UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, April 29, 2015, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Arriola, Bond, Campbell, Cappi, Giese, Grace, Harris, Hedin, Lenczewski, Liu, Parato, Riley, Schoenbachler, Schwartz-Bechet, Shannon, Sorensen, Starofsky, Vohra

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Birberick, Bryan, Carlson, Falkoff, Hanley, Jung, Kaplan, Klaaper, Scherer, Stafstrom, Weldy

OTHERS ABSENT: Coryell, Stoddard, Phillips

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: All right, shall we get going? Here we go. Hard to believe it’s the last one of the semester isn’t it? That was a fast year. I’ll call the meeting to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:04 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: Adoption of the agenda. Do I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

Unidentified: So moved.

D. Baker: Second? Do I have a second?

Unidentified: Second?

D. Baker: Any additions, or deletions or changes?

W. Pitney: Yes, thank you. I’d like to suggest amending the agenda to move President’s Announcements, Item V, down to Item X so that it comes later. That way we can get to a pretty large volume of business a little bit earlier and conclude with that at a later time.

D. Baker: Do we need a second to that? No. Any discussion of that? I think you wanted to make sure you got through the business of the year here first while we’ve got a quorum? Okay any
discussion? No. All in favor please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

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

D. Baker: The first item today is actually executive session. Oh, the minutes, I got to do the minutes then we do that. Sorry. A motion to approve the minutes.

Unidentified: So moved.

D. Baker: Second.

Unidentified: Second.

D. Baker: Any changes? Hearing none, all in favor please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed?

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

D. Baker: Okay, now the executive session. So this is for voting members only and this is where we have a report from the committee to evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of the Council and Jana will run that. Do I have a motion to go into executive session?

Unidentified: So moved.

D. Baker: Second? Second Ibrahim. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed. Okay thanks. So everybody that’s not a voting member, go drink coffee and we’ll be back to you in a minute.

... 

D. Baker: Bill we’ll say a few more positive words about you later on today, but just wanted to let you know we had a short executive session because it was a very positive review and on behalf of the University Council I want to thank you for leading this group this year and all the positive attributes you’ve brought to the job so thank you very much.

W. Pitney: My pleasure.
V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

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

D. Baker: So, let’s move on with the revised agenda. And so we’ll move down to the Reports from the Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. The first is A. FAC to IBHE, and Sonya Armstrong has that.

S. Armstrong: Twice a year we have a shortened meeting at the FAC and that’s because we actually spend just half the day in our session and then we meet with the full board and staff of the IBHE. The April meeting at Lincoln Land College in Springfield was one of those so you see a very brief report and that’s because it was a brief meeting. The bulk of our time, as you can see, was spent on elections for the FAC officers, which we are still working through, and also just refining the topics we wanted to raise with the board members at lunch. And you can see the various caucuses and the focus that each one adopted in the discussion with the board at lunch. Then we moved into the IBHE full board meeting and I captured a few of the major points there. But really I think the full minutes are probably almost available online. I don’t think they’re probably up yet, but I’ll entertain any questions.

D. Baker: Any key themes that came out of it?

S. Armstrong: From the board meeting? This focus on underrepresented student groups, that report took up the bulk of the time. They had a panel of experts in this area. They offered not only some very realistic critiques of current systems, but also offered some encouraging solutions or potential solutions. So that report is actually available online on the IBHE website and it’s a good report. It’s important to read it.

D. Baker: Thank you. Any other comments or questions? All right, thank you.

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

D. Baker: We’ll move on to the BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee. Bill.

W. Pitney: Yes, just real quick the report is on page 7. While the committee was slated to hear
some other content, the primary portion was spent receiving a report from Provost Freeman on the prioritization process and how it’s being implemented here at NIU. The Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment unanimously endorsed NIUs program prioritization initiative. That will go on then to the full board.

D. Baker: Questions or comments on that? All right thank you.

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

D. Baker: Next we’ll go to Resources, Space and Budget. Ibrahim.

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Thank you. The reports we have here, I think they are on pages 8 to 28. You have our budget priority report and then the second it is a request from the president to comment on some issues that that committee would like to know about. Then the third one is the survey that we sent to the unit directors, the chairs, deans and administration unit directors.

Regarding the budget priority, many of the budget priorities of last year are being implemented this year, but there are two items we thought they are very important and I want to highlight it to you today. The first issue was that we wanted the university and the administration to develop a master development plan so the Foundation the other units can use this plan for fundraising and also for our request from the state for space and for resources. We did talk about it with the president yesterday, and I think he can comment on that. We discovered that there are some activities along this line and maybe you would like to know what is happening.

The second issue was that we wanted to make the NIU campus one of the best accessible campuses to people with disabilities. We found that there are very minor issues that we do not really think about for the disabled person it is really a challenge and sometimes it is humiliating and embarrassing. In addition to other issues that require a lot of resources, we talked with the president about it and he promised us he will look at this and we are going to work with I believe the Presidential Commission for [Persons with] Disabilities and the budget committee will work with them next year in order to see what we can do. So those are the two issues from the budget priority.

Also when we received the survey from the directors, we identified two issues. Also we did talk with the president and the provost and the CFO about them. The first one was the budget process. There was a lot of comments if you can look at the report it’s, I don’t know, 20 or 19 pages of comments. The second one was the hiring process. The president indicated to us that he will look at these two issues and insure that the communication is done appropriately and they will develop process to make it easy for everybody. I encourage you to read the comments and read the report. They enlightened us about the issues that we are facing and that need to be
The other issue that I would like to let you know that, since the survey was very successful and since some people who are on the council wanted to survey all the faculty, we are going to do this next year to at least measure the perception of the faculty about what is going on and be able to find remedies for these issues.

The budget committee really went through a lot this year. We had to educate ourselves about the budget and the resources and off this information before we were able to have a survey and get the results. I would like the president to comment on the four issues we discussed yesterday.

**D. Baker:** Sure, thank you, Ibrahim and thank you and the committee for your good work on this in bringing all these pieces forward. The first issue was developing a master plan for the university and I think we may have briefly discussed in here earlier this semester. We actually have a group doing that for the core of campus right now and there’s actually three contracts out. One is to look at this building, Holmes Student Center; and another is Neptune; and then the third is on kind of the core of campus and how would that lay out over the next 20 or 30 years. There have been a series of iterative processes with feedback from faculty, staff and students and they’re getting close on those and some pretty exciting ideas.

Now where would the funding come from? Some of the funding is in the bank so to speak from our Build America Bonds that were sold back in 2009 or 2010. Those were the recovery dollars, the stimulus dollars that came out of the federal government at very low interest rates. And so this university sold some of those and has those revenues. And then auxiliary dollars that are used for capital improvements, those are again the auxiliary dollars by statute that have to be spent on auxiliary buildings like this one and can’t be used for other things. Those would be the two major sources of funding for that.

