Original Agenda

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 1, 2015 MEETING

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION
   A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council – Jana Brubaker

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES
   A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Page 6
   B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and William Pitney – no report
   C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – no report
   D. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Dan Gebo – no report
   E. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Greg Waas – no report
   F. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee – Bill Pitney – report – Page 7
   G. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Bill Pitney – no report
   I. Academic Policy Committee – Virginia Naples, Chair – no report
   J. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – report – Pages 8-28
K. Rules and Governance Committee – Jana Brubaker, Chair

1. Proposed revisions to NIU Constitution, Article 7 – Page 29

Related Councils

FIRST READING

L. University Affairs Committee – Greg Long, Chair – no report

M. Student Association – Joe Frascello, President – report

N. Operating Staff Council – Jay Monteiro, President – report – Pages 30-31

O. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczer, President – report – Page 32

P. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, FS Liaison to UBC – no report

Q. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Mary Beth Henning, Chair

1. Election of 2015-16 Executive Secretary of University Council
   Per NIU Constitution Article 3.2.1 and Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 2.1 – Page 33

2. University Council Faculty Member Elections –
   Report on electronic Voting – Pages 34-35

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, Article 9 – Page 36
   Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor
   SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

B. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws Articles 15.5 and 15.6 – Pages 37-60
   Proposed amendment to original proposal – walk-in
   Standing Committees of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council
   SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

C. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, Article 2.8 – Pages 61-63
   Resources, Space and Budget Committee
   SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

D. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, Article 2.3 Page 64
   UC-Minutes Committee
   SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

E. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, Articles 2.2 and 2.5 – Pages 65-68
   Proposed amendment to original proposal – walk-in
   UC-Rules and Governance Committee
   UC-Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee
   SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM
F. Proposed revisions to NIU Constitution, Article 4 – Page 69
Standing Committees of the University Council
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Student Grievance Annual Report per NIU Bylaws Article 12.6 – Bill Pitney – Page 70

B. Acting director waiver request per NIU Bylaws Article 19.5.2.2 – Page 71

IX. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Program Prioritization Update

B. Recognition of University Council members whose terms are completed, who have been re-elected and who are newly elected – Pages 4-5

X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XI. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council

B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee

C. Minutes, Athletic Board

D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee

E. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education

F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

G. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification

H. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience

I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum

J. Minutes, General Education Committee

K. Minutes, Honors Committee

L. Minutes, Operating Staff Council

M. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council

N. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council

O. Minutes, University Assessment Panel

P. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

Q. Meeting Schedule – 2015-16 – Page 72

XII. ADJOURNMENT
Faculty who have completed their service:
Elisa Fredericks, College of Business
Barbara Schwartz-Bechet, College of Education
Mary Beth Henning, College of Education
Donna Plonczynski, College of Health and Human Sciences
Hamid Bateni, College of Health and Human Sciences
Melissa Lenczewski, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Omar Chmaissem, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Khan Mohabbat, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Rosemary Feurer, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Students who have completed their terms:
Joseph Frascello, Student Association President
Raquel Chavez, Student Association
Dillon Domke, Student Association
Alex Martin, Student Association
Libardo Coronado, Student Association
Kayla Sorensen, Student Association
Benjamin Donovan, Student Association
Alex Summers, Student Association
Brandon Phillips, Student Association
Chad Harris, Student Association
Nathan Lupstein, Student Association
Miki Grace, Student Association
Brittany Parato, Student Association
Troy Cappi, Student Association
Jeffrey Kamholz, Student Advisory Committee, College of Business
Solomon Mason, Student Advisory Committee, College of Engineering and Engineering Technology
Stacie Ueckert, Student Advisory Committee, College of Health and Human Sciences
Joseph Starofsky, Student Advisory Committee, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Alyssa Freeman, Student Bar Association, College of Law
Tingkai Liu, Student Advisory Committee, Graduate School

Supportive Professional Staff and Operating Staff who have completed their terms:
Deborah Haliczer, Supportive Professional Staff Council President
Catherine Doederlein, Supportive Professional Staff Council
Jay Monteiro, Operating Staff Council President
Gina Shannon, Operating Staff Council
Deans
Jennifer Rosato Perea, College of Law
Richard Holly, College of Visual and Performing Arts

Faculty who have been newly elected:
Terry Bishop, College of Business
Jin Jung, College of Education
William Penrod, College of Education
Cathy Carlson, College of Health and Human Sciences
Anne Hanley, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Reed Scherer, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Linda Saborio, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Kendall Thu, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Kryssi Staikidis, College of Visual and Performing Arts
Report on the IBHE-FAC Meeting, April 7, 2015

The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) met on April 7, 2015, at Lincoln Land College in Springfield. This was a shortened FAC meeting as it was held in conjunction with the regularly scheduled IBHE meeting.

FAC Updates

The meeting was called to order by the FAC Secretary, Steven Rock (WIU). The group first heard a brief update by Gretchen Lohman, the IBHE Assistant Director of Academic Affairs, regarding the IBHE offices move. Following that was an announcement about the upcoming FAC officers election by Steve DePasquale (Kankakee Community College). The group then broke into caucuses for the bulk of the remaining time. Caucus discussion focused on clarifying the topics to bring up with IBHE Board members. The FAC meeting was followed by lunch with members and staff of the IBHE. At that lunch session, three topics were raised with the Board:

- A call for continued support of the IBHE Faculty Fellows Program and IBHE Staff Liaison Support (presented by the Private and Independent Institutions Caucus)
- A faculty perspective on Dual Credit and Dual Enrollment (presented by the Two-Year Colleges Caucus)
- A faculty perspective on the impact of past and future budget cuts on quality and student experience (presented by the Public Universities Caucus)

Following lunch was the regularly scheduled IBHE meeting.

IBHE Meeting Highlights

The IBHE meeting was called to order by Chair Lindsay Anderson. Following several introductions and welcome remarks, Executive Director James Applegate introduced a panel discussion on the 2015 Underrepresented Student Groups Report. The panelists were Dr. Arthur Sutton (IBHE Deputy Director of Diversity and Outreach), Dr. William Trent (Professor, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), Dr. Andrew Sund (President, Illinois Latino Council on Higher Education and President, St. Augustine College), Dr. Layla Suleiman Gonzalez (Executive Director, Illinois Latino Family Commission), and Mr. Michael Holmes (Executive Director, Illinois African American Family Commission). The panelists presented the report, which tracks the progress toward closing gaps for underrepresented students; this PowerPoint can be accessed at http://www.ibhe.org/Board/agendas/2015/April/Default.htm. Also, the full report will be available at (http://www.ibhe.org/Reports%20&%20Studies/access.htm).

Respectfully submitted,

Sonya L. Armstrong
Associate Professor in the Department of Literacy and Elementary Education
NIU Representative to the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council

NOTE: Once approved, full meeting minutes can be accessed at http://www.ibhe-fac.org/Meetings.html. In addition, the audio of the full IBHE meeting will be available at http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/aboutBHE/audio.htm.
Report on the NIU Board of Trustees Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee

March 27, 2015

The NIU Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment met on Friday, March 27, 2015 in DeKalb. Committee Chair Marc J. Strauss called the meeting to order at approximately 9:30 AM. The Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment (CoE) was created so the BOT could possibly identify areas in which they could be change or create policy as it relates to the financial sustainability of NIU.

The committee received a presentation from Executive Vice President and Provost Lisa Freeman on Program Prioritization at NIU. The presentation situated program prioritization around sustaining quality and showing accountability in a changing, challenging, and resource-constrained environment. The past, current and future steps of the prioritization process were explained to the committee including the guiding principles, inventory of programs, criteria development, data templates, task force development, recommendations, and implementation. The timeline for each step was also explained. The BOT Ad Hoc Committee unanimously endorsed NIU’s program prioritization initiative.

Though the committee was also slated to hear reports about the policies and practices that affect academic program additions/deletions as well as the policies and practices that affect faculty work, productivity and accountability, they had to go into closed session. Thus, this content was postponed.

Respectfully Submitted,

William A. Pitney
UAC Representative
Preamble

The Committee on Resources, Space, and Budgets (RSB) is very encouraged with the direction being taken at NIU as it relates to fiscal transparency and the greater and timely involvement of the university community in the budget planning process. The committee would like to acknowledge the serious undertaking of the Prioritization and Reallocation process, and the involvement of the university communities in this effort. The committee wishes to thank President Baker, Provost Freeman, and the former Interim CFO Nancy Suttenfield, for providing the committee with timely information and actively engaging with the committee as the university develops a new fiscal model.

With the continuing prospect of financial uncertainty and the changing fiscal landscape of higher education, the RSB believes it is paramount that this new direction is carried forward over the next few years and the momentum for change maintained. Moreover, the RSB believes that its active involvement in the process prioritization and reallocation will have positive impact on the academic and administration quality.

In its advisory role, RSB has prepared the following statement of budget priorities.

1- RSB Role in the New Budget Process

- The RSB’s (the “committee”) role is to advise the president, the provost, and the CFO on matters related to budget, space, and resources. The committee is charged with identifying issues, concerns, gaps, and solutions and use this information to work collaboratively with the university administration to help maximize institutional success as identified through the university’s mission and stated strategic goals.
- The committee has undertaken the following two initiatives. (1) Created a survey to identify the advantages and shortcomings of the new budget and hiring processes, (2) Agreed to extend the committee’s work to the summer to ensure the agility of the committee’s response to any emergencies. A proposal for the committee’s new charge has been submitted to the university council for approval.
- In the evolving budget model, budget hearings are an important part of the process. The RSB also believes it can play an active role and should be represented in the budget hearings as a collaborative partner with the CFO, provost, and president in establishing the metrics and benchmarks to be used in fiscal allocation decisions.
2- Budget

- NIU’s faculty, staff, and student employees are central to the operation and success of the university. While meeting the university payroll must continue to receive the highest priority, it is essential that efforts be made to improve employee compensation, which remains substandard. This was identified as a top priority of the NIU Strategic Plan.
- It is clear that the state fiscal crisis is not going to end anytime soon, nor will past levels of funding be restored. It is essential that NIU continue the process of prioritization and reallocation.
- Utilize a budget process that allows units to roll over funding at the end of a fiscal year to help eliminate frivolous spending that sometimes occurs at year end.
- As new revenue streams are explored, the role of the Foundation will be an integral part of budgeting and fiscal allocations. Given this, the RSB should be provided with financial information from the Foundation to ascertain how Foundation funds are integrated into the overall budget.
- Effort should be directed toward creating a mission-driven multiyear multi-years development plan for the university. This task may be given to an architecture firm specializing in creating master plan for academic institutions.
- The cost of a university degree has been highlighted as a growing concern for students and their families. The committee endorses the new tuition fees system that resulted in an overall reduction of the cost to the students. The committee encourages a tuition structure that supports a broader liberal arts education. Further, the committee encourages the Graduate School to examine the impact of graduate student fees on graduate assistantships.
- The committee encourages the NIU Administration to continue to explore efficiencies and cost savings in university operations and governance processes including consideration of energy efficiencies and other improvements that are eco-friendly and sustainable. Several areas, Accounting, Purchasing, and Hiring, were highlighted as having the greatest potential for realizing efficiencies along with developing procedures and processes that aren’t subject to change or reinterpretation when staff turnover occurs.

Resources

- Overall budget allocation needs to be prioritized to safeguard the academic mission of the university by supporting and improving the academic quality of those programs and services that directly promote excellence and engagement in teaching and learning, research and scholarship, creativity and artistry, and outreach and service.
- To stay competitive and be at the forefront of developments nationally and internationally, NIU needs to establish a coherent policy on course articulations, the approval of prior experiential learning, and explore the potential of competency-based education.
- Innovative teaching models (e.g., online education, hybrid teaching models, ‘flipped classrooms,’ flexible scheduling) need to be encouraged and supported through funding allocation models that incentivize faculty to develop such teaching models and by
instituting operating system changes (e.g., in how classes are scheduled) to facilitate change.

- Enrollment is critical to NIU’s long-term sustainability. Resources need to be allocated to ensure the effective marketing of NIU’s current programs, identifying prospective students who meet NIU’s entry requirements, and to establish new student markets. Additionally, we recommend that an integrated marketing plan be developed that works to connect prospective students applying to NIU with their interest in specific programs and to increase recruitment of students with the qualifications and potential to be successful in pursuing their degree and major.

- In order to enhance recruitment and become a more diverse campus, NIU should develop a plan to transform into a university that is most friendly to students and employees with disability. This will enhance recruitment and contribute to diversity as required by the university mission.

- The RSB believes that international programs are essential to NIU’s mission and continued success, and we urge the administration to act quickly regarding leadership of International Affairs and we request that international programs remain a budget priority of the university.

- While changes to employee pension and insurance programs are largely occurring outside the control of NIU administration, maintaining adequate pension and insurance benefits as part of an overall compensation package is essential to retaining current faculty and staff as well as recruiting highly qualified candidates in the future. The committee suggests that the administration explore other ways to offer attractive compensation such as dual partner hires and does all it can to ensure that accurate information on pensions is disseminated and to develop a plan to address how raises can be afforded. In addition, the committee advises that more attention be given to the impact of recent pension rules changes such as the 6% rule and the hiring of retirees.

**Space**

- The committee recommends exploring how existing space can be better utilized and maximized to meet the university’s academic mission through, for example, the shared and collaborative use of space and multipurpose space utilization.

- NIU should continue operationalizing the developed master plan for space.

- The committee is concerned about the long-term consequences of the need to defer maintenance due to budgetary constraints as it is undermining the university’s core education, research, and community service missions.

- With the challenges imposed by the state’s fiscal crisis, the committee believes the NIU administration needs to continue to seek innovative ways such as through public-private partnerships to fund new facilities across campus to keep NIU competitive with other public universities.

- Existing space needs to be examined for its potential to be used to generate revenue through rentals fees, conferences, and conventions.

