. This issue has been bubbling up for over the past ten years. And a year ago the University Affairs Committee, under the leadership of Kathleen Coles, did a great job of floating a draft out, getting some feedback. And then this past year we’ve worked hard to try to create a process, change that process, so that we address many of our concerns. I just wanted to highlight that in this article the grounds for grievance is unfair treatment by faculty or staff in the university setting and these can certainly include such things as misuse of authority or
intimidation, professionally inappropriate acts, etc. We see in the committee that a vast majority of the types of issues that would be brought to bear on this process would be incivility in nature. I’d also like to point out that the process we’ve proposed requires students to identify in their written complaint the way in which they have been affected in a substantive way. So that’s the other piece of what constitutes grounds for grievance. I’d also like to highlight the exceptions. There are lots of processes already in place for such things to address Title IX issues, sexual harassment, discrimination, so forth so the process we’re putting forth would not include those. If such a complaint was raised to the committee, the committee would screen that and send that to Affirmative Action Diversity Resources where that complaint belongs. So again, this process is for acts of incivility primarily.

I’d also like to highlight that we have identified as an exception to this process, academic rigor and performance and we’ve added in that issues pertaining to the enforcement of academic policies and curricular changes would also be exempt from this. Highlight in red here in the text box, the language that we’ve added since the first reading because that was brought up in our discussions and we believe these changes make sense and hopefully allay any of those sorts of concerns. We think we’ve put together a process that affirms academic freedom, maintains academic rigor and quality of student performance.

Please know that in the article there is a requirement to make sure that students go through informal step first, because, indeed, we believe that an honest discussion about a complaint can sometimes resolve the issues so that is certainly part of our article that we’re proposing. There is a formal written complaint that would be processed. The report from last February showed a draft of the form and the type of information we would get from a student who is levying a complaint and we see the process a lot like a peer review.

If there is a complaint made and information is obtained, you’re going to be reviewed by a panel of your peers and they’ll examine the facts and then they’ll weight and consider those facts and make a reasonable decision.

One of the concerns expressed last year from this body related to having a committee in place that would have punitive power. That’s been changed. The committee, itself, doesn’t have punitive power. The committee could enact one of four actions, they could deny the grievance meaning the grievance is not upheld. They could refer to Affirmative Action and Diversity Resources if the complaint fits better with the current process. The matter could be referred to Alternative Dispute Resolution meaning you’d have a mutual third party examine the issues, and both the grievant and the complainant would agree to have that party make a decision. Or, in more serious instances it would be referred to administrative authority with a recommendation of an action. So that’s the potential outcomes as the current article reads. So I just want to highlight those things. We’re happy to try to address any questions that you might have at this time.

D. Plonczynski: (mic not on) timeline on page 22 and I’d like to suggest a friendly amendment. In the section 12.5, under Formal Procedures, Step 2, the very last sentence of the first paragraph the word, 60 days is used. It’s up there on the board. And when calculating the timeline, and I apologize for not catching it the first time, it appears that the time is actually 70 days.
W. Pitney: Thank you for drawing that to my attention. She spoke with me just before the meeting and I’m glad I asked you to bring that up because I would have forgotten, so thank you. I went back through and counted the days and I think you’re absolutely correct. I think I was confused that there were some processes that have a little bit of overlap and I think 70 days is correct so I would certainly accept that friendly amendment.

D. Plonczynski: I apologize I should have noticed it the first time around.

W. Pitney: You know it’s one of those things we’ve seen so many times, plus there are three kinds of people in this world, right – those who are good at math and those who aren’t. Thank you, I accept that friendly amendment.

D. Plonczynski: I also have a follow-up question. Could you tell us the discussion the ensued regarding absolutely having a student on this committee rather than randomly drawing from the entire pool?