The core of campus I think is a good idea. Let’s be planful about how it’s going to lay out over the next many years. And so we’ll have some ideas and drawings on that over the next month or so and we’ll get those out first thing in the fall for people to look at and get people’s feedback or you can look at them over the summer. I know a number of you have already commented on those. I appreciate the feedback. I think the architecture firms have been very thoughtful in their work and responsive. I think we’re going to get some good stuff out of them. So far so good on that. And I think Ibrahim’s right, if you have a drawing of let’s say remodeled homes, it’s easier to raise additional dollars for it than it is if it’s just a concept. They’ve gone through some planning and some initial design work. The next steps would be if we think that’s a good idea then refine it and go to more detailed plans and assuming we’ve got money to move forward on those. So we’d have to have the budget in place to move forward.

Enhancing the accessibility of NIU campus to persons with disabilities; almost every campus in the country has a long list of things they need to do. So what we thought at the committee was that we would work with the President’s Commission on Persons with Disabilities and the [Resource, Space and] Budget Committee and come together and do some prioritizing and see if we could get here’s the lay of the land so to speak. Here’s our list; let’s prioritize it and start working down and put budget to the numbers and see where we are. So I think that will be a good project to take on here in the short to medium term. Maybe it’s even something we can work on over the summer if there’s enough people around.
Budget process. Two years ago we didn’t have a very clear budget or budget process. We’ve been trying to build it as we’ve been reducing the budget. We’re down about $20 million in this year’s budget over last year’s budget. We go word from the state a month ago. I think I reported that there would be a 2.25 percent budget reduction for this fiscal year, so we have to give back about $2.1 million.

There’s been additional news in the last week or two that didn’t solve the problem for this year. There’s another $100 million hole that they need to fill and there’s ongoing debate about whether or not they’re going to ask for yet another pullback or if they’re going to try and do it with whatever resources they have at the state level. We’re waiting to see that. That was a couple billion dollar hole that they fixed with this pullback that put $2.1 million into. We’ve, over the last year, been planning that something like that might happen, so with frozen positions and whatnot we’ve put together enough money for that one-time payment to the state and we don’t think we’re going to have to go back out to the units to get additional funding. So I think that’s good, the money in your budget is there.

We are working on as clear a process as you want. We did ask what it meant by “budget processes take place in closed door sessions” because my sense is they’re pretty open with the cabinet and then the deans and the deans working with their faculty and the other unit administrators working down. But we can always be clearer and one of the suggestions was to have kind of a flow chart so we could see where it is on the flow chart and be able to tap into that and I thought that was a good idea. So it was very clear what the steps are but we’ve been kind of trying to build that as we go along working towards the budget principals you all adopted last year and the various committee reviews that it went through. So we’ll continue to work on that and move those forward.

Top loading administration. We weren’t sure where the top loading was. At the very top we’ve reduced by a couple VP’s and $600,000 at the cabinet level, the payroll, $600,000 so I think that’s good news. So maybe it is at over levels. We haven’t added any deans, so we’re trying to get a handle on where the additional administrators were. We’ll continue to look at those numbers and see. I will note that the state has asked all the universities in the state for data on number of faculty, number of administrators, space, furniture; no they didn’t ask space did they? They had furniture. I don’t know why furniture. Somebody somewhere evidently bought too much furniture. You can tell it wasn’t us by these tables. The state is still working on that.

Money from vacant positions should cover any vacation and sick leave payouts. We’re effectively doing that now. Need to have clarify about the college’s budget and yes that’s the case. It’s been a little slow in some areas to get those budgets back out because we didn’t know what ultimately the budget was going to be because of these pullbacks. And so it isn’t as clear as it should be. We’ll see what happens in the next few weeks in Springfield. They’ve only got a few weeks left to figure it out. We’ll just have to deal with what comes to us. Do you want to say anything about any of the others?

Need to be easier and more efficient processes involving unit heads. One of the things we met with the deans on, was it this week I guess and last week, we talked to them about better communication with chairs and the opportunity for Lisa and me and Al Phillips, the CFO, well no Harlan Teller, the VP for Marketing and Communications, to meet with the chairs at least
once a semester in small groups so that we could have these conversations about what concerns or questions they had and if they’re operational or strategic issues that we could work through those. So I think we’re going to undertake that after having conversations with the deans and encouragement from them that that was a good idea.

Hiring process, I think everybody wants a more efficient hiring process. HR wants a more efficient hiring process and we all want more efficient but high quality hiring processes that are compliant and so we will continue to work on that. So that was the condensed version. Anything else you want to add, Ibrahim?

I. Abdel-Motaleb: No, but is there any questions?

R. Feurer: At the Faculty Senate meeting last Wednesday, the CFO gave a presentation and I asked then about a matter – that of the reserve fund which used to be quite substantial, at least that’s my memory. And I asked him how much money was in it and I think he said $2 million.

L. Freeman: $15 million.

R. Feurer: He said $50 million?

L. Freeman: $15, one five, just under, $14.9 million.

R. Feurer: He said $50 million?

L. Freeman: $15, one five, just under, $14.9 million.

R. Feurer: So I just wonder what has happened with respect to the reserve fund. Is it in good shape? I mean the CFO had suggested we needed much more and I remember it being a matter of great concern for the former financial officer that, if the reserve fund was low, if the state didn’t pay, that it was really imperiling the university, so I’d like to know what happened to the reserve fund.

D. Baker: Well, in a nutshell, enrollment dropped by 5,000 students. If you multiply that times $10,000 per student tuition, that’s $50 million.

R. Feurer: And so the reserved fund was used to make up for that?

D. Baker: I’d assume so because our employment is about the same as it was 5,000 students ago.

R. Feurer: Is, I mean, is I guess that used to be considered a, the word was a sacrosanct fund that was not touched and it was only used in emergencies. Is that not the case?

D. Baker: I would assume that a 5,000 student drop would be an emergency so you could pay payroll and keep the operations going. In addition, we lost $25 million in state funding over that same time period. So that’s a lot of money for a university to absorb and the reserve fund should be larger but we’re going into another budget reduction from the state and probably a reduction in enrollment. We will have to use that to help us bridge as we look at the efficiencies of our institution, see how we can do things more efficiently, like maybe a more efficient HR process that we just talked about. Can we cut steps out so it’s easier for us? And then look at how we turn enrollment around and get that back that through improved recruitment and retention.

R. Feurer: I guess my point is that this is an issue of transparency and I don’t know why we
weren’t informed about that or if maybe the committee was informed about it along the way.

**D. Baker:** Well we’ve held town hall meetings where we’ve laid the budget out for two years so I think we’ve been pretty clear about it. We’ve laid out the enrollment trends, the budget trends, and what that and last year it created, if you go back and look at those slides, we said it created a $15 million deficit for us, a structural deficit. Ultimately, it ended up being a $20 million budget reduction that we dealt with. I think we’ve been pretty clear about it in public and published.

**L. Freeman:** Maybe I can just add, President Baker, that you and I and Al Phillips and Nancy Suttenfield were not here during the great recession years of 2008 to 2010 so we can’t really speak to exactly what was done. But I did interview late in 2009, early 2010, and one of the points that was made to me during the interview and that I heard made in this room at University Council subsequent to that, was that NIU was very proud of the fact that there were no layoffs or furloughs during the great recession, whereas many of the other Illinois publics had furloughs, or layoffs, or early retirement incentives given the decline in state appropriations coupled with the decrease in tuition and fee revenue from the decline enrollment. I agree with the president that payroll had to come from somewhere, and I would guess that the reserves were part of that.

