UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT
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Holmes Student Center Sky Room
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I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Welcome. Good afternoon. I’ll call the meeting to order. Did the lights just get brighter or was that me? It did. That’s what it was. Magic.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: Could I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

J. Frascello: So moved.

D. Baker: So moved, Joe.

D. Domke: Second.


Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed. We have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 8, 2014 MEETING
D. Baker: Next, the approval of the minutes. Do I have a motion for the minutes?

D. Haliczer: So moved.


C. Doederlein: Second.


Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed. Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: President’s Announcements. Boy, a lot of stuff going on. First thing I’d like to do is update you on a few searches that we have underway. The first is a vice president for advancement search. That’s Mike Malone’s position. Mike’s retiring this summer and we have a search underway. Dennis Barsema is chairing that committee. Rich Holly, I think I saw Rich. I see Rich’s hand. Rich is vice-chairing it along with Sean Frazier and we’re off and running. And it sounds like we’re developing a good pool and we’ll have candidates on campus for all of you to meet with here in the next couple months. So I’m excited about that search. Really an important one as we go forward and try and start another capital campaign here for the people of the university, for the faculty and for the students and also for our programs and facilities. So I’m looking forward to working on all four of those major priorities and help us move forward. I really am excited about what we could do with that campaign. We’ve got 240,000 from this university and almost a 130,000 in the Chicagoland area I’m told at last count. That’s a lot of opportunity. And most development officers have to fly all over the country to meet their people. And we have to do some of that too, but we’ve got a lot of people close by that care about the university, so I’m really excited about what we can do there.

Second, the vice president for administration and finance is underway. That search, Lisa is chairing that. I thought it was important for her in her role as executive vice president and provost to chair that. She worked so closely with Nancy Suttenfield over the last year to develop budget principles, a budget process, and we’re going to continue to evolve that. So she knows that work intimately. We’ve got a much stronger pool, I’m told, than the last time around and we’re making great progress there. We hope to have candidates in for you all to meet before the end of the semester. So middle of December-ish I think we’ll be having them on campus. So please look forward to that. When they are here, avail yourselves and go meet with them and see what they have to say.

I made a structure shift in the interim. As you know, Bill Nicklas retired and the board is going to have a fond farewell for him in December at their December meeting. And many of you went to his farewell last week, so thanks for doing that. It was a great event. In the interim, we need interim facilities leadership and so I’ve asked John Cheney and I’ll have John stand. John is in the back of the room. Hello, John. John is going to be running facilities and John has been
running facilities here at NIU in the athletics department for the last year, and before that ran a large operation in facilities at Oregon State University, go Beavers! So can we all welcome John. If you want to want to get his cell number so you can call him at three in the morning when something is screwed up, John is willing and able to do that. So thank you, John.

Let’s see, Lisa and I are in receipt of a draft report from the Diversity Task Force. As you probably know, the beginning of last summer we appointed a task force to look at diversity issues broadly read and the committee divided up into a number of sub committees and worked vigorously over the last few months. It’s an excellent report. We’ll share that with you here shortly, but I wanted to let you know we’ve got that. We’re going to meet with a committee before we put it out but we’re going to have an implementation plan around that a good communication plan. I’m really impressed with the work that they’ve done. They looked at best practices around the country and I think have some excellent recommendations. That will be coming to you shortly as will the report from the Violence Against Women Task Force.

Lisa and I this week were in Orlando, the happiest place to have a conference in the world, and I’ve got to say flying to Orlando is my least favorite place to fly because there’s always a 1,000 tired kids on the airplane screaming and I had them surrounding me on the flight both directions. Anyway it wasn’t the happiest airplane in the world. But at Orlando there was a session at the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities Conference on the Violence Against Women Act and what universities are doing. And it was clear from those that we’re out ahead of almost all the other schools in the country. That we’ve had this task force, they’ve been thoughtful about it, they have many good recommendations and I’m looking forward to again an implementation plan that they’ve suggested coming out of it and we’re going to make some significant changes there.

A. NIU PLUS – Progressive Learning in Undergraduate Studies – presentation – Pages 3-45

D. Baker: Speaking of significant changes, the NIU PLUS group continues to work diligently and has been working with the Faculty Senate and others and I wonder if Anne and Joel could give us a little update on that.