W. Pitney: I think so. The way we’ve got it set up is that, should this article be passed, we would be sure to have selected 15 students that would be part of, and this would be through the Student Association that would be part of the larger grievance panel. That grievance panel would also include a faculty, operating staff, and professional staff. And so we felt it necessary, since this was a student-related process, that, when a final committee is selected from that panel, we at least have one student voice on there to kind of oversee that complaint process. So the way it’s written right now we’ve got the larger panel, once a grievance is filed and the executive secretary would work to create a grievance committee of five folks from that, one of which would be a student, one of which would be faculty, and then we would have to have, the way it’s written, at least folks that would be from the grievance employment classification and then also a representative from Human Resource Services. We felt the Human Resource Services person being on the committee was important for two reasons:: Number one, if we are screening a complaint, somebody from that office who continually deals with other issues such as sexual harassment, discrimination, they might look at a complaint and say that’s discrimination, that’s not part of this and we’ve got a process for that and they can help us identify that. And also if it got to the point where there was a hearing or a need to collect more information, do some fact finding, having somebody there to help with that investigation is critically important. That’s a step that really you don’t want to have go bad. There are lots of reasons and so that’s why we put that person on. I don’t know my answer answered the question.

D. Plonczynski: Yes, thank you. I thought this was brilliant. I applaud what you and your group have done.

W. Pitney: Thank you.

D. Baker: Others? My thanks go to the faculty and students and staff who have worked on this for so long and I know, Jack, this has been a big deal for the students as well. Mike, you’ve worked how many hours, a bazillion?
M. Theodore: Many.

D. Baker: I’m assuming you’re in favor of this.

M. Theodore: Yeah, I didn’t want to add much because Bill really did touch on all the points, but I mean since 2011 we’ve seen this process take hold. I know there are many people in the room who at least on council, at least on university affairs committees throughout the years have seen the variations of this policy. It’s going from so many different directions and I think this year the committee with Bill Pitney really has collaborated with all concerns, listened to every potential holes that might exist in this policy that really put together something that would work and would be there to help for student treatment and student with respect to dignity. So I’m really proud of this document and I’m really looking forward to see where the vote goes today.


A. Rosenbaum: Okay, to vote one will be yes, that means that you are in favor of the grievance policy as written, two will be …

D. Baker: With the friendly amendment of seventy instead of 60 days.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, of course. I think we can wordsmith it even afterwards, that’s a correction. So 1 would be yes, you’re in support of the grievance policy; 2 you are opposed to it and you’re voting no; 3 you are abstaining. Don’t touch them until we are ready to go. Okay are we ready, Pat? Vote. 1-yes, 2-no, 3-abstention. It will say A or B; don’t worry about that. A and 1 are the same. How many votes do we have showing up there? Anyone else before we close it? Anyone who has not voted? If you don’t have an A or a B showing on your screen, your vote hasn’t been registered. Okay close the vote and let’s look at it.

D. Baker: Hey congratulations! Wow, pop the cork, Mike.

50 – YES
5 – NO
0 – ABSTAIN

VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Page 5-6

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and Andy Small – report – Pages 7-9

D. Baker: Shall we move on to the Reports from the Councils, Boards and Standing Committees? The FAC to IBHE report by Sonya is written only. You can look at that. Board of Trustees, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel, Dan?
A. Small: Actually I’ll give the report today.

D. Baker: Okay sorry.

A. Small: Thank you very much. The AASAPC Committee did meet on February 27. I do have a written report in your handout. If you were lucky enough to print out the report, you will see that it is a nice colored salmon sheet. Thank you, Pat, for doing that. Yeah, I don’t know how that came out that way. But as you’ll notice some emphasis were approved, a minor was approved and a specialization was approved, but really what you need to take a look at is the recommendation for faculty and supportive professional staff sabbatical leaves for the year 2014 to 2015 academic year, and if you see your name up there, congratulations. You have been approved for a sabbatical leave. And if you know of a colleague or a friend that has a sabbatical leave please congratulate them. That concludes my report and I’ll be glad to answer any questions if you have any.