- As the use of space is repurposed and plans developed to build new facilities the RSB believes, that it should be part of the decision processes leading to such changes.
April 23, 2015

From: Ibrahim M. Abdel-Motaleb, Chair, RSB committee
      Abdel-Motaleb
To: Doug Baker, NIU President
Cc: Lisa Freeman, Executive Vice President and Provost
    Alan D. Phillips, Chief Financial officer
    William Pitney, President of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Secretary of the University Council
    Resource, Space and Budget Committee Members

Dear President Baker,

The RSB Committee is attaching a copy of the Statement of Budget Priorities and the results of the budget survey that was conducted recently. Except for two new additions, the Statement of Budget Priorities is a continuation of last year’s report, where many of the recommendations are in the process of implementation. Regarding the budget survey, it appears that positive and negative feedback about the budget and hiring process are balanced, resulting in a Gaussian distribution, with the mean located at the middle of the numerical grade, 3 out of 5 (please see attachment). However, the survey reveals a huge number of comments that need to be studied, evaluated, and addressed.

For this meeting, the committee identified four issues to be addressed, with the understanding that other issues can be added if necessary.

**Issue #1: Developing of a “Master Development Plan” for NIU**

The RSB suggests the creation of a “Master Development Plan.” It is believed that using a specialized architecture firm would lead to a realistic plan. The purpose of the creation of the plan is to be used for fundraising by the university foundation, providing the justification for capital development requests, and providing a road map to all university units for future developments.

**Please comment the feasibility of this plan.**

**Issue #2: Enhancing the accessibility of NIU campus to persons with disabilities**

Students and staff with disabilities suffer from some difficulties on campus. These difficulties range from minor inconveniences to major hindrances. The committee feels that NIU needs to develop a plan to make the campus the most friendly to persons with disabilities. Although many of the issues can be addressed immediately, others may need substantial resources. Therefore, an elaborate plan needs to be developed by a specialized architecture firm. Such plan will have a positive impact on the recruitment of a more diverse student population, which is one of the core missions of NIU.

**Please address the feasibility of such a plan.**
Issue #3: Budget Process (see survey’s feedback)

The RSB committee acknowledges the efforts of the administration to be more transparent and inclusive. However, some concerns, whether real or perceived, have been raised. Below are some, but not all, of the concerns about the budget.

(a) Transparency: Below are some of the comments about transparency:
   i) Budget process takes place in closed doors.
   ii) Current practices are top loading the administration.
   iii) Money from vacant positions should cover any vacation/sick payouts before they are returned centrally.
   iv) Need to have clarity about the college’s budget; how the budget will be balanced.
(b) End automatic retraction of funds for unfilled position.
(c) Needs to be easier and more efficient process. Involve units’ heads.

Please elaborate on the hiring process, and the possibility of revisiting the process to address some of these issues.

Issue #4: Hiring process (see survey’s feedback)

Similar to budget process, there are positive comments and some concerns. The details of the feedback is shown in the attachment. Below is a list of some, but not all, of the concerns about the hiring process:

(a) Efficiency: This is one of the concerns, even though HR is praised for their effort.
(b) Process is very lengthy (major concern from the majority of the respondents).
(c) Excess paper work.
(d) Problems with communication regarding the process and the status of the vacancies.
(e) Hiring hearing is not effective.
(f) Real hiring decision appears to be done somewhere else other than the hearing.

Please elaborate on the hiring process, and the possibility of revisiting the process to address some of these issues.

Thank you.

Attachments: (a) Statement of Budget Priorities, (b) budget survey feedback, and (c) budget survey analysis
Please select the position title that best describes your role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Department Chair</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Director or Department Head</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have budget responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, the new budgeting process implemented by the new university administration under the leadership of President Baker in 2014-15, compared with the old one, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - Better</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Worse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value
--- | ---
Total Responses | 50

Communication about the budget between my unit and the university budget offices are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - Better</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Worse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My unit hired new faculty or staff in FY 2014-15 (choose all that apply).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, my unit hired faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, my unit hired staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, my unit has not hired during FY 2014-15.</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, the current hiring process implemented by the new university administration under the leadership of President Baker, compared with the old one, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - Better</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Worse</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RSB Budget Survey, Qualitative Analysis

4. Things I like about the budget process are:

Transparency
- More transparent, I have greater responsibility for my area (control)
- In theory, the new budget process makes more sense and is more transparent.
- There is a greater sense of transparency.
- I feel that there is more transparency and more involvement all the way around, but I don't feel the new process is fully completed. So, it's hard to compare the old process to the new process.
- More transparency, more structured.
- Transparency
- Transparency regarding the choices being made and the processes and priorities driving the choices.
- There is an elevated level of transparency. I think academic chairs have a better "high level" view of challenges at NIU which they can then communicate to faculty and staff.
- Greater transparency.
- My understanding is that this is part of a more transparent process and the Provost and President have reviewed all of our budgets. It is nice to have a clean fresh start.
- At the level of public transparency, the process is much better. President Baker, Provost Freeman, CFO Suttenfield (when she was here) have done a very good job of providing the campus community with "big picture" information about the university's budget situation. Similarly, I am impressed with the significant increase in information supplied to the BoT to provide context for budget proposals to them. I am also pleased with the budget principles that were developed over the past year.
- More transparency, more performance-based funding.
- More transparent.
- More transparency.
- Actually know what amount is being provided.

Faster
- decisions are made more quickly.
- It's being done earlier than half way through the year.

Ease of use
- Ease of the review process. Flexibility between lines.
- The budget development and budget review spreadsheets are easy to use.
- The process seems very organized.

Sustainability
- that we are addressing problems that have been buried too long -- e.g., sustainability
- 1. that we are addressing longstanding budget problems -- i.e., sustainability. 2. that an attempt was made to help everyone realize the interconnectedness of what we do and that revenue issues in one place ultimately impact us all. But, that effort should also have stressed where our revenues come from -- i.e., which units or divisions in the university generate money and which units/divisions do not. I.e., not enough effort was put into educating units where they fit into the overall revenues vs. expenditures picture.

The change has not been observed
- I haven't noticed a change in our area.
- I am not sure that I see a lot of differences but we have a very minimal and simple budget.
- I was not aware that there was a new budgeting process implemented. Sorry

The change is incomplete
- In theory, it is better. For my area of responsibility, things are still somewhat up in the air regarding budget. There are many unanswered questions.
- There needs to be more definition to budget process. If by budget process you mean more controls, this has increased the time it takes me to do everything. With people not being replaced, I have become more inefficient due to the changes and cannot get my job done without putting in
many extra hours.

- Not much has really changed other than the position approval process which has slowed down everything to almost a standstill and I believe has affected services provided students.
- I don't think there really is a well defined new budget process yet, so I am finding this difficult to answer
- What new budget process?  The few changes that were made, like rolling over 02 money, were never implemented. We were that administration was aware we'd run a deficit and not to worry about it.

**Nothing to like**

- There is not much to like about the current budget process.  The situation is very fluid and the processes being used currently need tweaking.
- Nothing. See number 5
- Not much to like

**Misc.**

- There is accountability where there wasn't before.
- I like that travel has finally been cracked down on
- We're better able to determine rates at a time when students are making decisions about attending/returning to NIU, rather than over the summer when decisions have already been made without all the info.
- It requires institution level planning. Units have been given money that was traditionally held centrally then doled out.
- Relatively quick response to questions from the Budget and Planning e-mail. Although, I usually got quick answers from Dena Funkhouser or Roger Maas, when I could contact them directly.
- More realistic and relies on real numbers not hopes, expectations, etc.  Many of the issues we now face are due to unrealistic goals and budgets to fit those goals.  Tearing back those layers will be a difficult and challenging process which must be done for us to SURVIVE!!!!
- Moving strategic planning into the base budget
- I have a very knowledgeable business manager to reference and guide me through fiscal decisions.
- I like that the higher ups take the time to really hear what is going on. I think this is very good because we all can see some numbers and make some determinations based upon that, but to have someone really feel like what you say can make a difference (even if it doesn't) is great!
- It's more thorough, allowing us to make decisions based on data.  It will also allow for cost-benefit analyses, which will then justify improvements through business cases.
- 1- There is more certainty about the amount for each unit.  2- It is uniform for all units, hence units get what they need.  3- I assume in the future, there will be more communication between the basic units and the budget committee.
- Taking control of the overall budget, and spending within our means, is critically important.  I believe/hope decisions being made now are going to accurately reflect our goals as an institution.  Significant efforts are being made to get a handle on our budget. Work on this should have begun years ago given the lower enrollment trends.
- the automatic removal of salary dollars from my budget when a person leaves, will cause me to stop purchases of all equipment and supplies and lay off students to have enough money to handle the benefit payouts.

**N/A**

- I'm new to the process of budgeting, so I can't make comparisons, and I'm still learning.
- see item 7
- I've only been a director under President Baker and have no comparison.

**5. Changes I would like to see in the budget process are:**

**Increased transparency**

- More transparency and accountability by the decision makers.
- It's supposed to be more open, but it takes place in a closed room!  I have no idea how decisions about hiring are made. Moreover, our dean is not a great advocate, and I have a feeling that people who are more persuasive do better; in other words, a certain amount is now dependent on
the rhetoric and public presentation skills of administrators rather than the needs of units.

- Cuts cannot be across the board. They have to be more strategic. Across the board cuts are not successful ever. More transparency!
- The hiring timelines to be considered while redefining the budget process. There are significant unknowns about the budget process and the process is not participative enough.
- Current practices are top loading the administration. Transfers and withholdings are not transparent and reconcilable. Changes are not well thought out and stream lined.
- I do not see any of the budget process aside from being sent my core budget and being told to cut whatever percentage they are requiring. How the funding that came from the Provost Office would be dispersed was completely decided by CLAS after several months of trying to get answers to how many people we could hire.
- Monies from vacant positions should cover any vacation/sick payouts before they are returned centrally. A process to request funds for temporary employees who are performing the duties of vacant positions needs to be implemented. A better tracking of positions and funds returned centrally needs to be established and implemented. I also noted while doing the 8-month 02 budget review that some budget transfers were reflected in the budget review sheets and not in the February Peoplesoft reports. When questioned, I was told it was due to a "timing issue". I wish the budget team would be transparent when it is evident the budget transfers were made after the month end close rather than forcing those preparing the budget review to "figure it out".
- More responsibility given to Chairs, particularly with respect to hiring. For all the talk about transparency I certainly feel that the budgeting process is even less transparent than before with authority taken away from chairs and deans.
- More clarity about the process. For example, our 02 seems unclear after the salary take backs.
- * Clarity about the college's budget. The Provost's Office acknowledges that none of the colleges' budgets are balanced, and that changes need to be made to balance them (with the strong implication that funds need to be added, not just that we need to cut expenses), but that hasn't happened yet.
- Increased clarity regarding decisions to fund or not fund faculty hiring requests.

**End automatic retraction of funds for unfilled positions**

- No automatic sweeps of funds for unfilled positions.
- Taking away the float provided by vacant positions leaves many units to deficit spending. In many ways, the budgets provided to units at the beginning of the year are meaningless because we really don't know how much money we have.
- Ability to move funds between personnel and non-personnel budget categories. In the current model, with all personnel dollars swept back centrally whenever a vacancy occurs, there is no ability to make a strategic decision to move funds from personnel to non-personnel categories; and no incentive to move funds from non-personnel to personnel (since, as soon as you do, you risk those funds being swept centrally and never seen again).

**Needs to be easier to use/more efficient**

- I'm not sure what changes you are talking about, so my first comment is that if there have been changes they have not been adequately announced. If you are talking about the policy of returning all vacant positions to the Provost and having "hiring hearings," at a minimum that adds delays. I also have to say that the decisions I have seen have not made sense to me and have not, as far as I can tell, been well informed by data. Decisions have been occurring more slowly than ever (and the system has always been slow). My own department is in a state of crisis because of vacant positions.
- Faster approvals for hires.
- Allow the Vice Presidents to give approval for hiring within their departments so the process is not slowed down so significantly by going through additional layers. I hope and expect the prioritization process will help to determine where NIU spends its money. And then, we can ease up on the lengthy process it takes to hire staff to keep our departments running smoothly. Not having adequate or qualified staff in units/depts. is not a good way to serve students!
- Also, it seems slower and more centralized.
• Improved support on budgetting at the division and department level. Availability of user-friendly budget software. A codified capital budget request system with a standardized format.
• Streamlined forms, less forms, less prose

**Budgeting needs to be completed sooner**
• Better communication and to begin the budget process earlier in the fiscal year.
• The timetable for decisions needs to be moved forward. Academic hiring begins in early fall semester, for some units even before the semester. Decisions about funding for positions were made much later this year than in the past, and that created a number of planning problems. I realize this year was transitional. But if you really are asking what can be improved, it's that: earlier decisions. Approve positions for funding no later than the beginning of the fall semester.
• 1. Publish the budgeting schedule. 2. By this time in the fiscal year, I should have had to submit a draft FY2016 budget by now. Is that planned? By when? 3. Alan Phillips will be making process changes, which will require budget-related revisions. That's a huge positive step.
• Receipt of a unit level budget in a timely fashion.
• Budgets for the new fiscal year available before the fiscal year starts. Taking into account future FY needs that are known now. Being fully funded for the work we are required to perform and the associated personnel. More in-person communication as a group so I can learn from other areas' questions. A way easily report FSR information into the division level for various units and departments and by funds instead of having to do so manually, which is very time consuming and prone to human error.
• Too many wait and see items. Our budget wasn't finalized until November, so there's no way to use it as a planning tool. Lots of unanswered questions - utilities, reserves, capital expenditures

**Concerns with travel restrictions**
• 1- Budget items should be discussed with the directors and chairs. 2- Blanket order such as, no travel unless authorized by higher authority, is counter-productive, since it discourages chair and faculty from even asking. 3- The most important thing is to know exactly what the unit will receive to help managing and planning.
• The restrictions on travel is significantly impacting my ability to meet statutory requirements specific to training my staff. Given our limited resources and that our funds are 02 funds, it is causing a problem. However, the Budget Office has been very accommodating and helpful in finding resolutions to our needs.

**Communication should be better**
• More timely communication
• There has to be greater communication about the process and expectations
• Lack of clarity ... changes are communicated late in the process
• The Accounting Office needs to communicate with departments about changes it implements before they are enacted. It also needs to learn and understand the businesses needs of departments to get the job done. For example purchasing and paying vendors, may follow textbook processes, but do not fit the reality of our situation and thus workarounds are developed to address the real world which require more time and effort.
• Better communication between the budget office and my unit, I have a hard time getting a response to emails and phone calls.
• I would really like to see us asked for our ideas, i.e. what we'd like to see increased or changed within our budgets. We are never asked for input.
• As an administrative department director, I've received very little communication about the budget process changes to date. More communication would be very helpful.