**R. Feurer:** Well I was involved in discussing this issue in 2011 and there was still pride that that reserve fund had not been tapped at that point. That’s my memory, I don’t have the records, but it was not used up to that point.

**D. Baker:** There may have been two reserves funds you’re thinking of too. One is an auxiliary reserve fund which can’t be used for payroll and that’s what I was mentioning about like the remodel of these buildings. By bond covenant and by statute, auxiliary dollars can’t be used for salaries or other things. There is some money in the auxiliary fund that you may be remembering. And then there’s whatever there was in the reserves for operations. Then in reserves, there’s kind of two kinds of reserves. There’s one-time reserve and ongoing reserves. If you’ve got ongoing reserves, that means you’ve, let’s say, got an open line you didn’t fill, and it’s there every year. And then there’s the one-time reserve where maybe somebody took a leave for a year and you’ve got that piece of money. But then they’re back and you just have that one piece of money that isn’t ongoing and so, once it’s spent, it’s gone. So I’m not sure which of those reserves were there in ‘09, or ‘10 or ‘11 that you’re referring to. But that’s where we are. Those are the reserves that we’ve got today to face the challenges that we’ve got. Any other questions on those?

**C. Doederlein:** Not actually a question, but I just wanted to comment as chair of the Presidential Commission on Persons with Disabilities, how much we appreciate the efforts to include that within the budget considerations from this committee’s report and look forward to being able to participate in that prioritization process. We’ve already been looking at prioritization of what can be done, but admittedly our commission budget understandably is not such that we could make any dent in that. But with the ability to actually to connect with that committee that will be great. Thank you for that.

**D. Baker:** Good, we’ll get that going. Others? Yes, Bill.

**W. Pitney:** Just a quick item of business, I would like to move that we approve the Statement of Budget priorities for the spring of 2015 that’s found on pages 8 to 10 and Ibrahim had reported
on that. Do I have a second?

Unidentified: Second.

W. Pitney: Second from the floor. All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.


D. Baker: Good, thank you.

K. Rules and Governance Committee – Jana Brubaker, Chair

1. Proposed revisions to NIU Constitution, Article 7 – Page 29
Related Councils
FIRST READING

D. Baker: All right, shall we move on? Rules and Governance Committee, Jana.

J. Brubaker: I’m the chair of the Rules and Governance Committee and this pertains to Article 7. Article 7 of the university constitution describes other councils related to the University Council. Ben Donovan, who was our UC representative from the Student Association, noticed that there was language in Article 7 stating that the organization representing students was an integral part of the university system of governance. And Ben noted that this was true of all the related councils listed in that article so he suggested adding language to that effect to each of the groups so that’s what we have here.

D. Baker: Any comments on the first reading? None? All right, well thank you.

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

M. Student Association – Joe Frascello, President – report

D. Baker: President of the Student Association, Joe.

J. Frascello: Thank you. I just want to take this time to recognize a few students. First of all, Dillon Domke, congratulations. He’s just been reelected as speaker of the Student Association Senate. Congratulations. To my left we have two senators, Student Associations Senators, Alex Summers and Leon Kincaid. I want to thank them for their time and dedication to represent students. Also, Husam Salem is our current treasurer of the Student Association and he’s graduating and I believe he has an internship, congratulations to you Husam and the two senators. And also I have to my right Nathan Lubstein is the incoming president of the S.A. He will be filling my role as president. I’m confident that he’ll be able to work with students and faculty staff members even better than I could. Again, congratulations and we look – I’m sure Dr. Baker and everyone in this room looks forward to having you.

Also in the spirit of engaging students and recruiting students, to my right I have a prospective
student. I just want to single her out and embarrass her. Her name is Anna. She is looking at different universities at the moment. NIU happens to be on her radar at the moment so if you could just give Anna a nice round of applause, thank you for being here.

Lastly, thank you for having me. It’s been a great year. Lots of professional development that I can put on my resume, put under my belt. It’s been a great time so again thank you. With that, I will yield the rest of my time to Dillon Domke.

**D. Domke:** Unlike Joe, I’m not leaving so you guys all get to see me again here next year. I want to announce two things that the Student Association is putting together or has done for the upcoming academic year, next year. This Sunday we just passed legislation to move our senate elections from the fall to the spring to coincide with the executive elections, for simplicity. It will lower the amount of money we’ll actually be spending overall in the long term in our elections. So as with many things, budgets are being cut. We need to look at even as students how we can save money. So we’ll be doing one election for everybody instead of two at separate times during the year.

The second thing I’d like to announce coincides to an article in the Northern Star that I’m sure many of you read on Monday that the $7 printing quota will be back next year for students. I would like to announce the creation of the Eco-friendly and Sustainable Printing Task Force that the S.A. Senate is going to be putting together. This task force will be aimed at lowering NIU’s overall dependence on paper products in the classroom. The end goal will be to create an ecologically friendly but sustainable option for both students and faculty in place of the university’s quota printing program. As it currently sits, students all too often are wasteful with their printing and many professors often require loads of printed materials for class. Printing is costly to the students, to the faculty, and to the university as a whole. Furthermore, printing has become an environmental issue as well, requiring loads of printed material, has become a thing of the past and we will work towards sustainability through electronic and online methods that are more cost effective and eco-friendly than printing. I’m announcing this today because I do want to ask for shared governance support on this. So if there are any members of the faculty, SPS Council, OPS Council and students that would like to join in this initiative to speak with me after the council today. We aren’t going to be doing anything until we get back in the fall, but we just want to make sure that we get it out there and get people involved. As I said, printing is coming back, but for one more year, so I think people need to start realizing that there needs to be a sustainable option as an alternative to printing quotas. So with that, if anyone has any questions, I’ll take them now.

**D. Baker:** Well good. It sounds like a really interesting project so thanks for taking it on and involving the faculty and staff in that as well.

**D. Domke:** One more. I just wanted to announce as well that I’ve been working with the state student legislators across the state trying to get them on board to send a resolution jointly from all the student governments across the state to the legislators in Springfield urging them to hold the line on the budget for fiscal year ’16. Unfortunately with it being the end of the year, we’ve been trying very hard to get in contact with a lot of these other students but with finals and things coming up we have support so far from less than half of the public institutions’ student governments in the state. But, hopefully over the next coming weeks, once maybe people get done with finals, we will have a higher turn out and be able to get more money back for our
higher ed institutions.

**D. Baker:** I appreciate your quick work on that. Time is short in the legislature. The committees are forming and they’re going to be coming to resolution in maybe the days or weeks in front of us. Time is of the essence if you’re going to work on that. Thanks. And I thank Dillon and Joe for both testifying during this legislative session. They both did a great job, represented the university well and Dillon was invited back for a second round, they liked him so much the first round. He did a great job for us so thank you, both of you.