D. Baker: Anybody? All right thank you, Andy.


D. Baker: Alan, you’re going to give the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee?

A. Rosenbaum: Yep. Finance, Facilities and Operation. The main issue that was dealt with by this committee was the change to the way we deal with the process of attendance. In the past we’ve dealt with tuition, fees and room and board individually and often students would not know what those charges were until very late in the year. I believe the June meeting was often the one at which we finalized the tuition and so students would be expected to make decisions about coming to NIU without knowing how much it was going to cost. So the change was to combine all of these expenses into what is identified as the cost of attendance and to have the Board of Trustees deal with this as a block and as early in the year as possible so that students and their families would have a better idea of what to expect. That was the main item. This was done at the February 27 meeting. And this year, the cost of attendance, what they did is they increased tuition two percent for the incoming class keeping in mind that we have a tuition policy which freezes that tuition for four years and one semester for incoming students. It means that that rate is increased only for two percent. There are no further increases for that incoming class so it amounts to about a half a percent a year. To counterbalance that, the costs of room were reduced by a comparable amount such that for resident students the cost of attendance were relatively flat with some increase in the fees. And you can see from my report that the fee increase is about two percent for undergraduates and 1.96 for graduate students and .95 for law school students. And so this item was approved.

And you can see that the other major issue has to do with health insurance fees and those have increased. And my understanding is that the health insurance fees are passed along from whoever the provider is that we have contracted with. And so that was really the crux of the meeting.
Nancy Suttenfield our CFO also presented the Guiding Principles which she also presented here at the University Council and many of you have seen that here, and at senate. That concludes my report unless anyone has any questions.

**D. Baker:** Anybody? Just on health insurance, it did go up significantly and that’s because a regulatory change in the health care reform bill and more stuff had to be covered so then it had to jump because of that. Most of our undergraduate students are under 26 and are on their parents insurance so their actual insurance may not go up because they’re covered somewhere else besides this.

**D. Baker:** Okay, let’s see the Legislative and External Affairs Committee, Rosita.

**R. Lopez:** The chair of this committee commented and also commended President Baker for his representing us throughout the country, throughout Illinois and the very, very busy schedule that he’s been keeping, so we thank you for that in moving NIU continually forward. Kathy Buettner presented a really good report on just all the things that NIU is doing. The most updated information throughout the university and beyond utilizing every type of technology frame that she could possible use to get this out including the “We’ve Got That” which over at the very end of the report is a little link and you can read a little bit more about that. But it’s a way for freshmen and well, new students in general, who might have questions and to have other students also respond to them who might have the answers. So we’re using every means possible, cable TV, phone, direct print to moms, dads, community and all that, to really put out there that NIU should be their university of choice. There again, in providing the most updated information, there are digital displays now that take the place of bulletin boards and we’re also using FaceBook, Twitter, YouTube and everything out there. Our website has now become a much more user-friendly tool. And something I didn’t mention last time was that our marketing received a gold award for top level marketing and for this Kathy Buettner thanked her team for the work that they’ve been doing. One of the questions asked was how much is this costing us? And because much of this work is done in-house, the cost is kept lower than it possibly would be if we were outsourcing this. The response was $1 million not including staff hours and resources. And again this is about recruitment. Although retention is very important, this is really about recruiting students, bringing them into NIU and having everybody know about NIU as being a good choice. We also had guests. Senator Edward Maloney, Dr. Lane Johnson, VP of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development, and both of them just came to say hello and to thank us for allowing them to partner with us and also allowing them to representing us in Springfield. So it was a very uplifting, good report. That’s the end of my report. Are there any questions? Thank you.

**D. Baker:** Thank you, Rosita.
**D. Baker:** Next we have Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs, Alan.

**A. Rosenbaum:** This is a very brief committee meeting and I think the crux of this meeting was the acceptance of the fiscal 2013 external audit and there was not much discussion of that and so there’s much to say about that so I don’t have anything else to say about that.

**D. Baker:** You could read it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I could.

**D. Baker:** Okay let’s not. Let’s move on then if there are no questions.

F. BOT Ad Hoc Committee on Sponsored Research Activity and Technology Transfer – Greg Waas – report – Pages 14-15

**D. Baker:** The next is the Ad Hoc Committee on Sponsored Research Activity and Technology. Greg Waas has submitted a report. I would note there’s just one correction I’d make to that in the second paragraph, last sentence, it says the division blank will continue to house and administer the graduate school. That blank ought to say academic affairs will house and administer the grad school. Brad if you were confused. Any comments on that one? Great.

G. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report

**D. Baker:** Board of Trustees, Alan.

1. February 27, 2014 – Page 16

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, we have three Board of Trustees reports. Despite that, this will go fairly quickly, the reason being that the first one is a special meeting. It was held on February 27 and that was following the BOT subcommittee meetings in the morning and this meeting was the one in which the full board approved the costs of attendance that I described when I talked about the FFO committee meeting. So you’ve already heard all of that and that’s what they did.