A. Birberick: So, thank you very much for allowing us to come to the meeting this afternoon. My name is Anne Birberick and I’m here with my colleague.

J. Stafstrom: Joel Stafstrom, I’m sitting in for Michael Kolb who couldn’t be here today.

A. Birberick: So, Joel is a member of the PLUS Task Force and so this is an informational meeting, there’s no action required. This is to update you. It’s all part of what the PLUS Task Force has taken very seriously and that is to engage in as many possible ways all the stakeholders. And so we’ve met with students, we’ve met with NIU faculty, we’ve met with our partners at the community colleges, and it’s been a continual process of update, reflection, action, and then update. So this is still in keeping with that. We did have an open comment period and that closed just recently. And the PLUS Task Force considered very, very seriously what the feedback was and has sent individual response – letters as well as gone out to meet with individual groups. So if we have time maybe we could just do about ten minutes of Q&A. You have a long agenda and I want to make sure that we don’t monopolize it, but we do want again to give you the opportunity, if anybody has any questions, to ask them and we’ll do our best to
answer them.

**D. Baker:** Do you want to salt the mine? Do you want to ask yourself a hard question or anything?

**A. Birberick:** Well, I can answer the question about implementation. How about that?

**D. Baker:** That’s good.

**A. Birberick:** Because that’s come up in multiple areas. PLUS is a very large, comprehensive program. It incorporates changes to the current general education program as well as changes to NIU’s baccalaureate requirements. One of the concerns that has been expressed on multiple occasions and in multiple forms is the progress at which this is being rolled out. I want to assure you that we realize that there are multiple pieces to this and the implementation involves a series of sub-groups. So there will be some changes that will occur and be recorded in the 2015/2016 undergraduate catalog, and then there will be more that will take place in the 2016/2017 catalog. It’s going to be a process that unfolds over a period of time. And we’ve already begun working with very crucial curricular committees to discuss how to do this, as well as other constituents on campus. So it’s not something that is just going to be picked up and put en masse into the catalog.

In addition, we need to have some preparation for the faculty and allow the faculty to create pathways. So the plan is in the next couple of weeks to have an RFP that will provide funding for faculty to work with one another and to create the pathways, which is one of the pieces for the general education revision. So I do want to assure you that multiple conversations are going on with different constituents at this time and they range from curricular committees to groups of individuals that have expertise in various areas related to the PLUS. And their advice and wisdom will be considered and consulted and clearly is necessary to a successful implementation. How about that for a hard question?

**D. Baker:** Good. There’s a question.

**D. Plonczynski:** I was reading this and I realize that the focus, it seems to me, is obviously getting students here, more students. It looked like under number 2 that it seemed like that was just about generating money with 101/201, but I don’t see the connection with increasing our enrollment.

**D. Baker:** Before she answers that, I don’t think the objective here is to increase enrollment. I think it’s to improve undergraduate education. The driver isn’t enrollment, it’s doing the right thing, you know, the learning outcomes for the university. And this is part of a 20-year effort that’s gone on across higher education that in many ways AAC&U has helped lead on the reformation of general education in America coming out of the LEAP standards, Liberal Education and America’s Promise. That’s the genesis of much of this and this group’s done a great job trying to adapt that to our context.

**A. Birberick:** And, yes, I echo that. I mean the foundation, well NIU’s not a LEAP school, Liberal Education and America’s Promise, going back to the initial revision of the baccalaureate goals, they were clearly inspired by the LEAP initiative and their learning outcomes, though we
used our own language and we tailored that and adapted it to NIU and its culture. We hope that
what will happen is that students will be attracted to NIU and see the value of coming to a four-
year institution in which learning and that classroom and co-curricular classroom experience is
given such high priority and valued and that we’re an institution where we’re really trying to pull
all the pieces together and have a deliberate, integrated learning experience for the students.

D. Plonczynski: Do you think that – I guess I’m asking where 70 new students, where that
figure came from?

A. Birberick: So, we asked Admissions, you know Admissions tracks students who are
admitted, students who accept, students who actually enroll and, according to our information,
we have about 2,500 students that are admitted to NIU but choose to go elsewhere. And we were
being very modest and we said if we could just get 70 of those students and convince them to
come to NIU, let’s play it out mathematically what would happen.