**Misc.**
• Auxiliaries still need better coordination to make sure all parties are on the same budget cycle as many are dependent upon each other for internal charges back and forth between them.
• Opportunity to request changes based upon actual and not perceived need
• In practice, not all changes have been implemented. For example, my office has a position that is funded by another campus unit. In theory, these funds (recurring for more than 10 years!) should be transferred to my budget.
• I would like to see how capital equipment requests will be handled. Projecting out more than a year in advance all of our equipment needs is very difficult especially when we are already working with aged equipment. We can plan ahead for some things, but other requests may need to be added
during the year and a need may be more immediate and we need to know how you would like us to address these issues. Right now, I look to see if I have funds and contact The director of financial analyst for assistance. She does help me out with immediate needs, but is this really the process we should follow?

- I would like to see a 5 year budget plan so that we can do actual meaningful planning. I would like to see the revenue allocated to my cost center as soon as the budget is approved so that I have a true cash position on my FSR and be confident about the amount I am actually funded for. I would like to stop the talk of mid-year recision. Distribute the budgets already reduced the 3% and then mid-year roll the 3% out if possible or just to those who are able to justify the need.
- A more cohesive sense of receptivity on the part of central administration about the unique challenges of specific units would be welcome. It feels--perhaps inaccurately--that unique (discipline based) difficulties are not taken into account and some personnel refuse to be educated on these.
- I want to see program prioritization and program review made parts of the process.
  1. recognize and prioritize revenue generators. Students don't come to NIU for its student services; they come and they pay tuition for an education. 2. the budget process does not seem to be driven by clearly stated and focused objectives (other than saving money). What exactly are we striving toward as an institution? Prioritize or incentivize budgeting on the basis of how units contribute toward those objectives. 3. a more concerted effort to reduce the size of administrative services and the exorbitant overhead of forms, paperwork, reports, etc.
- Annual hiring hearings for professorial hirings materially dampen the university's ability to use hiring strategically. The previous method of negotiating for lines that were in turn either filled, searched for, or on held allowed a department (and the university) to make more effective use of new faculty lines, which are arguably the most valuable human resource that we apply to our mission of scholarship and artistry.
- Have VPs report to President re: budget
- An equitable accounting based upon exposed and documented criteria
- no more frivolous spending at the end of the year to rid the budget of the 02 money!
- ONLINE HUMAN RESOURCES PAPERWORK. HUMAN RESOURCES TRAINING MODULES AVAILABLE ONLINE. Addition of Filled position budget amounts BACK to the budget when justified, as quickly as Vacant position amounts are taken away.
- Ask Business Managers and department heads first before you impose solutions.
- Determining need verses history. There are numerous "bloated" layers of administration that just rubber stamp the previous layer decision. Look at the University as if it were a private college or university and had to survive on it's own resources. If private business ran their operations the way we do they would go bankrupt.
- I would like to see units being reimbursed or given funding for extra help/additional pay/student worker personnel expense incurred as a result of filling in for a vacant position, rather than the position budget amount giveback to a central cost center in the Provost's Office.
- Funds removed when we had an opening last year have not yet been returned that I am aware of even though we had the greenlight to hire and did so. (Our personnel lines are now veering into the negative).
- In a lot of ways, I see us in transition. It seems clear that the old model is ended, but a new model is not yet clearly in place. It is therefore difficult to really comment on the current process, as I don't yet feel that we have a budget process. In particular, there is presently a disconnect between the principles and practice. I understand the urgency of the current situation, and the need to centralize resources and centralize decision-making. But the budget principles call for aligning budgets with responsibility, and giving budget control to those with the responsibility for achieving goals. We have not yet fulfilled those aspirations. There may well be movement in that direction, but such movement is not visible to me. Similarly, we have set a goal (I believe) of moving away from the private treaties and side-deals that were part of the old process, but as we've moved forward with activities like creating differential tuition plans, it feels like we've said "put the scheme in place now, and figure out later how to integrate it into the overall budget picture". I worry that will tend to perpetuate the old model of a rabbit's warren of specific agreements. As we move towards a new process, there are several specific things I hope to see: * Clarity about the college's budget. The Provost's Office acknowledges that none of the colleges' budgets are balanced, and that changes need to be made to balance them (with the strong implication that funds need to be added, not just that we need to cut expenses), but that hasn't happened yet. * Creation of a
mechanism for "flexing" those parts of the budget that need to adjust on a fairly short time scale. I'm thinking particularly of what we call the "instructional staffing budget": determining the needs for instructors, faculty overloads, adjuncts, etc. This needs to adjust up and down in response to two factors: changes in student demand; and changes in our "base capacity" (in our college, professorial faculty and graduate assistantships). Right now, this is done in a completely ad hoc manner, with us going to the Provost's Office and requesting funds every time there is a change.

- We have cost centers within our 02 budget that we would like to have a better way to budget.
- Prioritize faculty hires over administrative positions. While we lost significant faculty this past year we're now hiring an Assoc Vice Provost for Engagement. We don't need more administrators!
- more educational opportunities for unit leadership
- I would like to see budgets be set to realistic numbers. I know we are in an environment where we need to do more with less, but sometimes it is not possible to get the same quality with less. I would also like to see how the impact of a department can somehow be given leniency when it comes to distribution of funds. Here at Campus Recreation the overall generation of Revenue may be considered low compared to the overall impact on the students, staff, community and faculty members that use our facilities.

N/A

- There is no budget process at this point, so I can't say what should be changed. The deans were told that the central administration knows that every college will run a deficit this year and they are fine with that.
- I am not sure if there is where I need to speak my opinion but I have staff making a little over $21,000 annually and they have went without a raise for 3+ years and work hard for this university. Please give raises!!! Please have upper management what a great job they are doing, they hear it from me every day but they need to hear it from higher up. It is not our fault that NIU has failed to recruit better. I have children just getting out of college. NIU's recruitment for their schools and in our area at home was very poor. I could do it better. I am an alum and I work here. I am proud of NIU. Get the morale up and give raises...please! Get out there a recruit!
- None.
- None

7. Any further thoughts about the budget process:

Concern with efficiency

- A lot of work needs to be done as individuals overseeing the budget process lack the experience and the expertise to make it efficient and effective.
- With the current practices in place, many of the roles of the Dean and Business manager are now attempting to be done at hire levels. this practice is inefficient, more costly, and hampering the ability of the colleges to function according to the University mission. In many cases students needs are not being met on a timely manner.
- There seems to be a bottle-neck in approvals and the first answer from the Office of the Provost in terms of funds always seems to be "No."
- It seems that the solution to every budgeting or HR paperwork problem is to set up more hurdles to the HR and budget process. The vacancy hearings and additional hiring forms (criminal background checks, Declaration of Status, Mandated Reporter) are good examples of that. More meetings, more paperwork, more frustration, more delay. No one seems to acknowledge that the extra time and intellectual property spent on the extra processes uses up taxpayer resources at the same time that it tries to save taxpayer resources. If, in the final analysis, resources are actually saved, I would be very surprised.
- Budget and transfer requests are extremely backlogged currently, with no communication from the Budget and Planning Office on the status of submitted budget transfer requests. (We have transfer requests that are over 1 month outstanding, with no status on if and/or when they will be processed). This is very frustrating and making it extremely difficult to manage budget lines as the end of the fiscal year approaches.
- There are not enough people in the university office to make things work effectively.

Communication

- There are belated directives but no communication.
- Better communication regarding changes; need to have set budgets by the beginning of the fiscal
Communication between my unit and the university budget offices are the same, which is to say, the department has access only to the college-level budget office.

I learned about changes two ways: 1) from the business manager 2) when I have made a mistake and it needed to be corrected

I don't feel as though there is much communication at all.

Better communication needs to happen. I have sent numerous emails with questions to the budget team mailbox and never receive a response. The team I thought was to provide guidance through the new process.

Communication has been good. They have offered guidance which was much appreciated.

I have always had good communications with the budget office. This continues to be the case so it is not necessarily that communications are better but that they remain at an expected, acceptable level.

Budget and transfer requests are extremely backlogged currently, with no communication from the Budget and Planning Office on the status of submitted budget transfer requests. (We have transfer requests that are over 1 month outstanding, with no status on if and/or when they will be processed). This is very frustrating and making it extremely difficult to manage budget lines as the end of the fiscal year approaches.

As far as communication it's 50/50. Sometimes I receive responses and other times my questions fall into a black hole and I receive no response, or responses come over a week later. Responses should be more timely.

**Transparency**

- Keep it transparent.
- Make it more transparent.

**Suggestions for other budget models**

- I would like to see the university address certain needs through a net-revenue model.
- The budget review process needs to be modernized and updated. The present "cover every deficit" process effectively destroys the use of financial statements and budgets as a planning and feedback tool. A better process (one which I have shared with the Budget Office for their review) would be to worry about whether a college is on budget or over budget *in total*, allowing individual cost centers or budget lines to be over budget with proper documentation and an actual reason for the overage.

**Misc.**

- Concern that money goes back to the provost. It leaves no room for innovation by the dept/college. Return of money to dept/college only happens if there is a new hire.
- Having a CFO is an excellent move
- Continue educating the chairs/director about the budget process.
- What budget process? We went through an exercise of vacancy hearings last year, and have been told that we won't be doing it that way again. Yesterday I asked if we could be told how we're handling vacancies for the coming year and was told "We don't yet know how we're doing that."

- It is essential that we are able to plan our future either by getting greater autonomy or a commitment from budgeting authority to long term strategic planning as it affects individual areas. Rewards for performance would be welcome as well.
- I would like a better way to determine if the funding for the positions that we should be receiving (or giving back) are correct. Since it is always a moving target, I cannot determine if we are at the correct funding amount.
- It took a year for leadership to figure out where the money was at according to college reports. I believe there is better accounting now. I think the process is more transparent. I wish the PeopleSoft reports actually fit our needs. I feel like we have to jury rig most things, to make the system work.
- I think we should be allowed to hire persons to replace people that have left. most position left are important and when we are not allowed to fill them, those left behind become more depressed
- Always room for improvement.
- More resources for developing new lines of funding at the unit or college level would be
beneficial. We have no mechanisms to enhance the fiscal viability of our units. We are completely dependent upon the whim of state legislators, IHBE, and high-level administrators.

- This process can not be separated from the overall university morale scene. If operational units suffer cuts, then overhead positions and CONSULTANTS and other non-productive staff have to be seen to share the love too.
- Evaluate duplication and get rid of it. Maybe do a round of layoffs to get people's attention. Use some of the funds from the reduced staff level to give minimal "token" increases to those left. Token is all we can afford. People need to realize we are in a very difficult and challenging spot and it will take everyone working "HARD" and committed to get us to through it.
- The changes haven't really affected our area yet, that I can see.
- I am not really aware of changes that have been made other than funds at the end of the year returning to Central (rather than the state where perhaps they never went but was what we were told).

I assume that the budget process refers to the process of assigning funds to units, and to specific spending categories, so that those units can deploy the funds to achieve their mission. In particular, I assume that you're not asking about the transactions involved in actually spending funds, accounting for them after the fact, etc. But just in case, let me make a couple of points:  
  * Because we don't have a stable budget, we use the transactional processes of hiring and expending funds as proxies for the budgeting process. That is, instead of saying "we have X dollars and exercise our discretion to spend them on Y", we are instead saying "we want to do Y, and we need X dollars to do it, will you both approve us doing Y and give us X dollars to do it". That's a very inefficient way to operate.  
  * In general the back end processes are better and smoother, but not completely. There's still a strong sense across my college that offices charged with procurement, accounting, reporting, etc. approach their roles in a narrow compliance point of view. It may be an exaggeration, but there was an assertion that a travel reimbursement was sent back because the middle initial was missing. That assertion was readily believed by many others, and it's that ready acceptance of the story that speaks to the perception that people in the college hold.

- Thank you for clarifying NIU finances-- formerly (& informally) known as a Rube Goldberg Machine.
- This is a product of uncertainty, ambiguity and less staffing
- In these comments, I'm assuming that "budget process" refers to the process of allocating resources to units to achieve their mission. In particular, I assume that you're not asking about the accounting practices, paperwork needed to carry out a transaction, etc. Those practices are a bit better, but I worry a bit that there's some regression towards old practices.
- If we are going to delay or deny the hiring of staff then we have to cut back on our services. We cannot continue to over work the same group of people and expect them to keep doing more, especially with the lack of raises. On the other hand, there are those who completely abuse the benefits and privileges provided by NIU. Change (HR) practices so those who are not doing a good job can be fired. Keeping them on is very costly to the departments and the university. NIU is too employee friendly when it comes to those who abuse sick time, FMLA, and don't work efficiently in their job. Too much time and money is spent protecting employees who don't deserve to be here. I would recommend for the program prioritization committee to survey NIU staff regarding 'waste' they see on a regular basis that has a significant impact on the budget, but is often overlooked. I regularly see and hear about significant inequities regarding how many hours per day/week and how hard some individuals work compared to others. Setting clear expectations for use of vacation and sick time, FMLA, work hours, etc. would be very helpful, especially to supervisors who are trying to manage budgets, provide high quality programs and services, and accommodate excessive staff absences and lack of work ethic.
- I feel like money is being siphoned away from instruction for "Vices"--provosts, presidents, and the like--as well as for consultants. How can we retain students better when instructional staff is so demoralized?

N/A

- It was my understanding that we hired Dr. Baker to lead the university, to help us make the right decisions for our future, and along the way hopefully fix a few of the many longer-term issues we've been reticent to face. How are we supposed to have trust or faith in that leadership when the answer to "how shall we address X" always seems to involve hiring a consultant first? I guess we're all idiots.
• I do not know what the budget process was previously as I am somewhat new.
• I have only been a chair for a < 1 year, so I am not really able to realistically compare the budgeting process now with the one that was in place previously.
• Cannot judge number 6 yet. In 8, does this include instructors or VAPs?
• No

10. Things I like about the hiring process are:

Nothing to like
• There is very little I like about our current hiring process. Our paper-based processes are antiquated.
• Can't think of anything I like about it.
• Not much
• Not much.
• Not much
• Nothing!
• nothing!

Things are moving faster
• HRS seems to be moving a little faster.
• I appreciate how quickly my paperwork went through HR.