**A. Rosenbaum:** The second Board of Trustees meeting was a special meeting that was held on March 3 and that meeting was simply an opportunity for the Higher Learning Commission site visit team to meet and ask questions of the Board of Trustees. So that was a question and answer period. There were no action items or informational items; it was simply the board answering questions from the HLC site visit team. That went very well.

3. March 27, 2014 – walk-in

**A. Rosenbaum:** And then the last meeting is the March 27 meeting which was just held this past Thursday. That was the regularly scheduled board meeting and I’ll just call your attention to the
two action items that the board dealt with. One was the release of concentration of Southeast Asian Studies, that’s being replaced by a certificate in Southeast Asian Studies which is considered more attractive and so that’s an improvement, that’s not losing something in a way for students taking that program.

And the second thing that the board did was they approved the president’s request to use $4.5 million of local funds to demolish the Douglas dormitory complex and extend Lucinda Avenue through to the west campus and Convocation Center creating a “main street” for the university. This was one of the items that was articulated in the Charrette Thesis for the university’s improvement plans.

Those are all of the items, but before I take questions, I just want to acknowledge Kathy Coles who is standing in the back there. And, as Bill mentioned, she was one of the architects of the student grievance policy and felt very passionately and strongly that we should have this. And, when she did step down as chair of that committee because she had to leave the University Council, she asked that we really keep that alive and so we have done that and we owe Kathy a debt of gratitude as well for her work on this. Thank you for that. And now I’ll take any questions that you have on any of the three Board of Trustees meetings that I have spoken of. Anybody?

M. Theodore: I had a question about the discussions they’re going to be having about chief diversity officer. When will those be happening around campus and how can we (inaudible) of that process?

D. Baker: I’ll start that. Lisa Freeman and I have appointed two people to co-chair that, Laura Vasquez and Sean Frasier. They are close to being done with the people that they’re going to ask to serve on it the developing subcommittees. They’ll be working throughout the rest of the spring and students will be involved throughout that process. Lisa what do you want to add to that?

L. Freeman: The president and I just met with Sean and Laura either the end of this week or the beginning of next. They’ll be naming the diversity and inclusion task force which is the group that will lead the campus, and community conversations. It looks as though that group will have about ten to 15 people on it. The list wasn’t finalized when we saw it. The model that will be used will be similar to the model that was used for the HLC Steering Committee, where the actual committee is a manageable number. If you believe ten to 15 is a manageable number, but between 40 and 50 additional stakeholders will have the opportunity to be involved on subcommittees. Just as the HLC subcommittees were formed around specific criteria, Sean and Laura have been busy behind the scenes, having individual conversations with key stakeholders who you would expect, the heads of the centers, the people who are heavily involved in academic diversity and affirmative action and in the community as well. From those initial conversations, there were 13 topics that were themes that arose from a qualitative analysis that will be given further attention between now and the fall when the search is launched. I’m happy to say 13 is a baker’s dozen so the president finally got a list to come out organically and our ability to use that phrase.

Anyway that process will go on through the end of the spring and the summer so that a search
committee, which will be separate from the inclusion and diversity task force, and the people who are involved through the subcommittees. That search committee will be named in the fall with the idea that the search will be launched then and, rather than confuse you anymore, maybe I’ll just take questions if there are any.

D. Baker: And just why are we doing this? We need to make significant improvements in all aspects of our diversity. I talk about student career success. If we don’t have an environment where we learn about diversity issues, faculty, staff, students; if we don’t have a welcoming culture, if it isn’t infused in our curricular and co-curricular activities; if we aren’t preparing people for a global economy, we’re not doing our jobs. And so we need to think about that. What do we want to be like? How do we want to help our students learn? How do we want to learn? We really think that a chief diversity officer is important and, before we go off and hire somebody, let’s stop and look. Where are we? What are other schools doing around the country? Who’s doing the best work? How are they structured? What kind of charge do they have for those people? What kind of organization structures and committees? Let’s go see what the world’s doing and then come back and do it right here. So that’s why we’re spending now to August doing that work and then we’ll get on with the search in the fall. So we’re going to look before we leap.