**N. Operating Staff Council – Jay Monteiro, President – [report](#) – Pages 30-31**

**D. Baker:** Operating Staff Council, Jay.

**J. Monteiro:** Our report starts in your packet on page 30 and I’ll let you read through that. I just have a couple of announcement to make. First of all I wanted to wish Bill good luck as he moves on here and thank him for all is collaborative work with our council. He’s been a great resource and it’s been a pleasure working with you. My other announcement is I wanted to announce the four winners of the Operating Staff Outstanding awards. Their bios should be coming out in Northern Today soon, but I wanted to announce those and these are alphabetical order. Christine Atherton, an administrative assistant in the Executive Vice President and Provost; Margaret Berg who is an office manager in accountancy; our own Pat Erickson here, Administrative Assistant for the University Council; and Katherine Zuidema, a graduate placement officer in Career Services. And we thank them all for their wonderful service to the university.

**D. Baker:** Thanks for putting that recognition together. Any questions for Jay? Congratulations to all four.

**O. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczer, President – [report](#) – Page 32**

**D. Baker:** Okay, Deb, you’re up.

**D. Haliczer:** Again, you can read my written report in your packet. A couple things that I wanted to highlight are that SPS Council is collaborating on a task force on SPS personnel policies and procedures and we’re going to be really emphasizing looking at our evaluation process for SPS, making sure that people are getting appropriate frequent performance feedback so that we can really assist in career development, professional development. So we’re working on that. And by the way, commercial: If you have SPS, this is the time when you should be doing their evaluations. You know me and commercials. I also want to acknowledge excellent collaboration that Jay and I have both experienced from our colleagues on Faculty Senate, the Student Association. SPS and Operating Staff Council work closely together on so many things and it is only through close collaboration, honest dialog, and open communication that we really are going to make it through some pretty challenging times. I think we had some excellent conversations in the joint APC/RSB conversations about program prioritization and that’s the kind of open and honest and frank dialog that has to keep on happening if we’re going to make it through these times through use of shared governance.

**D. Baker:** Thanks, Deb. Any questions or comments for Deb? Okay thanks.
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

D. Baker: Next, Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, Mary Beth Henning.

M. Henning: As the chair of Elections and Legislative Oversight, I’d like to draw your attention to your agenda packet, the NIU Constitution Article 3.2.1 as well as Faculty Senate Bylaws Article 2.1. And I would like to introduce you to the nominee from the Faculty Senate for the office of Executive Secretary of the University Council. That is Greg Long sitting across from me. And I would like to move to accept the nomination of Greg Long, close the nominations, and approve his election to this position. I need a second.

W. Pitney: Second.

D. Baker: Bill was quick on the second, for the record.

M. Henning: And for this vote, we will use the clickers. So if you would vote yes to the motion, that would be 1. If you are voting no to the motion to accept Greg Long as our new Executive Secretary, that is a 2. And you may vote 3 to abstain.

1 – Yes – 40 
2 – No – 5 
3 – Abstain – 1

D. Baker: Congratulations, Greg.


M. Henning: There is a report which you are welcome to read from the University Council Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee which is recommending that in the fall this committee, or if we have a new combined committee, look at making some proposed changes to the bylaws which are also included here in your agenda packet so that we could formally move to trying electronic for University Council elections. And you can read the rationale and a little bit of history about that in your packet. That’s all I have.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

D. Baker: Okay, Bill, I think you’ve got a bunch of unfinished business.

W. Pitney: So, our first item of unfinished business can be found on page 36 of your packet. This was an item that was postponed last time because we did not have the requisite number of folks in attendance to address the motion. Just a reminder for these updates for Article 9, what was missing is mention of supportive professional staff in the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor’s role, at least in the text of the article. So what you see there is added language to address that. This is a second reading. I would accept a motion. Actually, I will move that we accept this change to Article 9 and I would need a second, please.

D. Haliczer: Second.

W. Pitney: Thank you, Deb. Any discussion? Okay, seeing none, if you would use your clickers please. One or A is to vote yes, you approve that motion; two or B is to vote no; and three or C is to abstain. So if you would go ahead and vote now. Everybody have a chance to vote? Can we close the vote? Any 42 the motion passes. Thank you.

1 – Yes – 42
2 – No – 1
3 – Abstain – 3

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

W. Pitney: Our next item, Item B, is the proposed revision to NIU Bylaws 15.5 and 15.6. This can be found on page 37. This came forward from the Academic Policy Committee and is the curricular committee structure change at the university level. I move that we accept this proposed change and I will need a second. Second on the floor, thank you.

So let’s open this up for discussion please. It’s a second reading. At your, one item that did come here in the recent past, is actually at your place. You’ve got a sheet at your desk. In the justification for the committee changes, we forgot to highlight and add in some information related to one change. Consolidating some of our committees, specifically the CUC, APASC, and UCC, there was a change made to the ex officio advisor that served originally on APASC. On APASC, the advisor has a vote. That body has typically addressed policy issues, academic and education policy. So when we consolidated these, we took a look at all of the committees. Currently on CUC and UCC there is not an advisor serving ex officio. The change was made to bring the language from the UCC and also to make consistent ex officio members being on that committee all being nonvoting. So in sum, the advisor’s role on the newly formed and proposed baccalaureate curriculum committee council says that the advisor would be ex officio, nonvoting,
and that would be consistent with the others. I just want to make that clear. The rationale is bulleted there and it includes that the BCC would be the primary curriculum body at the university level and curriculum is under the purview of faculty. While the advisor had voting privileges on APASC, APASC focused solely on policy issues and the only standing committee of the UCC originally were on advisors granted voted privileges was on APASC. The sum and substance is that the language had changed. I wanted to alert this body to that. There has been some counterpoints offered to me in terms of a rationale for why advisors should have voting privileges, and you can see those delineated below. So I just wanted to start our discussion by making that clear and highlighted that specific change because it did not show up in the original rationale. So I’ll open the floor for any discussion points and so forth. Let’s go to Donna.

**D. Plonczynski:** Thank you. Because of the historic ability of the advisors to have a vote in the curriculum process and because of their unique perspective looking at the student from preadmission to graduation, I would suggest a modification, an amendment to this motion that would allow them, the representative, a vote the BCC.

**W. Pitney:** So you are suggesting an amendment to that language to revert back to that original language?

**D. Plonczynski:** Correct, but I believe I need a second for us to even consider this.

**C. Lee:** Second.

**W. Pitney:** So we’ve got a motion within a motion, right?

**D. Plonczynski:** Yes.

**W. Pitney:** So, what we’re doing, we’re focusing now just on that language for the advisor’s privileges.

**D. Plonczynski:** And if it moves forward, I believe and we have a parliamentarian here who will do this much better than I.

**W. Pitney:** So let’s focus on this at this point in time. Any other discussion points, comments related to that? Barbara.

**B. Jaffee:** Well, I just had a comment. I guess, if we’re focusing on the role of the advising dean, my comment is that we are reducing what were three committees to one which means there are substantially fewer faculty making decisions at the university level about curriculum. Given that situation and as you point out, the role of faculty in curricular policy, I think that the current language of the nonvoting is actually extremely important because there’s a tremendous amount of change going on here and we’re losing a lot of faculty eyes on the issues and votes.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you, Barbara. Any other comments?