Misc.
• I support that fact that units should tie their staffing needs to mission critical duties.
• Ability to request based upon need for positions to be filled rather than hoping to be in one's favor to be granted hiring decisions.
• It is an advantage that a unit can request, with justification, a faculty line with higher pay. If this is done correctly, it will have a great impact on the academic units.
• Again, since we do not hire very often, I don't have a lot of experience to draw upon to make a comparison. When a position came vacant, I immediately addressed the need to re-fill the position with Nancy Suttenfield and was given authority to proceed. I do not feel this has been the “typical” experience on campus but I can not speak to the experience of others.
• I like the way funding for the new approved position is rolled into my budget.
• Personnel in HR are VERY Helpful!
• The AADR office has provided a lot of support in understanding and implementing the process.
• I like the process of coordinating with HR and the search committee. Even though it takes a while, I think the guidance we have been given has been very helpful.
• Transparency
• If a position is approved, the corresponding budget is allocated to us (in the 02s).
• I think it had strategy and impact in mind, rather than behind the scenes bargaining and trading.
• It works, sort of.
• At this time, the hiring process is also somewhat up in the air. There have been some conflicting messages. I know that that is due to the overall budgetary issues in the university.
• HRS was very responsive.
• As long as it's civil service, not much. However, there are individuals in HRS that are very knowledgeable and helpful. I am grateful for that.
• The increase of cooperation between organizational silos.
• It takes entirely too long to hire anyone at this university.
• It is on an as-needed basis
• I understand the University must get a handle on its finances..which are driven by personnel costs. I think the process speaks to this issue. It seems apparent that some thought is being given to the allocation of resources for rehires and new hires relative to the needs and performance of units.
• Slows down hiring process. Doesn't get at the realities that we have bad union contracts that require filling of positions to do work that could be done by our students. The biggest problem with the hiring at the University is the CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM!!!!!!! It is outdated and does not reflect our market today. Why should be need a Civil Service System when we are all unionized. Put pressure on the State to do what was done in Wisconsin in regards to labor unions.
• Positions were being evaluated and considered. So if one got approval, it would seem that yes, this is seen as a real need and a service of value. I am not sure if I am aware of other changes.
• I don’t necessarily “like” the centralization of hiring authorizations, but I respect the necessity of it, and respect that, at least in this transitional period, it’s a means of accomplishing a needed rebalancing of personnel across the university.
• that it is a search committee, not an individual hiring.
• I like that we are actually able to get some people in, as some other departments still are waiting.

N/A
• The position I needed was approved.
• See answer to #4
• Again, we’ve already been told that what we did last year would not be repeated. So, we do not have a hiring process at this point.

11. Changes I would like to see in the hiring process are:
Efficiency
• To be honest, I’ve never liked the hiring process because it is way too paper-intensive, and requires way too many hands for those papers to pass through en route to HRS. Additionally, the lengthy time it takes for HRS to compile civil service lists for vacant positions puts added strain on the folks who are “temporarily” taking on those vacant duties for periods of time much longer than they should. For the SPS process, the Part I and Part II reviews can take so much additional time that candidates move on because they have not heard back from us regarding their status. These reviews should either be expedited or the process made more simple (like the civil service EEO form) so that decisions can be made more quickly. Finally ... and this seems very trivial, but for many of my colleagues, it's important. The offering of a job comes from HRS, not the employing department ... but the notification of unsuccessful candidates comes from the employing department. That seems backwards ... HRS will not extend the same exuberance or excitement to a successful candidate as the employing department will. HRS can certainly tell us our candidate has been approved ... but WE should be the ones to relay the good news because we’ve met these folks and have come to “know” them in a way HRS cannot.
• I would like to see the process go quicker. When an essential position needs to be filled it should not take weeks on end to get that person processed and on the payroll.
• Gut HR and get people who are cross-trained and can keep the process moving. Streamline the hiring process to make it less combersome. All hiring should not have to go through the President. Decisions should be made by the supervising Dean or VP. Create an on-line application for civil service positions. Follow the lead of every other college and university! We are completely behind the times in this area. Allow for internal hires when justified and appropriate. It is very costly to go through a search process when you have a highly qualified and good person already within your area. This should be a retention initiative to keep our good staff. Creating a search process for every position, every time is costly and wastes a lot of work time.
• Secretarial hiring should not be subject to the same process as faculty hiring. For secretarial hiring, the decision should be done at the unit level, unless the unit wants to change the nature of the position or add a new administrative assistant position. Current process for secretarial hiring is not efficient.
• Faster! I have to submit the PRF in December for staff that are going to start in August. I have also experienced some confusion in the procedures for hiring and reappointing SPS positions, and I’ve gotten different information from different departments (AADR vs. Contracts and Records vs. Payroll, for example).
• It’s too cumbersome and confusing. There need to be a set of rules, published on the HR website or elsewhere, documenting the steps. Currently, the process appears capricious and ad hoc. Also, if we want to improve performance, we need to pay better in order to attract better talent. One does get what one pays for.
• HR personnel are overworked and it takes too long to get approvals for positions - especially when trying to determine if a position is Civil Service or SPS.
• More timely. Cover vacation/sick payouts prior to returning funds centrally. Better tracking of positions and dollars returned centrally.
• I wish it would go faster.
- Competing for the ability to hire amongst the various colleges does not serve the students we are attempting to serve. Micro managing by Administration wates valuable time at every level.
- It takes FOREVER for the whole process, and the longer lead time on approvals does not help. Have a way to verify that the proper funding is in the corresponding cost centers. Certain areas seem to be favored with being able to refill positions and others go without.
- Some will complain about speed. But so be it. Sufficient concessions were made to deal with emergency situations.
- The lag time between submission and approval is very lengthy for all positions. SPS and Civil Service hiring remains tedious and is handicapped by a very labor intensive paper process. Pay scales for office support personnel are ridiculous and are not commensurate with either the position requirements or local labor market trends. This results in the inability to hire for positions that are mission critical in order to support the academic mission and ultimately student career success. We can’t continue operating this way.
- The hiring process is extremely cumbersome and frustrating. Processes should be online and much faster. At my previous institution, everything was done online. My decisions for position classifications was not questioned because better guidance was given on how to write job descriptions, etc.
- Implementation of systems and processes that can speed all aspects of the various stages of the hiring process.
- It takes so long to get a position filled. You have to wait until the position is vacant before you can begin to request to fill it, and then you have to go through a justification process that could delay things further. Many times vacancies are being addressed through the hiring of extra help. This sometimes works, but not always.

**Concerns with excess paperwork/desire for more online elements**

- There is too much paperwork. Moreover, the civil service hiring process is antiquated and cumbersome.
- We need to expedite the process of hiring. There are too many steps along the way, particularly in the past two years. We are a lean office and a missing staff member cripples us, and impacts student services as a result. It seems that decisions are made to delay the process without ample opportunity for the specific department to express just how critical a position is to the area. We need to continue to refine the civil service hiring process to take into account that departments often know more than HR does about what skills are necessary for a particular position versus the classification. I should be able to reject a candidate that lacks certain technical skills that are required for my job without penalty. Civil service classifications still do not consider things such as clerical staff needing more experience in data entry and excel spreadsheets and web design than typing speed, which all are beyond any classification specifics for our jobs. The classifications are woefully behind our technical requirements. Thirdly, with regard to student hiring, it is a huge responsibility to hire international students. It would be exceedingly helpful that responsibility for the technical aspects of hiring students be handled by HR rather than put that responsibility on a large number of secretaries who do not make a lot of money to begin with. What if we could interview and select student workers, then send them to HR for the technical aspects of all of that hiring paperwork. It would reduce the errors made by our offices, and reduce stress they experience because of the complexity of certain aspects of hiring, especially with the 10 or more papers required to hire international students.
- The lag time between submission and approval is very lengthy for all positions. SPS and Civil Service hiring remains tedious and is handicapped by a very labor intensive paper process. Pay scales for office support personnel are ridiculous and are not commensurate with either the position requirements or local labor market trends. This results in the inability to hire for positions that are mission critical in order to support the academic mission and ultimately student career success. We can’t continue operating this way.
- On line review and selection process. Create a system that a replacement staff member can be hired and start working in 2-3 weeks verses the current 2-3 months. Allow posting, screening and interviewing of new staff members once a notice of resignation or retirement is obtained. Require departments to get notice of retirement when paperwork is filled out verses when they don’t show up for work.
- Human Resources should provide more information at the beginning of the process so you are aware of all the forms and information needed, instead of piecemeal. HR should also be
responsible for obtaining the required documents from the new employee, and should also be
responsible for notification to those candidates not hired not the hiring department.
- Online Human Resources paperwork and online HR training modules.
- Less paperwork
- The hiring process is extremely cumbersome and frustrating. Processes should be online and
much faster. At my previous institution, everything was done online. My decisions for position
classifications was not questioned because better guidance was given on how to write job
descriptions, etc.

**Communication**
- There seems to be less communication as to what's actually going on with position refills. Refills
that have been requested sometimes we don't find out what's going on with them and calls or e-
mails need to be made in order to find out what's going on. It can be frustrating.
- I think there has to be a better communication about the status of vacant positions.

**Misc.**
- Stop converting SPS positions to Civil Service, Provide enough staff in the HR team to effectively
manage the Civil Service hiring process, allow for departmental input into the screening/scoring
process.
- Academic advising must be better supported if we are going to achieve the gains in retention NIU
needs to see. Rejected requests for FTE staff in units with advising ratios greater than 600:1
does not align with NACADA recommendations and does not put NIU where it needs to be to
move the retention needle.
- HR requirements for background check did not feel consistent. I hired someone from another
area and a background check was done an issues were found from 15+ years prior. I feel that
this should have already been identified and handled since they were already in the system.
- More frequent submission of hiring plans
- Data driven decisions and a review of some of the non-academic units for their resources.
- Long term planning, which includes some predictable contingencies.
- Must be systemized, sustainable and consistent. The process does not now deliver as promised.
- More people to be hired in HR to assist in the processing time and not needing to be overseen by
both the dean's office budget manager and hr as there are usually mixed messages that require
additional paperwork.
- The vacancy hearings aren't working. The decision making about who we are able to replace
isn't sound. Dollars aren't being replaced in budgets when we are allowed to hire. There really
isn't a system in place.
- allow departments to hire people once a position has been vacated. There are not many of us
left on campus and when someone leaves, it leaves a BIG hole
- More people to review and process civil service employees.
- Criteria to identify essential staff/faculty positions that streamline the hiring process to facilitate
critical positions that must be filled.
- More frequent review of vacant positions rather than the occasional vacancy hearing. Ability to
track the progress of the paperwork as it progress through the system.
- The "hiring hearing" process did not feel effective or transparent. The hearings did little to
uncover why colleges were making their requests, had no real feedback mechanism from one
dean to another, and did little to help us all see the ways in which each others' requests either did
or didn't align with the university's mission. The real hiring decisions appear to have been made
elsewhere, by processes and criteria that did not feel transparent. I understand that a small
number of people were trying to review a very large number of requests, coming at them in a
variety of formats with wildly varying arguments and evidence supplied to support them. I
therefore understand that the system did not support making any sort of "apples to apples"
comparisons. Nevertheless, I did not come away with a clear sense of what criteria or priorities
informed decisions; and I was left with the sense that some of the decisions were based more on
personal impressions and anecdote than a systematic evaluation. If we are going to continue to
have hiring hearings, I would like to see much more clarity brought to the process. I also hope
we're moving towards an environment in which units are given a personnel budget and a set of
expectations to be met with that budget, and then provided some measure of discretion in
deploying the budget to meet expectations. I hope that for staff positions, which come and go
on a much faster time scale, we can arrive at a faster cycle time for considering replacements.
Finally, the process of automatically sweeping all personnel funds means that we have to either negotiate every time for “float” or “bridge funds” to cover until a permanent replacement can be found, or we have to use our very limited non-personnel funds to provide the bridging. I hope that some process can be found for providing a reliable amount of float when a permanent position is vacated. I recognize that the question of whether or not a position is meant to be refilled needs to be factored in somehow, so I don't have a simple solution to this.

- Prioritize faculty and SPS staff, reduce administration. NIU is following the national trend with a large administrative head and dwindling tenure track faculty.
- Other offices are moving more slowly, especially the Provost. Increasing diversity is an admirable goal, but intrusion into the appointment of search committees is counterproductive. It places pressure on some people to serve on more committees than they can or should, and it causes delays and quarrels.
- amending the process to offer quality candidates a competitive salary at the discretion of the hiring manager as long as the hiring department has the funding available. Currently I have found that I had to make an offer starting at the bottom of the civil service job classification pay range and had to seek presidential approval to offer a higher salary.
- When a position become vacant, NIU should have an assessment policy to see if the position needs to re-filled. On the other hand, when they see that a position needs to be filled they should let you post for that position immediately, maybe even while that person is still working for NIU. This would help go hand and hand with my solution to question number 12. (Located below)

N/A
- See previous response.
- ???
- See answer to #5

12. Any further thoughts about the hiring process:

Efficiency
- It takes way too long. If HR is resource-light, please restructure the area or hire additional people.
- the process from start to finish is very time consuming.
- It is a costly, lengthy and frustrating process. It takes a minimum of 3 months to hire a new staff member, at any level. Something needs to be done about this cumbersome system if NIU is going to be competitive or even survive in this budget climate.
- It needs to be more efficient.
- A new hiring process is needed that quicker. We lose candidates because of how long our HR processes take.
- I understand budget constraints, but the hiring process seems to take way too long and that doesn't include all of the civil service hoops we have to jump.

Misc.
- I am encouraged by program prioritization. I am hopeful that it will provide an opportunity to shift hiring resources in a productive manner.
- HR seems to be an adversarial department rather than a partner in the hiring process. Requests are denied, contacts are not returned, etc. We need HR to listen to our needs and propose workable solutions to accomplish them.
- There is much discrepancy throughout the university. Departments with larger budgets are able to hire additional staff seemingly at whim, even if (to the average person) those new positions do not appear to be mission critical. Smaller units are forced to "make-do" which is not helpful as we are all overworked and taking on additional duties to fight the enrollment decline. The civil service system remains a challenge.
- Not really sure why some departments can hire whoever they want and some departments cannot get a break. There are many many jobs posted for a hiring freeze....
- I am concerned that the fiscal situation in Illinois and the uncertainty regarding pension is detrimental to attracting good people.
- Lack of a clear plan and lack of experienced individuals handling the process.
- It is understood that the new process is adopted to be able to manage the budget and ensure its viability. This is the right way to go. With some adjustments, the process will be very efficient.
The main thing is to inform, involve, request feedback, and educate the unit manages/chairs about their budget and the hiring process of their open lines.