L. Freeman: I’d like to make just one more comment and I’m mindful of the time, but I know that there have been questions raised not about the importance of diversity and inclusion or the noble purpose behind having a chief diversity officer, but concerns have certainly surfaced about adding an administrator at this difficult time. When we met with the Resources, Space and Budget Committee today, I shared organizational charts for the direct reports to the executive vice president and provost that this position was actually created through the elimination of a number of positions that were part-time dedicated to special projects and the elevation of the academic position that was previously devoted to diversity. I just wanted to make that clear to people who are concerned, rightly so, about resources and administrative structure.

D. Baker: Good point. Thanks for mentioning that, Lisa. Okay anything else? Good question Mike.

H. Academic Policy Committee – Sean Farrell, Chair – report

1. Review of Guidelines for Online Courses Carrying Undergraduate Credit Offered by NIU, APPM Section III, Item 23 – walk-in

D. Baker: All right Academic Policy Committee, Sean.

S. Farrell: Over 12 and a half years ago, the University Council approved guidelines for online courses carrying undergraduate credit. As part of those guidelines, there was a five-year process that was also approved and included in that. That has never happened or there is no evidence that that has every happened. This is a particularly interesting oversight in that you may have a sense online education is a rather rapidly changing and increasingly important field both in higher education more broadly and at NIU as articulated by this administration more particularly. Thus
the charge to our committee, hardly a surprising one in this situation, was to review the
guidelines as articulated originally in 2001. I mention the dynamic, fast-moving landscape as
central to this because it is critical and it’s an important idea in how the committee and I
approached our task. As we review then, if you reviewed the original guidelines that I included in
the packet here, that review revealed certain problems that I think needed to be addressed.

First among those and most obvious at a cursory glance, was the outdated and borderline
embarrassing language of something that was drafted in 2001 in the field. References to
correspondence course at all probably shouldn’t be anywhere on the website.

Secondly, and this was raised in particular in the committee by Dean McCord and Dean Vohra
and others, that the original guidelines didn’t included definitions, key definitions. Particularly
in the aftermath of the HLC visit, Dean McCord has been especially useful on this in making sure
that such definitions were integrated into the proposed, revised guidelines. Those also have the
added benefit of bringing us into line with, oh I don’t know, federal guidelines. That is included
in there as well.

Finally, given the model and dynamic and fast-growing and changing nature of online distance
education as it were, there was a concern expressed throughout our committee meetings and e-
mail discussions, that it be important that the language that’s included in the guidelines be
flexible enough to allow for development and change, not to constrain types of developments that
are happening in a rapidly changing field, these are guidelines.

Our edit that we’ve proposed, the revised guidelines that you have, were very much made with
those three concerns in mind. Physician do no harm I think is one of the things in trying to
legislate for things that haven’t happened yet I think was one concern that we had. And we tried
to avoid reference to particular technology and uses that in three years may have to be revised.
Thus, before you as I see, I threw together a report briefly to outline that and I’ve included both
the original and revised documents in the report and recommend consideration and passage of
these revised guidelines so that we can remove correspondence courses from our guidelines here
and bring us into line with important assessment and evaluative standards across the country. I’d
like in particular to thank again Dean Chris McCord for working particularly hard on this edit
and also other members of the committee who answered e-mail with is something to be
treasured, let’s just say that. Thank you very much.

D. Baker: Thank you, Sean. I think you made a formal motion didn’t you?

S. Farrell: Yes.

D. Baker: Is there a second to that formal motion?

G. Long: Second.

D. Baker: Any discussion then? Greg?
G. Long: I would just say whether we put this in now or later that the document, perhaps this is a friendly amendment, but it says nothing about our commitment to online accessibility. And, from a guideline standpoint, I think as an instructor it would be important that we would do that because that’s an expectation at this point whether it’s captioning, whether it’s whatever, that would be the only thing. It’s great work, but I would say that’s something that we should include as well.

S. Farrell: As you know, since we talked about it about 45 minutes ago, it’s a very friendly amendment. I think in terms of the placement of such a sentence that talked about access to distance education in the instructor considerations is appropriate and that it talks about development. So we could wordsmith it.