**B. Jaffee:** I had a question that was unrelated, but are we just focusing on that?

**W. Pitney:** Yeah, if we could focus on this now and then situate that. Anne, would you like to
comment on any of these issues?

**A. Birberick:** So, for those of you who don’t know me, my name is Anne Birberick, I’m Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academic Affairs and one of the functions of the office of the vice provost is to work with undergraduate curriculum. All the committees that are involved with undergraduate curriculum, the office of the vice provost provides support. We provide support in terms of taking minutes, making sure the meeting are arranged, getting material out, those kinds of things.

The overall idea was to streamline the curricular process and, in doing that, a new committee was created. When you create new committees, there is a new kind of shuffling of the membership of the committees and how they function and how they work. We wanted to make sure that the faculty voice was respected. As Barbara pointed out, faculty purview is for curricular matters and matters that are related to educational policy for that. Part of this creation of the new committee was again an issue of standardization and making sure that everybody was treated equitably on the committee. The decision to have all members who are not faculty or students selected through a faculty-driven curricular process, be ex officio without a vote was what was pursued. So in that respect you have standardization and equity across all of the ex officio members on the committee. The ex officio members are a wide ranging group. They go from the Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management or his designee, the Admissions Director, the Director of the Transfer Office, and a representative from the Educational Services and Programs. And if you don’t know what they are, some of them would constitute the CHANCE Program, the Center for Black Studies, the Trio Program, Access. So these are programs that work with students and do see students. That was the idea behind it and I can answer any questions but it’s perhaps some of the faculty members and the individuals who were involved with that process that could answer questions as well.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. Yes, Donna?

**D. Plonczynski:** I just wanted to address the concern about having faculty representation on the committee. From my understanding, there is some difficulty in having people participate in some of these committees and there may be some overlap of certain individuals who serve on two or more of the committees in the past. I’m not sure that we’ve perhaps lost as much as numerically it appears. And then to address your concern, I wonder if for conformity we’re not allowing the advisor to vote, but because that would be consistent, but according to Robert’s Rules, you can have an ex officio able to vote and it’s almost, although that certainly wasn’t the intent, it seems diminishing their role in the curricular process by having initially the ability to vote on issues and now the proposal is so that there wouldn’t be.

**A. Birberick:** So, let me take the first issue. With the old structure, which I hope will be an old structure, which is the overarching change, we have had issues with getting representation on these committees because faculty are overworked. They don’t have the time to sit on all of these committees and, unfortunately, it’s been regrettable that we haven’t been able to get the needed representation from certain colleges. Can’t fill their slots because they can’t find the faculty because there simply are too many committees for faculty to serve on. So one of the impetuses is for the overall restructuring was to be very cognizant and respectful of faculty time and energy, which is one of the greatest resources this university has. If you have the undergraduate in the current system, members of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council have a dual role. Select
members sit on the Undergraduate Coordinating Council and then they also go off and sit on another committee. So they actually sit on two different committees.

With respect to the role of the advisors, this committee is very different from the previous committee in that the new Baccalaureate Curriculum Council really has a very strong focus on curriculum. They are the university level so you have the department, you have the college, and then you have this one-stop shop which has lots of curricular matters involved in it. They also will take over the function that was done by the CUC and that is they will serve as the curricular body for programs that don’t have a college. So UNIV programs, the Center for Black Studies that you may be aware is not affiliated with a college, International Programs, there are a myriad of those. So that’s the difference. The APASC really kind of looked at a very narrow thread which had to do with certain policies. This is a broader all-encompassing committee that is looking at everything and in doing so making it easier, we hope, for the whole curricular process so it won’t take anywhere from 12 to 22 months to get your programs through because you have to spend time here and wait and you have to spend time there and wait. So there’s a different focus of the committee. Let’s go to Doris first and then Barbara.

**D. Macdonald:** I would like to advocate for including the advising dean. I’m actually on the Academic Policies Committee and I’m very much a proponent of the streamlined process. I think it absolutely has to happen. Having been on curricular committees at a bunch of different levels in my time here, it’s painful to see how long things take. I also think that one of the things that having an advising dean does is they understand policy. When Anne just talked about APASC policy, one of the things in streamlining was making sure that someone that has policy knowledge was on the newly constituted BCC. And I believe that faculty are concerned about policy. I think faculty educate themselves well for these committees but I think it’s good to have someone who has a longer term perspective, somebody who is involved with all of these issues from admission and reinstatement, etc. when we do make those policy decisions. I also agree that curriculum is majorly in the hands of the faculty, but there are 15 faculty votes and we’re asking, I think they’re asking, for one additional vote from the advising and I don’t think that is overwhelming the faculty vote.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you, Barbara.

**B. Jaffee:** Well, I’d comment, I am strongly in favor of having an advisor on this committee. It is the vote that I’m concerned about. My piece of this puzzle has been CUC. That’s the committee I’ve served on and so I am speaking from that perspective. It seems to me to be entirely appropriate for an advisor to be advisory to a committee and there certainly is an opportunity for this person to speak and to be persuasive, as persuasive as they can be. I would like to reframe the discussion of this amendment to point out that it’s not just, or only, or even that what we’re doing is taking away a vote that was narrowly connected to policy decisions. What we’re actually talking about is adding a vote on curriculum.

**W. Pitney:** The motion is, go ahead, Janet.

**J. Hathaway:** Just a point of clarification, when we say advisor, I’m hearing advising dean and I’m hearing advisor, so I don’t know what our definition is here. And as kind of a corollary to that, these folks that we’re talking about, do they have a vote at another level as well so this would in effect would be giving them two votes?
A. Birberick: So the group we’re talking about has traditionally been called advising deans. I don’t know where this name came about, but what we’re really talking about with one exception are, we’re talking about six individuals representing the six undergraduate colleges. One of them actually holds the title of an associate dean, all the others are the director or had or whatever title they have at the college level advising. Whether or not, and I’ll pass this over to Donna, what their roles are within their college in terms of whether or not they have votes on curriculum or this process, that is a matter for the college and I think it varies from college to college. So I’ll pass it over to Donna on the second.

D. Plonczynski: I have to say I don’t know the level of voting available at the different colleges, but I do know that it’s a historic term, the advising dean, it’s just a layover from who knows what.

W. Pitney: Thank you and Dr. Weldy.

E. Weldy: I’d just like to make a brief comment due to the fact that I do have a designee that serves on the APASC committee as an ex officio member. I think that the insight that the ex officio members give, I think is very valuable to the faculty in regards to making curriculum decisions. However, I really believe that when it comes to making curriculum decisions, that those of us that are ex officio members are there to support the faculty members to make sure they have all of the appropriate information to make the right decisions. That being said, I do not think that I’m qualified or even my director of admissions or other ex officio members are really qualified to make the kind of curriculum decisions that need to be made. Even though I am an ex officio member, I cannot make an argument from the standpoint of being a voting member on the new committee if in fact the decision is made to form the new committee. But I just wanted to share those thoughts.

W. Pitney: Thank you. Rich and then we’ll go back to Donna.

R. Holly: Just quick, I recommend we call the question at this point.

D. Plonczynski: Well could we clarify what the question is? Is it just on this part?

W. Pitney: Thank you, Rich. The motion on the table is to revert back to language allowing the advisor on the proposed BCC to be ex officio meaning they can vote, so we would strike out the language, “nonvoting member.” That’s the motion that Donna had made and it was seconded.