- Faculty and staff are stretched so thin already, and the prospect of having to continually do more with less has reached a point where morale is at an all-time low. Simply asking everyone to collaborate more with others isn't going to be the answer. If vacated faculty and staff positions aren't going to be filled, then the university must look at ways for streamlining outdated and inefficient processes and remove antiquated layers of institutional bureaucracy.

- I feel the university needs to take further action to implement controls to ensure that employees, no matter their classification (faculty, staff, SPS, etc.), are not beginning work at the university before Human Resource Services is aware they have been hired. We have a significant problem with make payments considered to be "retro" pay. We are at risk of not having the proper paperwork completed and not providing the appropriate notifications to employees within the limited time frame required.

- The several years of budget cuts (non-strategic, I would add) and the looming large budget cut for FY16 make it near to impossible to create a strategic and workable hiring process at this point. I can't imagine being at the table trying to figure this out right now. I feel badly for those who are in the positions who need to figure this out, more than I feel badly about the lack of adequate faculty and staff in my college. It's a bad situation.

- I feel the university needs to take further action to implement controls to ensure that employees, no matter their classification (faculty, staff, SPS, etc.), are not beginning work at the university before Human Resource Services is aware they have been hired. We have a significant problem with make payments considered to be "retro" pay. We are at risk of not having the proper paperwork completed and not providing the appropriate notifications to employees within the limited time frame required.

- I realize it is a difficult time due to the state budget but looking online, the majority of positions advertised are for Academics and HR.

- Attempting to balance the budget by not approving (in this new process) the staff positions that are open for refill will only prolong and expand our problems. Continuing to add high priced consultants and upper management just continues to add to the budget woes. To balance a budget you must cut dollars not dimes.

- I hope that Program Prioritization will help with hiring prioritization as well.

- The budget and funding aspects need to be streamlined and less confusing.

- Trying to find answers and stability in those answers has been extremely challenging, leading to delayed hiring and diminished student services.

- What is happening more is not sustainable.

- I think the marketing of positions outside of the HR website would improve the candidate pool.

- HR struggles as do administrators in this area. I want to acknowledge their hard work.

- To reiterate the CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM IS OUTDATED AND USELESS FOR TODAY'S MARKET. Controlled by people down state who have no idea of how our operations or campuses function, yet make rules and policies to preserve their jobs. Additional BLOATING of the system. Thanks for asking, I have been at NIU for 3.5 years after spending the majority of my career in private higher education. NIU is a great place that has not been subject to poor and corrupt management I respect Dr. Baker for working as hard as he does to try and clean it up. Hopefully he will be given the chance to finish what he has started.

- I think people should be able to test for any positions at any time. I am not sure if it is this way now but for quite some time they couldn't test unless there was a position open and you would have to be lucky to see the job post before the deadline. Also if a person has declined the position in the past please take them off our register and not waste our time each time we fill a position.

- I hate the fact that we have vacancy control but I understand how tight our budget is. I am looking forward to more breathing room and trying to hang in there now

- There have been lots of changes in a short period of time. I feel there has to be a way to bridge the gap between the old works and the new. We are losing so much expertise... I think people should be given the opportunity to train their replacements. While this would cost a bit more upfront, we would still retain the expertise and ultimately save money while not sacrificing knowledge. Knowledge is key!

N/A

- I opined about hiring processes in the budget area.

- I have only hired under the current budgeting process, so cannot realistically make these comparisons.
Article 7 of the University Constitution only identifies students as being an ‘integral part of the university's system of governance. In order to make our constitution more expressive of our commitment to shared governance, we propose adding similar language to every recognized council under Article 7. This change will grant the formal recognition of the importance of all members of our university community and help foster further collaboration and leadership at the governing level.

NIU CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE 7: RELATED COUNCILS

7.1 Students
The right of students to organize an association to provide a means for participation in the governance of the university is recognized. Upon acceptance of the constitution by student referendum and by the president of the university, it will be accepted by the university community as an integral part of the university's system of governance. The students, through their association, may communicate their concerns to the University Council or to the vice president for student affairs and, through that vice provost, to the provost and president of the university and have ultimate appeal to the Board of Trustees.

7.2 Operating Staff
The right of the operating staff to organize a council to represent that constituency of the university community is recognized. It will be accepted by the university community as an integral part of the university’s system of governance. The operating staff, through its council, may communicate its concerns to the University Council, to the appropriate vice president(s), to the president of the university and shall then have ultimate appeal to the Board of Trustees.

7.3 University Faculty
The right of the faculty of the university—which shall be defined for this purpose as those regular, full-time university faculty (as defined in Section 6.1.1 of the Constitution) in the academic division of the university, excluding the president, the president's staff, the executive vice president and provost, the executive vice president and provost's staff, the deans and the deans' staffs to organize a Faculty Senate to represent that constituency of the university community is recognized. It will be accepted by the university community as an integral part of the university’s system of governance. The faculty, through the Faculty Senate, may communicate its concerns, recommendations, and positions to the University Council, to the executive vice president and provost, and to the president of the university, and have ultimate appeal to the Board of Trustees. The Faculty Senate is empowered to act as the authoritative and official voice of the faculty of Northern Illinois University. The university bylaws shall specify the membership of the Faculty Senate, its method of selection, and its duties and responsibilities.

7.4 Supportive Professional Staff
The right of the full-time supportive professional staff to organize a council to represent that constituency of the university community is recognized. It will be accepted by the university community as an integral part of the university’s system of governance. The supportive professional staff, through its council, may communicate its concerns to the University Council or through the appropriate vice president(s) to the president of the university and have ultimate appeal to the Board of Trustees.
Northern Illinois University
Operating Staff Council
Meeting Report: Thursday, April 2, 2015

The Operating Staff Council (OSC) met on Thursday, April 2, 2015 in the Holmes Student Center Clara Sperling Sky Room. The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m. by Jay Monteiro, OSC President.

During announcements:
1. Bookmarks were distributed that outlined how to access the Payroll self-service system for pay advices and W-2s.
2. David Long shared that each Wednesday, weather permitting, there will concessions and events available in the Martin Luther King Commons. Long also announced NIU Cares Day would be Saturday, April 18, 2015, from 10:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m.
3. It was mentioned that HB 403, which would eliminate dependent tuition waivers, is still being discussed in Springfield.
4. It was also mentioned that SB 1525, which would privatize the Illinois state universities, should be watched. It was discussed that privatization might lead to the elimination of SURS, the Civil Service system, and the NIU Board of Trustees.

Guests:
Karen Baker, Associate Vice President, Administration & HR Compliance, addressed the Council to clarify the different situations when release time can be used. She reminded those attending that a supervisor can say no to a request based on operational needs. Baker is working with the Provost on a release time policy.

Harlan Teller, Interim Vice President for Marketing & Communications, spoke to the Council. He gave a number of examples of what NIU could do to solve its budget crisis. These included: taking market share from others, holding the line on tuition and fees, and remaining focused on the university’s mission. He announced that a University Marketing Council has been created. He announced the new NIU tagline is “Your Future, Our Focus.” Teller asked that whenever employees have an interaction with a student that might keep the student on campus, to share that information with him.

Sub-committee reports included:

Public Relations Committee:
Changes in the OSC bylaws were approved. These changes made the bylaws agree with election processes, required number of members, and alternate Council members that had been approved at a previous meeting.
Employee Advisory Council (EAC):
Andy Small reported that the State University Civil Service System office is still working on the NIU Civil Service audit from January 2014. Small said EAC discussed the fact that qualifications and specifications in job descriptions across the state are outdated. EAC believes there is a need for more flexibility for human resource offices. This would include: specialty factors for advertised positions, allow out of state recruiting, a three-year audit cycle rather than two, and all positions be Civil Service until determined to be SPS.

Administrative Professionals Advisory Council (APAC):
Robin Andersen reported APAC had a demonstration at their meeting on how to order from the new document services printing system. She also announced that APAC continues to develop its mentoring program for new employees.

Old Business:
1. Program Prioritization – Task Forces are still being formed
2. Wellness Fair - The OSC had a table at the Wellness Fair on April 1, 2015. The Council collected $230 for the 50/50 drawing. $115 will go to the Operating Staff Dependent Endowed Scholarship fund.
3. Proposed Campus Non-Smoking Policy – It was reported that the open forums were finished and that the task force will be meeting to discuss the information received.

New Business:
A request was made from OSC for a submission form on the Faculty & Staff section of the main NIU website. Dr. Baker sent a message to say that his staff will work on this.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay Monteiro
President, Operating Staff Council
SPS COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY, April 9, 2015

The SPS Council met on April 9, 2015. Council members reported on the upcoming events of “MoneySmart” Week, a campus and community event. It was reported that SURS is sponsoring a retirement transition workshop in Naperville and Champaign and other locations. NIU Cares Day still needs volunteers for April 18. The Faculty/SPS service award luncheon will be held on April 28.

NIU HR will co-sponsor, with the NIU Annuitants Association, a series of retirement brown-bag seminars on topics including the timing of retirement and career planning for retirement. These sessions will be held on: April 29, May 6, May 12, and May 20.

The Awards Committee reported on the upcoming SPS annual awards ceremony on April 14. The spring newsletter will be out in late April. SPS Council elections are taking place this month. This year’s SPS dependent scholarship recipient will be recognized at the SPS awards reception. A variety of spring events are planned, and the Workplace Issues committee is going to conduct a short survey on morale issues.

The Council discussed the Program Prioritization process, and elected Jeanne Meyer to the committee that will name members to the Task Forces. Deborah Haliczer discussed the process of selection of criteria for academic and administrative programs that is being discussed by joint meetings of the APC and RSB.

The Council discussed issues regarding release time, and heard a report from members of the Task Force on SPS Personnel Policies. Next meeting will be held on May 14.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Haliczer. President SPSC
NIU Constitution

3.2 Executive Secretary of the University Council

3.2.1 The executive secretary of the University Council shall be elected by the voting members of the University Council from the elected faculty members of the University Council as defined in Section 2.2.1 of the constitution.

Faculty Senate Bylaws

2.1 The Executive Secretary of the University Council shall also serve as President of the Faculty Senate. The Executive Secretary is nominated by the Faculty Senate from the elected members of the University Council and is elected by the University Council.
The committee met electronically to discuss a proposal to move to electronic voting for University Council members. There was also some concern about inconsistent and poorly understood practices for nominating members of UC. The committee felt that it would be helpful to move to electronic voting. In the fall, it may be appropriate for this committee (or the newly formed Rules, Governance & Elections Committee) to propose updated language for NIU Bylaws Article 4.2.4, 4.2.5, and 4.2.6 to broaden the language to allow for (but not require) electronic distribution of ballots and electronic casting of ballots.

In the meantime, some colleges may wish to work with Pat Erickson, the UC administrative assistant, in order to pilot electronic voting. When electronic voting was last discussed in 2011, security of voting stymied the proposal for electronic voting. Qualtrics provides the ability to insure that only one vote can be cast from one computer.

Here is a plan endorsed by the UC Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee: This summer, Pat Erickson, the UC administrative assistant could contact the college deans’ administrative assistants, and set up a test run with one college and approximately 5-10 faculty voter participants to test the system. Next year, The UC office could create a separate/unique Qualtrics survey/ballot for each college and provide the link to each college administrative assistant. This is a change. In the past, the college administrative assistant prepared the ballot. In this new scenario, the UC office would take on this task. The UC office prefers to do this in order to maintain accuracy and consistency among the ballots and to insure they are set up within consistent parameters.

The college administrative assistant sends out the invitation to vote along with the link and the deadline information. This is not a change. In the past, the college administrative assistant has distributed the paper ballots. In this new scenario, she will still be distributing the ballots, but via email and with a link instead of a piece of paper.

Following the deadline, the UC office will close each survey/ballot and collect the data/voting results. This is a small change. In the past, the UC office collected the paper ballots which were returned via campus mail or hand delivery, and on a specified day, the ELO Committee counted those ballots. In this new scenario, the UC office will still collect the ballots, but via the survey/ballot results. But no meeting for hand-counting ballots will be necessary.

Once we have successfully tested the idea, Pat could work with the University Council Elections & Legislative Oversight Committee to create a new UC election time line for 2016.
Relevant bylaws for review:

4.2 College and University Libraries Faculty Elections

4.2.1 Elections of representatives to the University Council from college and university libraries faculties shall be initiated by the Elections Committee no later than the third week of February of each year for terms beginning the following fall semester.

4.2.2 The Elections Committee shall inform each college and the university libraries of the number of positions to be filled by the faculty of that unit and ask the unit to forward to it a list of nominees drawn from the unit's faculty members qualified for election to the University Council. Each college and the university libraries shall submit to the Elections Committee, no later than the first week in March, the number of such names equal to no fewer than two (2) times the number of representatives to be elected from the college. Each college and the university libraries shall determine in a faculty referendum its own procedures for developing its list of nominees to be submitted to the Elections Committee. These procedures shall be transmitted to the executive secretary of the University Council and shall remain in force until amended in a subsequent referendum.

4.2.3 The executive secretary of the University Council will contact each finalist to determine the faculty member's willingness to serve. The Elections Committee shall then cause to be circulated to the qualified voters among the faculty of each college and the university libraries an election ballot containing the names of the nominees for election from that unit, and ask each faculty member to vote for a number of persons equal to the number of representatives to be elected. The nominees receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected.

4.2.4 All elections shall be conducted by secret ballot circulated by campus mail.

4.2.5 The committee shall send by campus mail a written notice of each election to each qualified voter no later than one week in advance of the distribution of the ballots. The written notice shall indicate the positions to be filled by election and the names of the candidates for those positions.

4.2.6 The ballots shall be cast by mail and canvassed by the Elections Committee. The committee shall break, by lot, a tie vote which occurs at any stage of the balloting.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Beth Henning
Chair of the University Council Elections & Legislative Oversight Committee
On April 30, 2008, the University Council approved the change in this position title from Faculty Personnel Advisor to Faculty and Supportive Professional Staff (SPS) Personnel Advisor. At that time, the change in title was recommended in order to emphasize the appropriateness of SPS employees using the services of the personnel advisor. While the position title was updated in 2008, no other revisions to the content of the bylaw article were discussed at that time. Those revisions are being recommended now so that the position description coincides with the intent of the position title change as well as with current practice.