G. Long: The point on all that is: If you’re going to think about online education, there needs to be a consideration upfront because, if we do it after the fact, it’s expensive and often times doesn’t work.

S. Farrell: Do you have a phrase in mind or kind of some language I could use?

G. Long: I have lots of phrases but appropriate phrases, I’ll get back to you on that. Seriously, let me…

D. Baker: So, are we comfortable with saying that the theme here is that the format would be accessible to all?

G. Long: Right, that we need to consider accessibility considerations.

S. Farrell: And that would take, if you look at the revised guidelines, that would be placed at the end of the first paragraph, the ideal place for that as Greg and I indicated would be at the end of the first paragraph there that’s talking about development.

D. Baker: Okay, are we comfortable with that thematic change? And we’ll wordsmith that and we’ll report back?

D. Plonczynski: I would like to ask Greg, I know Greg really well and I certainly believe the intention of this, but in Nursing we wouldn’t have some students who would need to have some of the technology that perhaps you are discussing and I’m wondering if we would be required then to offer our online courses with those additional services.

S. Farrell: I don’t, I mean these are guidelines and these are things that an instructor has to consider. I can allow Greg to speak to this too given his work in disability access, but I think the sense is this should be included in the guidelines so that any instructor who does consider doing an online at least has to consider and create and construct such a course having these things in mind.

G. Long: There are basic principles in online design that are related to say universal design for
learning. And so to invoke some principles and to argue that when you’re designing a course try to make it as accessible to the greatest range, and of course any time we offer a single session there may be students who are, some of those additional things aren’t going to be necessary but when we do need to have something that is available in brail or that’s captioned or whatever, to not have thought about it ahead of time puts us at risk and so for me it’s more just that idea that as you’re developing an online course that that’s part of the decision making process, the design process that it’s not an afterthought is really kind of where I’m coming from on this.

D. Plonczynski: And I totally agree, I appreciate the word consider rather than mandate because it may indeed may not be necessary and it would be onerous perhaps for me to add to some extra tasks for someone who is not going be able to take…

S. Farrell: And it’s, again, useful to think about that these are guidelines and in each of the paragraphs are considerations as underlined in bold.

D. Plonczynski: I’m certainly not opposed.

A. Rosenbaum: I’d suggest, though, that given their different ways to phrase things that you interrupt it differently, there’s no urgency that we approve this today, so we can hear the exact language and then vote on it on our next meeting if people are more comfortable with that. Otherwise, if you would like to propose exact wording right now so that people can hear and vote on it.

K. Thu: I just might suggest as you reconsider the language, the heading of the document is guidelines and yet there are provisions in here that are not guidelines, they are though shalt. So for example, distance education must include significant interaction, proposals, undergraduate course intended to be offered via distance education, must include a rationale. So there are several provisions there that are not guidelines, they are actually this is the way you have to do it. So you might want to tweak the heading a little bit to insure that those provisions are included.

S. Farrell: Given these issues, we can take these suggestions back and I can spend more of my life revising this. So thank you for that Kendall. I think these things have to be improved and it would be better if we had them.

A. Rosenbaum: Do we need a motion to postpone?

F. Bryan: Since we only have one meeting, we should postpone it.

A. Rosenbaum: So, we need a motion to postpone it to the next meeting. You’re the motion maker so can you make the motion to postpone also?

F. Bryan: It needs to be someone else.

A. Rosenbaum: We need someone else. Kendall you want to make the motion?
K. Thu: Sure, I’ll make the motion to postpone and make Sean’s life a little more miserable.

A. Rosenbaum: Well either way it’s got to be changed before we vote or after so it’s the same work. So your motion is that we postpone until the next meeting.

K. Thu: Yes I make a motion that we postpone until the next meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay we need a second.

V. Naples: I’ll second.

D. Baker: Any discussion? All vote to postpone say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? All right you get to spend five minutes on that. That’s all, that’s it. Thank you Sean for the good work, we’re on the precipice of victory.

1. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Paul Carpenter, Chair – no report

2. Rules and Governance Committee – Jeff Kowalski, Chair – no report

3. University Affairs Committee – Bill Pitney, Chair – no report

4. Student Association – Jack Barry, President – report

D. Baker: Jack Barry, tell us about the Student Association.

J. Barry: I had a very exciting semester. My most telling moments I think were when we staffed the campus master plan. I really did enjoy that. Your appointing students was sometimes was kind of pulling teeth to get them to come to that room as they were walking by, but then when you saw their face light up with excitement it was cool to see and I think that’s going to help out with the retention issues. With that being said, just because it’s down does not mean that the discussion is over, it’s now online. So when you’re dreaming about NIU, like we all do at night, wake up and go online. NIU.edu/campus_experience/ and then you can continue to carry on that conversation. With that being said, Saturday we’re helping co-sponsor the Latino Empowerment so Ivan’s group reached out to a bunch of different high schools and we have 300 plus high school students registered so that’s a big deal. They’re going to be coming and listening to different speakers on Saturday and kind of seeing campus, so I’m doing it as a recruitment kind of event but it’s definitely a Latino Empowerment event. That’s exciting to see.

D. Baker: And, Jack, before you leave that could you just note how that’s changed from last year? And what you did to transform the world as we know it?

I. Garcia: The biggest change was basically attendance. It has increased over 100 percent for
sure. We have so many high schools coming and, like Jack said, we’re going to use it as a recruitment because they get to come here to NIU and experience the campus and then of course if they like it that’s going to make them want to come to NIU which is what we’re looking for to increase the attendance here. We have great speakers, motivational speakers, that are known world-wide. We have a poet champion coming as well which is a national poet champion so it’s looking like it’s going to be a great event. It starts at nine o’clock so if anyone can make it, feel free to come out.

**D. Baker:** Where is it, Ivan?

**I. Garcia:** Campus Life.

**D. Baker:** I’m proud of you guys and what you’ve done. That’s really impressive work. Over 300, that’s incredible.

**J. Barry:** And the last thing was we had our elections last week and we had the second highest voter turnout in school history so that was great to see that more students are trying to get involved and learn about the SA. Paul Julian who’s Student Trustee elect so congratulations to him and we’re really looking to have a good transition.

**D. Baker:** Thank you, Jack. Jack thank you for a great year. You’ve been a great partner for the university and really moved the institution forward as your whole leadership team.

M. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – no report

**D. Baker:** All right next Supportive Professional Staff Council, Deborah this is your…

**A. Small:** I’m sorry if I could interject quickly, I don’t have a written report but I would like to mention one thing if I could.

**D. Baker:** I jumped over you Andy.

**A. Small:** It’s quite all right. We have had our Outstanding Service Award come to fruition and an announcement will be coming out shortly. I do want to mention and thank all of you who did either nominate or write a letter of support. I would also like to acknowledge Amy back there, who chaired our committee again this year. We had three times the nominations that we had last year. Three times the nominations. In a year of stress, this is vitally important to our staff that you acknowledge them through these types of programs. Even those people in your offices that potentially didn’t get nominated, these are time where an acknowledgment of a job well done is very crucial. So if you could do that also when you see the announcements, remember there were a number of people that obviously did not selected but we did have four very, very, outstanding people this year and congratulate them when you see them. Thank you.
D. Baker: Okay, Deborah.

D. Haliczer: Yes, Andy and I are great cheerleaders for recognizing and celebrating excellence but it wouldn’t happen without the support of a lot of people so thanks to everybody who participates in these. We had more nominations than usual and I want to on a positive note, invite you all to come to take a break and celebrate excellence. Our Supportive Professional Staff reception is April 15 from 2 to 4:30 in the Ellington Ballroom. It’s a great opportunity to eat really good cookies, get to meet and talk to some of your SPS colleagues. SPS colleagues like people up at the front row because administrators are all SPS. In times of stress, gather, celebrate those things that we really care about. So come to our reception.

D. Baker: Did you all get the dates?
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D. Haliczer: Now let me descend from the positive note of celebrating excellence and talk about the Benefits Committee report. The Benefits Committee has complained that we have spent much of our time this year talking about pensions. It is the elephant that sits over all of us and causes grey clouds on the horizon. What we know from a recent briefings is not much is new with the benefits this year, the insurance and other benefits. Benefits choice period is May 1 through May 31. Not too much is changing except for probably some increases in premiums which we’ve come to expect. But we’ll be getting the exact figures in late April and telling you as soon as possible in an e-mail communication from HR.