D. Plonczynski: Does that need two-thirds majority votes since it’s an adjustment to the bylaws?

F. Bryan: This is an amendment to the bylaws. This amendment only requires a majority vote. It’s the amendment, itself, that requires a two-thirds.

W. Pitney: So, for this proposal, again this is just to strike out the nonvoting piece for the advisor servicing ex officio on the proposed BCC. Really it’s an amendment to this larger proposal so we need to address that. A would be to vote in favor of striking out the nonvoting language meaning the advisor would be able to vote, so that’s 1 or A to vote yes. Two or B would be to vote no and the language would stay as is; and C or three is to abstain. So if you’ll go ahead
and vote please.

1 – Yes – 24
2 – No – 19
3 – Abstain – 2

W. Pitney: So the motion carries and so that would strike out the nonvoting piece. We would revert back to the original language then. Thank you. So that puts that issue to bed as they say. Let’s turn our attention to the larger proposal. Again you’ve seen the rationale. We’ve had our first reading on this. We’ve already got a motion on the floor and a second to approve this. Any other discussion items related to this proposal? Barbara.

B. Jaffee: I would like to hear more about the role of the General Education Committee which in my reading of this new language moves from advisory and making recommendations to policy making decisions and then reporting to the new BCC Committee.

W. Pitney: I’ll start and then I’ll invite Anne and/or Virginia to comment on that. The sum and substance of the General Education Committee in terms of their duties, roles, responsibilities hasn’t changed. What has changed, however, is that they will report to the proposed BCC committee and not recommend to that committee for ultimate approval. What that will do is give the General Education Committee more autonomy much like the Honors Committee currently has. So that’s a change that’s been made. Anne, I invite you to add anything to that.

A. Birberick: Sure. So, Bill is correct that with the new Baccalaureate Curriculum Council you don’t have all of the other curricular committees that we currently have rolling up. They all just recommended to the University Coordinating Council and that is no longer the case. So we had to make an adjustment in the language to reflect that there was no longer coordination going on for that. So what we did immediately this time around is that we said that the General Education Committee would report to the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council, not recommend, and that in the future, the University Council at the beginning of next session will see revised bylaws for the General Education Committee. In reporting to the BCC, the BCC will be able to provide feedback and enter in dialog, but ultimately the General Education Committee will have that dialog with the BCC, but will have to come up to the University Council. So the General Education Committee cannot ultimately just go off and do whatever it would like to do. It will have to…

B. Jaffee: That’s the clarification I’m looking for.

A. Birberick: I figured that might be what you’re looking for. It can’t go rogue, it will have to come up and bring whatever it is to the University Council. Does that help clarify? And then, as I said, the General Education Committee had looked at its bylaws and done some revision and the University Council will see them next year after we take them to UC’s Academic Policy Committee first, which is the appropriate order.

W. Pitney: Thank you. Any other comments, questions? Okay, seeing none we’ve got a motion on the floor to accept the university level curricular committee restructuring and it’s been seconded. To vote yes and approve these changes, press 1 or A. To vote no against this motion, press 2 or B. To abstain, press 3 or C. Have we all voted? So this requires two-thirds vote. No we
did not get two-thirds. We needed 40. So the motion fails. Yes, Virginia?

1 – Yes – 38
2 – No – 6
3 – Abstain – 1

V. Naples: If I could just say thank you to everybody who was involved and for all of those.

W. Pitney: The only issue is that we needed 40 votes because it’s a bylaw change and we needed two-thirds to approve this. The motion fails. We could bring it back later in the fall to revisit this.

V. Naples: I would still like to say thank you to everyone who put in a lot of hard work on this and ask people to be thoughtful and to continue to think about this because one of the most important things we need to do is to ensure that we can put forward our curricular changes in a timely manner and not to end up with lots of back and forth and duplication of effort.

W. Pitney: Yes, I agree. Thank you.

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

W. Pitney: Well moving on, Item C. This can be found on page 61 of your packet. Just a reminder this is the changes proposed for the Resources, Space and Budget Committee. So I would accept a motion, actually I’ll move to accept these changes to the NIU Bylaws Article 2 related to the Resource, Space and Budget.

D. Domke: Second.

W. Pitney: We’ve got a second. Thank you. Let’s discuss this. A couple of things you’ll see from our last meeting it was suggested that we wanted, because we’re expanding the number of faculty on this committee, we wanted to include at least one representative from each of the academic colleges and the libraries. That language you’ll see it begins on the last sentence on page 61 of your packet and that’s highlighted there. So that change has been made. Any other discussion points to this? Any questions? Okay. We are getting things, aren’t we? So let’s go ahead and vote, please. This also needs two-thirds. A is to vote in favor of the motion; 2 or B is vote no; and 3 or C is to abstain. So go ahead and vote now, please. Everybody voted. Let’s see how we fared here.

1 – Yes – 42
2 – No – 1
3 – Abstain – 1

W. Pitney: Motion carries. Thank you.
W. Pitney: Item D, you’ll find that on page 64. This is a proposed revision to NIU bylaws and that’s to eliminate the minutes committee. As explained last time, we do a pretty good job taking care of the minutes and we have a chance for edits here. I move that we accept this change. Can I get a second please? Janet thank you. Discussion? Seeing no discussion let’s get out your clickers. One or A is to vote yes you approve the motion; 2 or B is to vote no; and 3 or C is to abstain. If you could vote now, please. If we could go ahead and make sure you vote. We had 44 just a second ago. Did everybody vote? Okay let’s go ahead and close the vote.

1 – Yes – 39
2 – No – 1
3 – Abstain – 1

D. Plonczinski: I’m sorry, Bill, you know what, Dr. Long had to step out for a second. I wonder if it’s legal to extend the vote for another moment. I thought I’d give it a shot.

D. Domke: Can I make a motion to reconsider the previous question? I would like to make that motion.

W. Pitney: So we’ve got a motion on the floor to reconsider that last motion. We need a second.

J. Frascello: Second.

W. Pitney: So, Ferald, if it’s correct, we need two-thirds vote to reconsider that? Okay let’s do it. Just a reconsider and revote on that. One or A is to vote yes you approve the reconsideration; 2 or B is no. We are voting.

1 – Yes – 42
2 – No – 1
3 – Abstain – 0

W. Pitney: Dillon, thank you for thinking of that, by the way. Okay so let’s revote on item D. Again this is the deletion of the minutes committee. I’ll accept a motion to accept that change.

D. Domke: I thought this was for the Resource, Space and Budget one.

W. Pitney: We’re on the Minutes. The RSB passed; the Minutes Committee didn’t. A motion to…

Unidentified: So moved.

W. Pitney: Thank you, a second?

Unidentified: Second.
**W. Pitney:** Any discussion? Okay so A or 1 is to vote yes you approve the deletion of the Minutes Committee; 2 or B is to vote no; and 3 or C is to abstain. Let’s try this again. We got 43. We’re ready to close the vote.