ARTICLE 9:
FACULTY AND SPS PERSONNEL ADVISOR

The Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor is a resource person whose services are available to any faculty member (ranked or no-rank faculty), administrator, Supportive Professional Staff member, or personnel body in the university. The advisor's role includes such activities as the following:

- To advise faculty and SPS members about the personnel policies and procedures within the university and the courses of action open to faculty and SPS members;

- To advise and assist faculty and SPS members who are experiencing difficulties with the personnel process;

- To advise and assist faculty and SPS members dissatisfied with personnel decisions;

- To observe the workings of the personnel process and to recommend needed changes or clarification;

- And to serve as grievance officer in cases of faculty pursuing the grievance procedure set forth in Section 10.2 of these bylaws.
Report of the Academic Policies Committee

The committee held two meetings to discuss details of streamlining two existing committees (CIUE and CUAE) into the CIUAE (Committee for the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience). Each of these committees has had partial responsibility for exploring issues pertaining to teaching and learning, and the teaching and learning environment. This recommendation was supported and is presented here.

History and rationale:
The existing committees (CIUE and CUAE) have duties that partially overlap, which results in some duplication of effort by their memberships. Combining them streamlines the policy recommendation process and facilitates communication among members. It is essential to retain all present aspects of the review process, and the Academic Policies Committee discussed these issues, concluding that these concerns can be addressed with the single committee. A consensus is that it remains important to retain opportunities for committee members to continue to serve in the academic planning process, and the new committee structure will accommodate this issue.

The united committee will retain the diverse representation of the previous entities of both voting and ex officio members. Because this committee is advisory only and makes no curricular decisions, it will report to the University Council.

The duties of this combined committee need to be amended to reflect the broader status of its charge. These changes are found in the updated article 15 that follows.

A second charge for the Academic Policies Committee was to explore potential consolidations of university curriculum committees. The committee originally explored integrating the CUC (Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum) and APASC (Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee) into the Curriculum Policy and Academic Standard Committee (CPASC). This proposal was also supported. However, dialog at the March 20 Academic Policy Committee meeting led to taking this change one step further to not only consolidating APASC and CUC, but streamlining the process further to create one university level curriculum committee, the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council.

History and rationale:
As with the CIUE and CUAE, the APASC and CUC have somewhat overlapping charges, despite having a different focus. As a means of reducing duplication of effort, combining the committees would retain all functions, but would increase efficiency with which these responsibilities are met. Presently, the Undergraduate Coordinating Council oversees the roles of its standing committees, APASC, CUC, GEC, CIUE, CUAE, and Honors. The proposed revision, as partially stated above, consolidates the CIUE and CUAE, but also makes the GEC and Honors independent committees that report to the UCC/proposed BCC. This action will reduce the oversight responsibility of the UCC/proposed BCC and have it focus solely on curricular matters arising from the departments and colleges. A singular committee would allow for curricular oversight at the university level, while streamlining our efforts. The changes endorsed will provide a more holistic review of issues and offer a process that is parallel to our graduate level curriculum procedure.

The goals of these proposals are to streamline the efforts of all committees, which should reduce the length of time required for approval of curricular changes, policies and procedures and also to allow the newly constituted committees to be more flexible and adaptive in responding to future new requirements. These changes also are intended to retain committee diversity and representation of all interested parties.

The proposed changes can be found in NIU Bylaws Articles 15.5 and 15.6 that follows.
PROPOSED

ARTICLE 15: ACADEMIC COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY

15.5 Baccalaureate Curriculum Council

15.5.1 Composition

15.5.1.1 Faculty Representation

(A) One faculty seat shall be apportioned to each undergraduate degree granting college and to the university libraries.

(B) The remaining faculty seats shall be apportioned as follows:

1. Determine an allocation of nine additional seats in accordance with the ratio between the number of regular full-time faculty members in each college, excluding the College of Law and members of the supportive professional staff, to the total number of such faculty members in all undergraduate colleges, this being the number reported by the office of the executive vice president and provost on January first of each year.

2. Determine an allocation of nine additional seats in accordance with the ratio between the number of undergraduate degree programs in each college to the total number of such degree programs in all colleges. Degree programs shall be considered to be those programs offered by departments for which a separate degree title is offered; minors and emphases within degree programs shall not be considered as separate degree programs.

3. Determine an allocation of nine additional seats in accordance with the ratio between the number of undergraduate credit hours taught per year in each college to the total number of undergraduate credit hours taught per year in all colleges.

4. Each college shall receive the maximum number of seats on the council to which it would be entitled under either formula (1), formula (2), or formula (3) of this subsection. The number of faculty seats on the council apportioned under this subsection shall be increased above nine if necessary to accommodate the total number of seats determined to be needed under the application of these formulae.

(C) Faculty members representing the colleges shall be nominated by their respective college curriculum committees and elected by their respective college faculties. The university libraries faculty representative to the BCC
shall be elected by the faculty of the university libraries. The elections shall be conducted before the end of the spring semester to select those faculty members whose term begins on the following August 16. Those elected shall serve three-year staggered, renewable terms.

(D) If, in a given year, no member of the council is a voting member of the Faculty Senate, the Senate shall elect one Senate member to serve on the council as an ex officio nonvoting member for that year.

15.5.1.2 Student Representation

(A) There shall be one undergraduate student member from each college. This representative shall serve a one-year, renewable term beginning at the start of the fall semester and ending at the start of the succeeding fall semester. Each department granting undergraduate degrees shall nominate one undergraduate student from its department to the college student advisory committee which shall select the college representative.

15.5.1.3 Administration Representation

(A) The Vice Provost responsible for undergraduate education shall serve ex officio as a member of the council.

(B) One advisor shall be elected by and from the persons with overall responsibility for undergraduate student advisement in each of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges. The person shall serve ex officio, nonvoting.

(C) The following, or their designees, shall serve ex officio, nonvoting: vice president for student affairs and enrollment management; director of Admissions; Transfer Center coordinator; a representative of Educational Services and Programs appointed by the vice provost;

15.5.2 Chair

15.5.2.1 The Vice Provost responsible for undergraduate education shall serve as chair of the council, and shall vote when necessary to break a tie vote.

15.5.2.2 The faculty representatives on the council shall elect from among their members a person who shall serve as the assistant chair of the council. The assistant chair shall preside over council meetings in the absence of the chair, act as a liaison between the chair and council members between meetings of the council, and perform such other duties as may be assigned by either the council or the council chair. The assistant chair shall be chosen annually at the first meeting of the council each fall semester and shall serve a renewable term of one year.
15.5.2.3 The Baccalaureate Curriculum Council chair shall be responsible for transmitting curricular proposals approved by the council to the chair of the Graduate Council, the Office of Registration and Records, and the editor of university catalogs for recording and publication.

15.5.3 Duties

15.5.3.1 To establish general policies for undergraduate studies and baccalaureate programs, including semester hour requirements for undergraduate majors and minors.

15.5.3.2 In accordance with the policies defined by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Board of Trustees, and the University Council, to determine changes in undergraduate policies, regulations, and standards dealing with:

- Admission of entering freshman students;
- Admission of transfer students;
- Academic probation;
- Academic dismissal;
- Readmission;
- Reinstatement;
- Admission to impacted and restricted programs;
- Retention, both in the university and in particular programs;
- Undergraduate curricular policy;
- Student progress toward graduation.

15.5.3.3 To review and approve college, school, and department policies regarding admission, retention, academic standards, and graduation requirements for their individual programs. And if need be, to return to the originating unit a proposed policy with appropriate comment or recommendations.

15.5.3.4 To receive and approve decisions from the college curriculum committees regarding the substitution, alteration, addition, or deletion of undergraduate courses and programs not in the area of general education. And if need be, to return curricular proposals to the originating department or college with appropriate comment or recommendation.

15.5.3.5 To review, negotiate, and resolve issues concerning course duplication or overlap between colleges, cross-college curricular concerns, or university standards that arise from or concerning proposals for curriculum change.

15.5.3.6 To serve as the curricular body for interdisciplinary undergraduate curricular material not located in an academic college or colleges such as UNIV and curricular offerings from the Division of International Programs and the Center for Black Studies. This responsibility includes usual curricular activity
(new, revised, and deleted courses as well as other catalog changes), and review of these units’ overall curricular offerings.

15.5.3.7 To receive reports from the General Education Committee and from the Honors Committee regarding their work.

15.5.4 Minutes and reports of the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council shall be deposited in the university archives and distributed in a timely fashion to the executive secretary of the University Council, to the executive vice president and provost, to deans of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges and the dean of the University Libraries, and to such others as deemed appropriate by the council.

15.5.5 Substantive changes in policies under the jurisdiction of the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council shall be reported to the University Council. If the University Council disapproves, it shall report its disapproval, together with a written statement of its rationale, to the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council. The Baccalaureate Curriculum Council shall reconsider the policy changes in question and either:

(i) Agree with the University Council and rescind its prior action;

(ii) Modify the policy change and notify the University Council of its action; or

(iii) Reaffirm its policy decision. If the Baccalaureate-Curriculum Council reaffirms its policy position, it shall report that action to the University Council, together with a written statement of its rationale. The policy proposal shall take effect unless disapproved by a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the University Council. The University Council shall have no authority to alter, amend, or otherwise modify a policy decision of the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council. Policy changes reported by the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council to the University Council shall be considered approved by the University Council unless that council takes action to disapprove the proposed policy within six consecutive weeks of fall or spring semester classes after receipt of the proposal from the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council.

15.6 General Education Committee

15.6.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

1. One faculty representatives from the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council shall be chosen by the faculty of the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council.

2. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of each undergraduate degree-granting college except the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
3. Three faculty representatives shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, including one from the humanities, one from the social sciences, and one from the other sciences.

4. Faculty members shall serve three-year staggered terms beginning in the fall semester.

5. The chair shall be elected by the voting members of the General Education Committee and shall serve a one-year renewable term beginning in the fall semester.

(B) Student Representation

1. Three student members shall be selected by the General Education Committee from nominees submitted by the student advisory committees of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges.

2. No more than one student shall be appointed from any college.

3. Student members shall serve one-year renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

(C) The vice provost responsible for undergraduate education, the general education coordinator and the associate vice provost for academic outcomes assessment shall serve as ex officio, nonvoting members.

15.6. 2 Duties

(A) To monitor and evaluate the university general education program.

(B) To create policies and procedures to manage both the general education program as a whole and individual components of that program.

(C) To make suggestions to colleges and departments regarding improvements that can be made in the general education curricula.

(D) To approve the addition or removal of courses from the general education curriculum.

(E) To oversee the improvement, including the design, of the general education program and of individual components of that program.

(F) To report its work to the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council.
15.7 Honors Committee

15.7.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

1. One faculty representative from the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council shall be chosen by the faculty of the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council.

2. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of each undergraduate degree-granting college except the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

3. Three faculty representatives shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to represent the areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and the other sciences.

4. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the faculty of the university libraries.

5. Faculty members shall serve three-year staggered, renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

6. The chair shall be elected by the voting members of the Honors Committee and shall serve a one-year renewable term beginning in the fall semester.

(B) Student Representation

1. Five student members shall be selected by all students enrolled in the honors program from among the students in the program, one to be nominated to serve on the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council.

2. Student members shall serve one-year renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

(C) Administration Representation. The vice provost for undergraduate education and the associate vice provost for university honors shall be ex officio, nonvoting members.

15.7.2 Duties

(A) To advise the Associate Vice Provost for University Honors on the administration of the program.
(B) To monitor and evaluate the University Honors Program, and to make recommendations for its improvement.

(C) To evaluate individual components of the Honors Program and make recommendations to the colleges and departments for their improvement.

(D) To participate in the selection of the Associate Vice Provost for University Honors.

(E) To advise the Associate Vice Provost for University Honors on extracurricular components of the program.

(F) To report its work to the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council.

15.8 Committee for the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience

15.8.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

1. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of each undergraduate degree-granting college except the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

2. Three faculty members shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to represent the areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and the other sciences.

3. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the faculty of the University Libraries.

4. Faculty members shall serve three-year staggered, renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

5. The chair shall be elected by the voting members of the Committee for the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience.

(B) Student Representation

1. Three students shall be selected so that there are two undergraduate student members from within the College of Liberal Arts and sciences and one undergraduate student member from each of the remaining undergraduate degree-granting colleges.

2. A representative of the Student Association, appointed by the president of the Student Association, shall serve as an ex-officio, nonvoting member of the
committee.

3. If the above selection procedures do not produce a minority student, or a non-traditional student, the president of the Student Association shall appoint such a student as a voting member.

4. Student members shall serve one-year renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

(C) **Alumni Representation**. A representative from the NIU Alumni Association, appointed by that association, shall be an ex officio, nonvoting member of the committee.

(D) **Administrative Representation**. The following shall be ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee:

1. Vice Provost responsible for undergraduate education or designee;

2. Director of one of the special academic units focusing on minority student concerns; (The Executive Vice President and Provost shall annually, by September, designate the director who is to serve on the committee during the academic year.)

3. Vice president for student affairs and enrollment management or designee;

4. A representative from Housing and Dining appointed by the executive director;

5. Associate Vice Provost for University Honors.

**15.8.2 Duties**

(A) To monitor and evaluate the campus environment from the perspective of its compatibility with, and support for, the learning process and the development of an appreciation for learning, and to recommend to the University Council policies and programs to strengthen that environment.

(B) To act as an advisory board for the First- and Second-Year Experiences.

(C) To establish policies and procedures and select the recipients for the annual awards recognizing innovative teaching practices and outstanding undergraduate educators at NIU.

(D) To monitor and evaluate undergraduate mentoring programs as well as initiatives involving NIU alumni and students and recommend appropriate changes as
necessary.

(E) To report its activities and recommendations related to purpose and duties to the University Council.
ADDENDUM

The following shows the current committee structure of the Articles 15.5 and 15.6:

NIU BYLAWS
ARTICLE 15: ACADEMIC COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY

15.5 Undergraduate Coordinating Council

15.5.1 Composition

15.5.1.1 Faculty Representation

(A) One faculty seat shall be apportioned to each undergraduate degree granting college and to the university libraries.