SURS. HR is doing everything that it can to work around the constraints being imposed by the State Universities Retirement System. No you may not do a retirement counseling, don’t be giving people advise, don’t be giving out too much information because everything is changing and it’s up to us. What we’re doing is trying to work around the edges of those restrictions by posting information on the HR website and so we have links, we have phone numbers we have some basic FAQs and information. April 24 is a day to put on your calendars because between 10 and 12 is the pension reform seminar that SURS will be coming to campus to talk about. Because the Sandburg Auditorium will not hold all the people that I have taken bets on showing up for that meeting, we will have an extra space in the Regency Room. We’ll also be streaming it so you don’t have to leave your office and it will be posted on the NIU TV station. SURS will not allow us to tape it and so we’re working on trying to get the tape from another university which was the one that they allowed to be taped. As soon as I have that information, I will get that posted somewhere. I can’t control these things and I need my magic wand, President Baker. There will be a second session for retirees. We’re trying to steer retirees from coming to the April 24 session because there’s a different one for them with slightly different information on April 23. So send your retired colleagues to the retiree session, send the active employees to the morning session,
And the other thing that we’re offering are sessions to put you all in groups of five or more to fill out your retirement applications if you’re retiring, have had your estimate, we will allow you to come. We will assist you in filing out the paperwork. Some of the content in the retirement application sounds Greek to me and I know something about pensions. It’s useful to come to those so do reserve for those because we’re canceling them and rescheduling people into other sessions if they’re too low enrolled. As for questions, my staff are told they can’t be asking questions so people catch me on the street and ask me and I say here’s what I can say and here’s where you would go and if you’re having pension anxiety, hey the employee assistance program or I can assist you with that. Questions?

D. Baker: Did you all get the dates?

D. Haliczer: April 24 is the big session for us. Look at the HR website, it’s all up there.

D. Baker: Thanks to HR for doing what you can in the constrained environment.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Deans Review Statement per NIU Bylaws Article 18.9 – walk-in

D. Baker: Let’s move on. The next is new business and I did have a walk-in. I think you’ve got a copy of this one-pager. We had three deans lined up for review and reappointment according to our bylaws and those are Deans Holly, Rosato and Vohra. Is Jen still here? She was sitting in back before. Are you still sitting in back Jen? Hello? That would be done by the provost, the executive vice president and provost. And since we have a provost search underway and it didn’t seem appropriate for the interim provost to do it, so I’ve asked to push that out and decided to put a one-year extension on the appointments as necessary. So I wanted to bring that to your attention. See if anybody had comments or questions about that. Seems like a good job for the next provost and executive vice president to take on. Okay, great thank you. Is there any other new business?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

D. Baker: Just on our way to adjournment, I note under X. J. that we have a report from the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee and just note that we added that to the normal informational items list. And we will welcome Monday our new CFO, Brett Coryell, or CIO I should say not CFO, sorry Nancy, coming to us from Emory University really a strong person and I think he’s going to do a lot for us to improve the functionality of our services, the efficiency and the costs involved, so it’s going to be great. At some point we’ll have to have him in to the University Council to talk about that, maybe early in the fall. Okay anything else?
XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Motion to adjourn? The governor. You reminded me. The governor is coming tomorrow. The governor’s coming, the governor’s coming. April Fool’s! No the governor is going to come tomorrow at noon for a short stint. He’ll be at Barsema Alumni Center at noon and he will make an announcement about increasing MAP funding. Funding for students that need MAP grants and so that will – I think it’s kind of a touch and go. He’s running around the state. He’ll be at two universities, I think, us and the University of Illinois and he’ll be here at noon. So if you want to…

A. Rosenbaum: Will he be taking questions?

D. Baker: I doubt if he’ll be taking too many questions. Maybe I shouldn’t have said the governor’s coming. No the governor’s coming. It’s nice of him to think of NIU to come make that presentation and I appreciate him thinking about this very needy aspect. I know Jack Barry was with us when we met with the governor and we talked about his very issue. So Jack you’re seeing the echoes of your comments and he’s coming up, so thank you. Now ready to adjourn?

Meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.