1 – Yes – 43  
2 – No – 0  
3 – Abstain – 1

**W. Pitney:** Motion carries, thank you, Dillon.

---

**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**

**W. Pitney:** Lastly, Item E, you can find this on page 65. I would accept a motion to accept the proposed revision to Articles 2.2 and 2.5 that can be found on page 65-68. Thank you Janet. Second? Thank you Virginia.

Let’s discuss this. We’ve got an interesting situation here. Originally, this was a proposal to have two things occur. One was to consolidate the Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee with the Rules and Governance Committee here on the University Council and we were going to work to do the same thing concurrently with Faculty Senate. Once those were done, we were looking to join those as well. At Faculty Senate we didn’t have the requisite number in attendance to take the vote so we could not get the committees consolidated. So that one was postponed.

So what I would suggest, actually I’d like to move to amend this motion and you can see at your seat a sheet that’s got this amendment. Basically what I’m suggesting with this amendment is that we, at the very least today, consolidate our Rules and Governance Committee and our Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. So what you see on this amendment is a strike out of the Faculty Senate, so we’re not joining it with Faculty Senate, all we’re doing is consolidating those two committees to create one committee here at University Council. The changes that you see on this sheet are simply to have taken out any language related to joining those committees with Faculty Senate and University Council. And so it’s just the University Council Committee on Rules, Governance and Elections.

So that’s the motion I’ll make to amend to that. Can I have a second please? Thank you. Any discussion on that? So like previously we’ve got a motion to amend within that larger motion. What we’re going to vote on right now is just this amendment to not join the committees. It’s on the sheet there. So that’s just going to be a simple majority. Please press 1 or A, unless there’s any other discussion, please press 1 or A to approve; 2 or B to vote no; and 3 or C to abstain. Okay so we’ll go ahead and close the vote. So that amendment passes.

1 – Yes – 42  
2 – No – 0  
3 – 0
W. Pitney: So now we need to turn our attention to the larger change to the University Council Bylaws to join these committees, merge these together, so that we can reduce two of our committees into one. We’ve already got a motion and a second on the floor. Any discussion about this? Seeing none, let’s vote on this. One or A is to vote yes; 2 or B is to vote no; and 3 or C is to abstain. Everybody voted? Let’s close the vote, please. The motion carries.

1 – Yes – 41
2 – No – 1
3 – Abstain – 1

F. Proposed revisions to NIU Constitution, Article 4 – Page 69
Standing Committees of the University Council
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

W. Pitney: Last one under Unfinished Business, Item F. This is a second reading action item. You can see this on page 69. This is a constitutional change. As you see on page 69, what we’re proposing is that we take out the listing of every committee and we’re adding language in that says the standing committees of the University Council shall be as defined in the NIU Bylaws. That will allow us to add, delete, modify, consolidate committees without always having to go back and make constitutional changes. I move that we accept this. Can I have a second, please?

D. Plonczynski: Second.

W. Pitney: Donna, thank you. Any discussion on that? We’re ready to vote. Constitutional changes only require two-thirds of those in attendance voting. Here we go. Vote 1 or A to vote yes; 2 or B to vote no; and 3 or C to abstain. Okay let’s close the vote please.

1 – Yes – 43
2 – No – 0
3 – Abstain – 0

W. Pitney: I think that’s at least two-thirds. That concludes our unfinished business.

D. Baker: Congratulations on almost a whole new slate. Well, I do hope you bring up that one that didn’t get quite the two-thirds. You guys did a lot of work, I think it’s a good structure and one to try. And again, let’s try stuff and if it doesn’t work we’ll come back and change it. Maybe you can take that on early in the fall and reconsider that if there’s interest in doing that.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

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

D. Baker: Bill, student grievance annual report.

W. Pitney: Thank you, just very brief. This is going to be an oral report only according to Article 11 of our bylaws, I’m supposed to give this report annually. We had two student grievances this past year, one of which was upheld and the other of which was denied. Those
both occurred in the first semester of this academic year.

**D. Baker:** Questions, comments?

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

**D. Baker:** I believe, Chris McCord, I think you’re up next with the acting director waiver request per the NIU Bylaws.

**C. McCord:** Thank you. Bylaws require that somebody in an interim or acting appointment may be appointed for no more than two years. We have a situation in our Center for Latino and Latin American Studies where Kristin Huffine has served for the past two years as acting director for a variety of reasons including both resource constraints and the ongoing search for the chief diversity officer. It was felt best not to conduct a search this year for a center director. Michael Gonzales retired as center director two years ago after many years of service. So I would like to continue Kristin for another year as acting director of the center, but the bylaws require approval of University Council to make an acting appointment for more than two years. So I come to you requesting that authorization.

**D. Baker:** All right, so I guess we need a motion from the floor?

**C. McCord:** I guess I move.

**D. Baker:** Do we have a second?

**Unidentified:** Second.

**D. Baker:** Any discussion. All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**D. Baker:** Opposed?

**C. McCord:** Thank you, all.

**D. Baker:** Congratulations. Well done.

**IX. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

A. Program Prioritization Update

**D. Baker:** Now the president’s announcement. I’ve got a couple of announcements and then we have some certificates to give everybody for contributing this year. So why don’t we do my stuff fairly quickly and then do that and then go to our reception. We also have a program prioritization update by Marc, I believe.

Just quickly, congratulations to Nathan who had to take off. I look forward to working with he and Dillon next year as leaders of the students. Vice President for Research search has been
underway. We had a committee formed. Jim Ciesla is chairing. We’ve had three candidates interviewing and I’ll meet with the committee in the next few days about that. So we had a good slate of three candidates there.

Chief Diversity Officer search, I understand we had an excellent pool there as well. We’ve got four people starting through campus. The first is on campus today. Dean Rosato Perea is co-chairing the committee and Eric is co-chairing as well. You guys put together a great committee and it looks like we’ve got four people coming through the next two weeks. So thank you for doing that. If you have a chance, please go to the open forums on those.

The Human Resources search, I think an e-mail went out this afternoon about that. I think Lisa made a decision to, she felt there were procedural irregularities in that search and so she’s going to restart the search and do it over, unfortunately. But I think for procedural issues, I think it was important to do that step and we’ll come back and take it on in a better way.

The house and the senate have been asking a lot of data from us. I think they’re getting serious as they go into the committees and asking for data requests on higher education and its efficiency and effectiveness so we’re providing all of that data. Our staff worked night and day for essentially the past week to get that data out so if you were calling somebody and they weren’t answering you in the Finance or Institutional Research areas, it was because they were up until midnight every night trying to get the stuff for the house and the senate. So my thanks to them for that good work. Any question on any of that? Marc, can you give us an update on program prioritization?

M. Falkoff: Thanks. I will be brief. Most importantly, the criteria that we’re going to be using for program prioritization were finalized by a joint committee of the Academic Planning Council and Resources, Space and Budget, as well as other members of the university community. There was a five-week process it took into account a lot of the feedback, all of the feedback that we received as a result of a survey that we sent around the university. The joint committee also assigned weights to the criteria and all of the results are posted on the prioritization website for NIU so you can view those.