(B) The remaining faculty seats shall be apportioned as follows:

1. Determine an allocation of nine additional seats in accordance with the ratio between the number of regular full-time faculty members in each college, excluding the College of Law and members of the supportive professional staff, to the total number of such faculty members in all undergraduate colleges, this being the number reported by the office of the executive vice president and provost on January first of each year.

2. Determine an allocation of nine additional seats in accordance with the ratio between the number of undergraduate degree programs in each college to the total number of such degree programs in all colleges. Degree programs shall be considered to be those programs offered by departments for which a separate degree title is offered; minors and emphases within degree programs shall not be considered as separate degree programs.

3. Determine an allocation of nine additional seats in accordance with the ratio between the number of undergraduate credit hours taught per year in each college to the total number of undergraduate credit hours taught per year in all colleges.

4. Each college shall receive the maximum number of seats on the council to which it would be entitled under either formula (1), formula (2), or formula (3) of this subsection. The number of faculty seats on the council apportioned under this subsection shall
be increased above nine if necessary to accommodate the total number of seats determined to be needed under the application of these formulae.

(C) Faculty members representing the colleges shall be nominated by their respective college curriculum committees and elected by their respective college faculties. The university libraries faculty representative to the UCC shall be elected by the faculty of the university libraries. The elections shall be conducted before the end of the spring semester to select those faculty members whose term begins on the following August 16. Those elected shall serve three-year staggered, renewable terms.

(D) If, in a given year, no member of the council is a voting member of the Faculty Senate, the Senate shall elect one Senate member to serve on the council as an ex officio nonvoting member for that year.

15.5.1.2 Student Representation

(A) There shall be one undergraduate student member from each college. This representative shall serve a one-year, renewable term beginning at the start of the fall semester and ending at the start of the succeeding fall semester. Each department granting undergraduate degrees shall nominate one undergraduate student from its department to the college student advisory committee which shall select the college representative.

15.5.1.3 Administration Representation

(A) The Vice Provost responsible for undergraduate education shall serve ex officio as a member of the council.

15.5.2 Chair

15.5.2.1 The Vice Provost responsible for undergraduate education shall serve as chair of the council, and shall vote when necessary to break a tie vote.

15.5.2.2 The faculty representatives on the council shall elect from among their members a person who shall serve as the assistant chair of the council. The assistant chair shall preside over council meetings in the absence of the chair, act as a liaison between the chair and council members between meetings of the council, and perform such other duties as may be assigned by either the council or the council chair. The assistant chair shall be chosen annually at the first meeting of the council each fall semester and shall serve a renewable term of one year.

15.5.2.3 The Undergraduate Coordinating Council chair shall be responsible for transmitting curricular proposals approved by the council to the chair of the
15.5.3 Duties

15.5.3.1 To establish general policies for undergraduate education.

15.5.3.2 To coordinate the intercollegiate aspects of undergraduate education.

15.5.3.3 In consultation with the colleges, to determine policy for undergraduate general education and for undergraduate studies and baccalaureate programs, and semester hour requirements for undergraduate majors and minors.

15.5.3.4 To foster high standards of undergraduate instruction.

15.5.3.5 To organize and direct the work of the standing committees of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, to receive reports from such committees, and to render final decisions on the policy recommendations received from them.

15.5.3.6 To determine policy governing programs of undergraduate study. A program of study refers to any academic concentration which is reported on student transcripts.

15.5.3.7 To encourage cooperation among departments and colleges concerning curricular matters and resolve any differences among the colleges.

15.5.4 Minutes and reports of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be deposited in the university archives and distributed in a timely fashion to the executive secretary of the University Council, to the executive vice president and provost, to the chairs of the standing committees of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, to deans of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges and the Dean of the University Libraries, and to such others as deemed appropriate by the council.

15.5.5 Substantive changes in policies under the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council must be reported to the University Council. If the University Council disapproves, it shall report its disapproval, together with a written statement of its rationale, to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council. The Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall reconsider the policy changes in question and either:

(i) agree with the University Council and rescind its prior action;

(ii) modify the policy change and notify the University Council of its action; or

(iii) reaffirm its policy decision. If the Undergraduate Coordinating Council reaffirms its policy position, it shall report that action to the University Council, together with a written statement of its rationale. The policy proposal shall take
effect unless disapproved by a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the University Council. The University Council shall have no authority to alter, amend, or otherwise modify a policy decision of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council. Policy changes reported by the Undergraduate Coordinating Council to the University Council shall be considered approved by the University Council unless that council takes action to disapprove the proposed policy within six consecutive weeks of fall or spring semester classes after receipt of the proposal from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

15.6 Standing Committees of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council

15.6.1 General

15.6.1.1 The Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be assisted in its work by its standing committees. The standing committees shall be those listed in Section 15.6, plus other standing committees that the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, subject to the approval of the University Council, shall establish.

15.6.1.2 Each faculty and student representative on the Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be appointed by the council to serve on at least one of the standing committees. Such appointments shall be for one-year terms, beginning in the fall semester, renewable so long as the appointee continues to serve on the council. Should the required number of faculty members from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council be unable to serve on a particular standing committee of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, the Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be empowered to select a faculty member or members to serve on that standing committee while retaining the same balance in the colleges.

15.6.1.3 Faculty members appointed to a standing committee by a college curriculum committee shall serve a three-year, renewable term beginning in the fall semester. Terms of college appointees shall be staggered.

15.6.1.4 Student members on the committees shall serve one-year, renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

15.6.1.5 Unless otherwise noted, the chair of each committee shall be named by the Undergraduate Coordinating Council from among the council's faculty members assigned to the committee. Chairs shall provide liaison between the council and the committee which they chair. They shall serve one-year, renewable terms of office beginning in the fall semester.

15.6.1.6 Recommendations from the standing committees regarding policy changes shall be forwarded, together with a written statement of the rationale for such changes, to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council for further action.
15.6.1.7 Minutes and reports from the standing committees are to be distributed to all University Council members and copies are to be deposited in the university archives.

15.6.2 Admission Policies and Academic Standards Committee (APASC)

15.6.2.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

1. One faculty representative from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be chosen by the faculty of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

2. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of each undergraduate degree-granting college except the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

3. Two faculty representatives shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

4. Faculty members shall serve a three-year renewable term beginning in the fall semester. Terms of college appointees shall be staggered.

5. The chair shall be elected by the voting members of the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee and shall serve a one-year renewable term beginning in the fall semester.

(B) Student Representation

1. Three student members shall be selected by the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee from nominees submitted by the student advisory committees of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges.

2. Student membership shall include at least one native and one transfer student.

3. Student members shall serve one-year renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

(C) Administration Representation

1. One advisor shall be elected by and from the persons with overall responsibility for undergraduate student advisement in each
of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges. The person shall be a voting member.

2. The following, or their designees, shall serve ex officio without vote: vice provost responsible for undergraduate education; vice president for student affairs and enrollment management; director of Admissions; a representative of Educational Services and Programs appointed by the vice provost; Transfer Center coordinator.

15.6.2.2 Duties

(A) Within the policies defined by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Board of Trustees, the University Council, and the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, to review and, as necessary, recommend to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council changes in undergraduate policies and regulations dealing with:

- Admission of entering freshman students;
- Admission of transfer students;
- Academic probation; Academic dismissal;
- Readmission;
- Admission to impacted and restricted programs;
- Retention, both in the university and in particular programs.

(B) To recommend guidelines governing college, school, and department policies regarding admission, retention, academic standards, and graduation requirements for their individual programs; and establishing a process by which such policies will be reviewed by the next higher level of academic authority.

(C) To study and make recommendations regarding the impact of college, school, and department admission, retention, and academic standards policies upon other academic units of the university.

(D) To recommend a procedure by which individual student progress toward graduation will be continually monitored.

(E) To monitor and make recommendations for the improvement of the university's undergraduate advisement policies and procedures.

(F) To make recommendations as needed to improve coordination among the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, the office of community college relations, and the persons with overall responsibility for undergraduate student advisement in each of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges.
(G) To coordinate the policies and procedures of the undergraduate college reinstatement committees, and, if necessary, recommend changes in university policies regarding the work of such committees.

(H) To perform such other duties as the Undergraduate Coordinating Council may prescribe.

15.6.3 General Education Committee

15.6.3.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

1. Two faculty representatives from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be chosen by the faculty of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

2. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of each undergraduate degree-granting college except the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

3. Three faculty representatives shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, including one from the humanities, one from the social sciences, and one from the other sciences.

4. Faculty members shall serve three-year staggered terms beginning in the fall semester.

5. The chair shall be elected by the voting members of the General Education Committee and shall serve a one-year renewable term beginning in the fall semester.

(B) Student Representation

1. Three student members shall be selected by the General Education Committee from nominees submitted by the student advisory committees of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges.

2. No more than one student shall be appointed from any college.

3. Student members shall serve one-year renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.
(C) The vice provost responsible for undergraduate education, the general education coordinator and the associate vice provost for academic outcomes assessment shall serve as ex officio, nonvoting members.

15.6.3.2 Duties

(A) To monitor and evaluate the university general education program.

(B) To recommend policies and procedures which will provide continuing evidence which can be used to evaluate both the program as a whole and individual components of that program.

(C) To make suggestions to colleges and departments regarding improvements that can be made in the general education curricula.

(D) To recommend additions, modifications, and deletions of courses which are a part of the general education curriculum.

(E) To make recommendations regarding the improvement, including the redesign, of the general education program and of individual components of that program.

(F) To perform such other duties as the Undergraduate Coordinating Council may prescribe.

15.6.4 Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum (CUC)

15.6.4.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

1. One faculty representative from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be chosen by the faculty of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

2. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of each undergraduate degree-granting college except the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

3. Three faculty representatives shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to represent the areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and the other sciences.

4. Faculty members shall serve three-year, staggered terms.
5. The chair shall be elected by the voting members of the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum and shall serve a one-year renewable term beginning in the fall semester.

(B) Student Representation

1. Two student members shall be selected by the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum (CUC) from nominees submitted by the student advisory committees of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges.

2. Student members shall serve one-year renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

(C) The vice provost responsible for undergraduate education shall be an ex officio, nonvoting member.

15.6.4.2 Duties

(A) To recommend general policies regarding the design of the undergraduate curriculum.

(B) To receive decision from the college curriculum committees regarding the substitution, alteration, addition, or deletion of undergraduate courses and programs not in the area of general education. All curriculum decisions involving course content, description, title, and number shall be reported to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council without committee action or comment unless they involve course duplication or overlap between colleges, cross-college concerns, or university standards.

(C) To review and approve, or return to the originating department or college with appropriate comment, all curricular proposals involving course duplication or overlap between colleges, cross-college concerns, or university standards. Proposals approved by the committee shall be reported to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

(D) To negotiate and resolve questions concerning course duplication or overlap between colleges, cross-college concerns, or university standards that arise from or concerning proposals for curriculum change. If the committee is unable to resolve such questions to the satisfaction of the affected colleges and departments, the questions shall be forwarded to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council for final action.

(E) To make recommendations regarding university policies governing programs of undergraduate study.
To review proposed new programs of undergraduate study and make recommendations to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council regarding them.

To perform such other duties as the Undergraduate Coordinating Council may prescribe.

To serve as the curricular body for interdisciplinary undergraduate curricular material not located in an academic college or colleges, such as UNIV 101 and curricular offerings from the Division of International Programs and the Center for Black Studies. This responsibility includes usual curricular activity (new, revised, and deleted courses as well as other catalog changes), general education submissions/resubmissions, and review of these units' overall curricular offerings.

15.6.5 Honors Committee

15.6.5.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

1. One faculty representative from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be chosen by the faculty of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

2. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of each undergraduate degree-granting college except the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

3. Three faculty representatives shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to represent the areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and the other sciences.

4. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the faculty of the university libraries.

5. Faculty members shall serve three-year staggered, renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

6. The chair shall be elected by the voting members of the Honors Committee and shall serve a one-year renewable term beginning in the fall semester.

(B) Student Representation
1. Five student members shall be selected by all students enrolled in the honors program from among the students in the program, one to be nominated to serve on the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

2. Student members shall serve one-year renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

(C) The vice provost responsible for undergraduate education and the associate vice provost for university honors shall be ex officio, nonvoting members.

15.6.5.2 Duties

(A) To advise the associate vice provost for university honors on the administration of the program.

(B) To monitor and evaluate the university honors program, and to make recommendations for its improvement.

(C) To evaluate individual components of the honors program and make recommendations to the colleges and departments for their improvement.

(D) To participate in the selection of the associate vice provost for university honors.

(E) To advise the associate vice provost for university honors on extracurricular components of the program.

(F) To perform such other duties as the Undergraduate Coordinating Council may prescribe.

15.6.6 Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

15.6.6.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

1. One faculty representative from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be chosen by the faculty of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

2. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of each undergraduate degree-granting college except the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
3. Three faculty members shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to represent the areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and the other sciences.

4. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the faculty of the University Libraries.

5. Faculty members shall serve three-year staggered, renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

6. The chair shall be elected by the voting members of the Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education and shall serve a one-year renewable term beginning in the fall semester.

(B) **Student Representation**

1. Six students shall be selected so that there are two undergraduate student members from within the different divisions in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and one undergraduate student member from each of the remaining undergraduate degree-granting colleges.

2. A representative of the Student Association, appointed by the president of the Student Association, shall serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the committee.

3. If the above selection procedures do not produce a minority student, the president of the Student Association shall appoint such a student as a nonvoting member.

4. Student members shall serve one-year renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

(C) **Alumni Representation** A representative from the NIU Alumni Association, appointed by that association, shall be an ex officio, nonvoting member.

(D) **Administration Representation** The following shall be ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee:

- vice provost responsible for undergraduate education;
- associate vice provost for university honors;
- director of one of the special academic units focusing on minority student concerns.
(The executive vice president and provost shall annually, by September, designate the director who is to serve on the committee during that academic year.)

15.6.6.2 Duties

(A) To recommend changes or experiments in the undergraduate program at the university to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

(B) To establish the policies and procedures for the annual awards to outstanding undergraduate teachers at the university.

(C) To explore ways of aiding faculty members in improving their methods of teaching.

(D) To report its activities and recommendations related to purpose and duties annually to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

15.6.7 Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment

15.6.7.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

1. One faculty representative from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall be chosen by the faculty of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

2. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the curriculum committee of each undergraduate degree-granting college.