The next step includes finalizing a list of what constitutes a program. That’s something Jeff Reynolds is working on. It’s an iterative process so he’ll be reaching out to all kinds of people across the university. Also, Jeff and Dan House are starting to collect the data that is going to be used to populate the reports, kind of drafts of the reports, and information that’s going to be handed out to the folks who will ultimately be responsible for drafting the reports on behalf of the programs to be submitted to the task forces. All of that data is going to be available in its finalized form, as I understand it, by August 15 at the latest. And the types of information will be made known people well in advance of August 15.

Nominations for the task forces, the bodies that are going to actually do the prioritization and the ranking programs were made, they’ve come in. There were over 100 nominations for the academic and administrative programs. The membership is going to be selected by a body that has been expanded to include three additional faculty members, a member of operating staff, an SPS member and a student. As I understand it, the task force members will be selected and that will all be finalized by the end of May if not sooner.
That’s pretty much it as the process is really taking shape. People have more questions, people want more information; the members of the prioritization coordinating team are making themselves available to any groups that are interested in learning more about the process. We’ve already met with some groups. On the website, the prioritization website, there’s a button you can click to ask for members of the team to come and talk to a group. I believe that’s it. If you don’t know already, there’s a prioritization website which has loads of information, FAQs, a lot of stuff on it. Thanks.

B. Jaffee: So, there’s going to be, my question has to do with maybe more clarification on the definition of program. I guess what I’m specifically concerned about is the criteria for deciding whether something is an administrative versus an academic program. How is that being decided?

M. Falkoff: Venturing into territory above my pay grade, but as I understand it, I’m not going to get the language precisely right, but academic programs are those which fulfill the university’s mission, and administrative programs are, as a first cut, those that support the academic mission. Perhaps that makes some sense. Beyond that, I think there’s information on this at the prioritization website. If you have a specific question, definitely Jeff Reynolds is the guy who’s been thinking through this most carefully; Carolinda Douglass as well. I’m just probably the wrong person to answer that question at this point. As far as dividing up on the academic side, what constitutes a program, the first cut is we look at CIP codes and then we make decisions about, for example, should minors be considered their own programs. And in some instances, the answer will be yes. In some instances, no. Where there’s a parent program, they will not be considered their own program. So there are a number of decisions that have to be made along those lines. Everything at this point, it’s a work in progress, so certainly any comments would be welcome so that they can do this in a coherent rational way.

B. Jaffee: The reason I ask the question is that it seems to me maybe more obvious what constitutes an academic program and maybe it isn’t, but it does seem like there is a careful process in place to make that determination. But in my own unit, for example, I have questions about things like the Art museum which supports our program or centers that are not degree offering, those kinds of things.

M. Falkoff: Right. I’ll just, I don’t have the answer to that. I’m not as well-versed in that because the subcommittee that I’ve been working on has addressed the criteria. I can assure you that these are not easy questions. They’re exactly the questions that Jeff Reynolds and company have been thinking about. I can assure you that he would be very eager to discuss what their thoughts are at this point and to address any concerns that you have or that anyone has. No doubt about it, Jeff is happy to talk through these issues with people.

J. Stafstrom: Do both task forces look at all programs?

M. Falkoff: No.

J. Stafstrom: Does the academic look at academic and administrative look at administrative?

M. Falkoff: Correct. Academic looks at academic, that’s right.

D. Baker: Other questions? Thanks, Marc.
M. Falkoff: We do have a question.

R. Feurer: I asked this at the Faculty Senate but I want to raise it again which is: In the end when there is – is there going to be open process debate on the relative merits between these two? I understand the process going forward, but in the end who is going to make the decision about cuts in prioritization between these two separate processes?

M. Falkoff: Again, I guess the only answer that I have is that these are recommendations that will be made by the bodies, by the administrative and the academic task forces, to the extent that our university rules require approval from any of the shared governance bodies for changes. Those are going to be respected. And then to the extent there are budgetary decisions that are made to the extent that the president is empowered to make those, he’ll still be empowered to make those.

R. Feurer: So, it would be voted on at this level and at the Faculty Senate level? That wasn’t my understanding last week.

W. Pitney: If I could jump in, for the academic programs, the recommendations that come from the task forces for the academic programs, all of those will be re-channeled back through our curricular process.

R. Feurer: Curricular processes but not through the governing bodies, not through the Faculty Senate at any point.

W. Pitney: Well right now our curricular process doesn’t go through Faculty Senate.

R. Feurer: But this isn’t curriculum, or is that what you’re saying this is a curriculum?

W. Pitney: So, the academic programs basically represent our programs of study our curricula that we as faculty design. And recommendations coming from the task force would be channeled back to the department level. Departments could accept the recommendations and make changes, they might negotiate some modifications to those that they believe might work better, and I supposed on another level they might say: Heck with that, we’re not changing that at all. But any of those changes then would go from the department to the college and then up to the university curricular bodies.

R. Feurer: Just begs the question what happens if the department says we don’t buy this, what’s the process then?

W. Pitney: Right now the resource allocation for anything is overseen by the president with the authority of our Board of Trustees.

R. Feurer: I gathered that but there’s no way like when this committee, this prioritization committee, has finished there’s no way to really intervene as a faculty.

D. Baker: No, exactly the opposite. I think Bill just said it will go through the normal curricular review process through here. So I think that’s not right. The outcome of these is beginning the
conversation. Somebody needs to look at the data for the university for all of our programs. We need to spend our money wisely. We can’t lock a budget in for this university and say we’re doing the right thing for ever and ever and ever. You’ve got to look and see: How do we allocate money to the best and highest needs to fulfill our mission? This process is going to allow us to look at some data with a lot of faculty and staff and student input and then we start the regular review process. So this is really an addendum on to the normal processes. It’s more process, not less process.

**R. Feurer:** I understand that but on the other side though, the administrative side, is there any oversight review after these decisions have gone through that committee so that we could evaluate as a faculty or as a university the processes that were used in the decision making that was made so that there’s another level of voice I guess.

**D. Baker:** I’m sure we’ll have those conversations with the Resource, Space and Budget Committee about all these issues and then those will, I’m sure, be reported in this venue and then they’ll also be reviewed at the cabinet level as well. There will be a lot of process in this. Others? Thanks, Marc.
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**D. Baker:** Let’s celebrate just a little bit.


**D. Baker:** And before you go, we have a little gift for Bill. So before I give it to you, just a couple words. Bill and I met on a regular basis and what did they say in the diplomatic circles, we had frank conversations. But they were always cordial conversations. They were honest and open. We’d both talk about challenges, but Bill was very creative and often brought the solutions and not just the challenges. And so I really appreciated the professionalism that he brought to the position and the ability to talk through issues and try to find solutions and do what was right for the faculty, the staff and the students of the university. So, Bill, I really appreciate the way you carried the University Council this year and really appreciated partnering with you so congratulations. Should we make him say something?

**W. Pitney:** Thank you very much, It’s been an honor.
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XII. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Is there any new business? Is there a motion to go to the Ellingtons’ room and be received?

Unidentified: So moved.

Unidentified: Second.

D. Baker: All in favor.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Let’s go party. Thank you. Good year.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.