3. One faculty representative shall be appointed by the faculty of the university libraries.

4. Faculty members shall serve three-year staggered, renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

5. The chair shall be elected by the voting members of the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment and shall serve a one-year renewable term beginning in the fall semester.

(B) Student Representation

1. Four undergraduate student members, at least one to be a nontraditional student, shall be selected by CUAE from nominees
submitted by the student advisory committees of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges.

2. A representative of the Student Association, appointed by the president of the Student Association.

3. A student representative from the Campus Activities Board, appointed by the chair of that board.

4. Student members shall serve one-year renewable terms beginning in the fall semester.

(C) Administration Representation The following shall be ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee: vice president for student affairs and enrollment management or designee; a representative from Housing and Dining appointed by the executive director; a representative from Student Involvement and Leadership Development appointed by the director; vice provost responsible for undergraduate education.

15.6.7.2 Duties

(A) To promote a campus atmosphere which will be maximally conducive to learning, and to stimulation of an appreciation for learning, and for the arts, the humanities, the sciences, and the professions.

(B) To monitor and evaluate the campus environment from the perspective of its compatibility with, and support for, the learning process and the development of an appreciation for learning, and to recommend policies and programs to strengthen that environment.

(C) To evaluate the interface between the curricular and the extracurricular aspects of campus life, and to recommend policies and programs to strengthen that interface.

(D) To evaluate the impact of campus housing policies and facilities upon the learning environment, and, when necessary, to recommend policies and programs designed to make that impact more constructive to the learning environment.

(E) To analyze the adequacy of the campus' support facilities for the learning environment, and to make recommendations for their improvement.

(F) To undertake such specific studies and analyses of the campus learning environment as may be prescribed by the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.
The current proposed state budget cuts and enrollments trends point to a substantive reduction in the University’s operating fund for the upcoming year. Moreover, the State allocation to the University may not be clearly understood until June, just before the start of the fiscal year. The University will need to examine potential resource distribution scenarios as well as revenue generation ideas. We need a shared governance body, therefore, that can be available outside of the typical academic calendar and advise the upper administration on critical and time sensitive budget issues as well as act as a sounding board for revenue generating ideas that may present themselves. It behooves us to allow the RSB to function as a smaller subgroup outside of the academic year calendar because this committee has the background necessary to understand the current budget climate, short-term and long-term financial plans, and budget priorities.

The proposed language presented below in items 2.8.3 (D) and (E) as well as 2.8.4 will address the concerns stated above. Also, because the proposed language points to the need for representatives to be available, as needed, outside of the academic calendar year, we propose expanding the number of faculty on the committee in item 2.8.1 (A). Other strike-outs and additions related to assigning committee members in item 2.8.1 (A) are proposed to reflect current practice.

This proposed expansion of committee personnel must be considered alongside the concurrent proposal to consolidate the Rules and Governance and Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee.

NIU BYLAWS
ARTICLE 2: STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

2.8 Resources, Space and Budget Committee

2.8.1 Composition

2.8.1.1 The Resources, Space, and Budget Committee shall consist of the following members

(A) Eight Twelve faculty members, six four of whom shall be members of the University Council at the time of their nomination, and shall be appointed by the executive secretary of the University Council (with the advice and consent of the University Council). The remaining four six shall be members of the Faculty Senate at the time of their nomination by the faculty Senate, and shall be appointed by the president of the Faculty Senate (with the advice and consent of the Faculty Senate). Faculty membership shall include at least one representative from each academic
Faculty members shall serve staggered two-year one-year terms and are eligible for reappointment. No two faculty members shall be from the same department.

(B) One student appointed by the Student Association. The student shall be a member of the University Council at the time of appointment. The student members shall serve a one-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.

(C) One Supportive Professional staff member and one Operating Staff member who shall be members of the University Council. They shall serve one-year terms and shall be eligible for reappointment.

(D) One nonvoting member selected by and from the deans of the degree-granting colleges, who shall serve a one-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.

(E) The Chief Financial Officer who shall be ex officio nonvoting.

(F) The senior administrator responsible for facilities who shall be ex officio nonvoting.

2.8.2 Chair The chair of the committee shall be a member of the University Council, selected by the executive secretary of the University Council with the advice and consent of the University Council. The chair shall serve a one-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.

2.8.3 Duties

(A) To participate with the president and the executive vice president and provost in the development of long-range planning regarding the allocation and reallocation of resources in both the operating and capital budgets and in the assignment and reassignment of space.

(B) To advise the president and the executive vice president and provost regarding goals and priorities for the utilization of resources, space, and budgets, and to provide periodic evaluations of progress in achieving the goals and priorities.

(C) To make other reports and recommendations to the Faculty Senate and the University Council regarding resource allocations and utilization as the committee feels appropriate or as may be requested by the faculty senate or University Council. In addition to holding regular meetings to seek input on resource needs and priorities, the committee shall meet with the president and the executive vice president and provost, together and/or separately, at least two times a semester, to offer advice on budget and space issues. The committee shall report its
recommendations and evaluations to the Faculty Senate and the University Council.

(D) To advise the president and executive vice president and provost on critical, time sensitive budget issues affecting the university.

(E) To participate and advise the president and executive vice president and provost on resource allocation matters and revenue generation opportunities that arise.

2.8.4 Operating outside of the academic calendar

(A) In order to address item 2.8.3 (D) under committee duties, the committee is authorized by the University Council to function outside of the academic year calendar, without a quorum, providing there are at least five voting members, the majority of which must be faculty.

Alternates for this committee operating outside of the academic year will be selected by the Executive Secretary of the University Council.
NIU Bylaws Article 3.1 requires that the University Council meeting minutes be presented to the University Council body for review and approval, which provides ample opportunity for any edits; thus duplicating the duties of the UC-Minutes Committee. It is proposed that this duplication of effort be addressed by eliminating the UC-Minutes Committee. Moreover, deleting this committee will free up valuable faculty and staff time for other, more important responsibilities.

NIU BYLAWS
ARTICLE 2: STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

2.3 Minutes Committee

2.3.1 Composition The Minutes Committee shall consist of members of the University Council as follows:

- Two elected faculty members;
- One student member;
- One administrator;
- The executive secretary of the University Council who shall serve as chair.

The committee chair shall be appointed by the executive secretary with the advice and consent of the University Council.

2.3.2 Duties Review a draft copy of the minutes prepared by the recording secretary and assist in the final drafting of the minutes.
In order to streamline our processes and reduce the overall number of committees on which University Council members must serve, we propose two actions: 1) consolidating the current University Council Rules and Governance Committee with the University Council Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, and 2) making this committee a joint committee of the Faculty Senate and University Council. By making this change, two additional University Council faculty members can be assigned to the Faculty Senate-University Council Committee on Resource, Space and Budget (RSB) where committee representation is necessary beyond the academic calendar. Moreover, University Council members not assigned to a standing committee would then be available to populate any ad hoc committees created to address time sensitive issues not otherwise covered in a current standing committee.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL BYLAWS

2.2 Faculty Senate-University Council Committee on Rules, Governance and Elections

2.2.1 Composition The FS-UC Committee on Rules, Governance and Elections shall consist of the following members:

(A) Eight faculty members, four of whom shall be members of the University Council, and shall be appointed by the executive secretary of the University Council (with the advice and consent of the University Council). The remaining four shall be members of the Faculty Senate and shall be appointed by the president of the Faculty Senate (with the advice and consent of the faculty Senate). No two faculty members shall be from the same department. Faculty members shall serve one-year terms and shall be eligible for reappointment.

(B) One student appointed by the Student Association. The student shall be a member of the University Council. The student member shall serve a one-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.

(C) One Supportive Professional staff member and one Operating Staff member who shall be members of the University Council. They shall serve one-year terms and shall be eligible for reappointment.

(D) One nonvoting member selected by and from the deans of the degree-granting colleges, who shall serve a one-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.
The committee chair shall be appointed by the executive secretary with the advice and consent of the University Council.

2.2.2 Duties

(A) Advise the University Council or Faculty Senate on any question referred to it by the University Council or Faculty Senate involving the interpretation of the university Constitution or Bylaws, and/or Faculty Senate Bylaws, and including questions relating to the definition or application of academic freedom standards.

(B) Administer and supervise elections to the University Council and Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate representatives on the committee will administer the Faculty Senate elections; University Council representatives will administer the University Council elections.

(C) Make final rulings on the eligibility of candidates from colleges and the University Libraries and all other election matters not specifically covered by these procedures.

(D) Review, prior to the elections in those years which are multiples of three, the ratio of the faculty in each college who are on regular contract, excluding the supportive professional staff and the faculty member from the University Libraries, to the total number of faculty in all colleges who are on regular contract and recommend to the University Council any needed adjustment in the number of elected faculty seats on the University Council allocated to each college.

(E) When a university committee or council requires staggered terms for its elected faculty members, determine in advance of the election which seats in each college shall be filled for one-, two-, or three-year terms. Such a determination must be made before the initial election of faculty to such a committee or council, and before the first election after each successive reapportionment of seats on the committee or council. Staggered terms shall be assigned so that, as nearly as possible, there will be an equal number of members of the council or committee elected each year and an equal number of members elected from each faculty constituency each year.

(F) Administer and supervise all referenda that require the vote of the entire faculty of the university.

(G) Monitor legislation that affects higher education and report the status of such legislation to the University Council so that appropriate actions may be taken.
2.2 Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee

2.2.1 Composition  The Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee shall consist of members of the University Council as follows:

- One elected faculty member from each college and the University Libraries;
- One member from the operating staff;
- One member from the supportive professional staff;
- One student member.

The committee chair shall be appointed by the executive secretary with the advice and consent of the University Council.

2.2.2 Duties

2.2.2.1 Administer and supervise elections to the University Council.

2.2.2.2 Make final rulings on the eligibility of candidates from colleges and the University Libraries and all other election matters not specifically covered by these procedures.

2.2.2.3 Review, prior to the elections in those years which are multiples of three, the ratio of the faculty in each college who are on regular contract, excluding the supportive professional staff and the faculty member from the University Libraries, to the total number of faculty in all colleges who are on regular contract and recommend to the University Council any needed adjustment in the number of elected faculty seats on the University Council allocated to each college.

2.2.2.4 When a university council or committee requires staggered terms for its elected faculty members determine in advance of the election, which seats in each college shall be filled for one, two, or three-year terms. Such a determination must be made before the initial election of faculty to such a council or committee, and before the first election after each successive reapportionment of seats on the council or committee. Staggered terms shall be assigned so that, as nearly as possible, there will be an equal number of members of the council or committee elected each year and an equal number of members elected from each faculty constituency each year.

2.2.2.5 Administer and supervise all referenda that require the vote of the entire faculty of the university.

2.2.2.6 Monitor legislation that affects higher education and report the status of such legislation to the University Council so that appropriate actions may be taken.
2.5 Rules and Governance Committee

2.5.1 Composition The Rules and Governance Committee shall consist of members of the University Council as follows:

- Seven elected faculty members from at least five colleges;
- Two student members who are not from the same college;
- Two deans from among the colleges and Graduate School.

The committee members and committee chair shall be appointed by the executive secretary with the advice and consent of the University Council.

2.5.2 Duties Advise the University Council on any question referred to it by the University Council involving the interpretation of the university Constitution or Bylaws, and including questions relating to the definition or application of academic freedom standards.
As we look at the process of re-engineering our committee structure – including possible committee consolidation or new committee creation – the process necessary to update the specific list of committee names in Article 4 of the Constitution each time a change is proposed could be cumbersome. The proposed language revision to NIU Constitution, Article 4 creates a less cumbersome process. Committee structure changes will still require the process necessary for NIU Bylaw revisions, including two-thirds vote of the University Council membership, but will not require faculty referendum, nor BOT approval.

NIU CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE 4: STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The standing committees of the University Council shall be as defined in the NIU Bylaws. Elections, Minutes, Personnel, Rules, and Steering. The composition and duties of these committees shall be prescribed in the university bylaws.
Bylaws Article 12: Grievance Procedures for Students

12.6 Post-Hearing Process

… The executive secretary is to maintain records pertaining to each grievance including the outcome. The executive secretary will provide a summary report of the number of grievances filed and the disposition to the University Council at the April meeting each year.
April 15, 2015

Dear Bill,

I would like to request authorization from University Council to extend Dr. Kristin Huffine’s term as Acting Director of the Center for Latino & Latin-American Studies through FY 16. Dr. Huffine was appointed as acting director in FY 14, upon the retirement of Dr. Michael Gonzales. Both budgetary and programmatic considerations have led us to defer a search for a permanent director, so I am seeking authorization to extend Dr. Huffine’s acting appointment for third year. I understand that, under Article 19.5.2 of the university bylaws, such an extension requires authorization by University Council.

Yours,
Chris McCord, Dean
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

NIU Bylaws
19.5 Acting and Other Temporary Administrative Appointments

19.5.2 When a vacant administrative office is being filled with a temporary or acting appointment, search procedures to secure a permanent incumbent for the office must be instituted within six months of such an appointment. Temporary or acting appointments made under such circumstances shall be for a term of no more than one year, and may not be renewed unless the subsequent search to fill the position fails to produce a permanent appointee.

19.5.2.1 This section of these bylaws may be waived when the office responsible for making the acting or temporary appointment is itself filled by an administrative officer holding office on an acting or temporary basis. In such instances, this section shall become operative on the date that an administrative officer who has a regular appointment as the incumbent in the appointing office assumes the responsibilities of that office.

19.5.2.2 This section of these bylaws may be waived if approval for such a waiver is obtained by the officer making the acting or temporary appointment from appropriate advisory committee and subsequently from the University Council. Questions about the appropriate advisory committee for any position shall be resolved by the University Council Rules and Governance Committee.
## 2015-2016 MEETING SCHEDULE

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

**STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**

**FACULTY SENATE**

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</th>
<th>FACULTY SENATE</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY COUNCIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>3 – 5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-STEERING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Clara Sperling Sky Room</td>
<td>Clara Sperling Sky Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Holmes Student Center</td>
<td>Holmes Student Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altgeld Hall 225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 26, 2015</td>
<td>September 2, 2015</td>
<td>September 9, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11, 2015</td>
<td>November 18, 2015</td>
<td>December 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17, 2016</td>
<td>February 24, 2016</td>
<td>March 2, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 2016</td>
<td>April 27, 2016</td>
<td>May 4, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring Break March 13-20, 2016