D. Plonczynski: Okay, thank you.

D. Munroe: I know that some of these questions were posed to you through the website, but I
guess I’d just like to hear what you have to say about this curriculum and how it might affect
students who are coming here for a second baccalaureate degree. In our health science programs
we have a lot of students who are in the baccalaureate program for nursing, for example, who
have bachelor’s degrees in other fields, and some of these recommendations seem that it might
be inappropriate for someone who’s already got a bachelor’s degree and so wondered how you
intend to accommodate that or what you think about that?

J. Stafstrom: Which ones in particular are you referring to?

D. Munroe: It was well it’s the University 101, the questions that were raised had to do with
University 101 or 201, a career class, and intensive writing classes.

A. Birberick: So, we have had – the College of Health and Human Sciences is one of the
colleges with whom we’ve had some discussions about their students because that college also
has a lot of degree completion students and different student populations. And we’ve begun to
have conversations with that college about where their concerns lie in terms of the specific
student populations and that’s about as far as I can get now because we’re really getting down to
very specific details depending on the different student cohorts.

D. Munroe: Thank you.

D. Baker: Anybody else?

H. Khoury: My name is Helen Khoury I’m with the Department of Mathematics. I have a
question regarding on page 5. I don’t claim to have read the whole report very well, but I noticed
something and I am wondering what is it that made you title a certain section. Just focusing on
scientific literacy and sciences and under that paragraph, you refer to mathematics, to
engineering and the like. I mean, if part of our mission is to promote student career development
and success, I think having the terms mathematics and engineering as well as science, those
could be attractive to many incoming students in the future. So what was it that made you only
focus on scientific literacy only? There’s mathematical literacy, there’s engineering literacy, although you did talk about the sciences, mathematics, technology and engineering in that section. So I’m wondering about the title of that whole section.

A. Birberick: So, they do go ahead because that came up and they did, the PLUS did, decide while they’re not necessarily changing the title but they are changing the description to be more inclusive.

J. Stafstrom: And in that case, it was because the science chairs had written us with some specific requests for revision of our language, number one, about scientific literacy which is why we rewrote that. We didn’t rewrite the other knowledge domains because we didn’t have requests to do that. Science chairs also had made requests regarding science labs and that’s outlined here as well. I think that the entire goal of these knowledge domains is to make them more inclusive, more broad in their context, which is why instead of calling it natural sciences, we called it nature and technology. While it might say scientific literacy, I think that we’re approaching that in a broad way that includes all of the STEM areas and things that support them as well.

H. Khoury: Well, does that mean that you did not receive any type of feedback from the other departments other than the science departments?

A. Birberick: We received feedback from multiple venues and considered all of the feedback that we received.

H. Khoury: Because I am thinking, if a student graduates eventually from NIU and if there’s no evidence on their transcript that they had some type of course work, not necessarily courses, that focus on all of these, not only scientific literacy, but mathematical literacy, engineering literacy, those could be really good attractions to employers. That’s what I was thinking.

A. Birberick: So, one of the ways that all of the things that you just spoke about are going to enter in, is through the pathways where you can see that, if a student chooses a pathway, that the domain of nature and technology has to play a role. So that has to focus in whatever the pathway is for a student.

D. Baker: And I might add, just on page 18 of our document, those pathways in foundational studies are listed. Maybe those titles are clearer than what was in the original document. So quantitative literacy was one of the foundations and then, if you drop down, nature and technology and the domain studies. So those seem a little bit broader and more inclusive.

H. Khoury: But I was just wondering about the title of that section and this summary, you know executive summary report also. Thank you.

D. Baker: Any other questions? All right, one more thing before we move on to the rest of the agenda. Provost Freeman took a team recently to a workshop that was held in Chicago on program prioritization. And the basic idea here is that we want to spend our money on the highest need of the faculty and students and staff of the university. And we need to have some kind of inclusive process that allows us to do that. So they went to this conference to talk about what are the process options and how would you undertake this. Bill went and a team of about
ten people. Lisa could you just give us an update on where we are with that?

**L. Freeman:** Sure. I know there’s a lot of interest in this subject and, as a result of that, a lot of speculation. So let me cede with an FAQ and that is: What has been decided? And the answer is nothing. But let me tell you where we are in the process and what you can expect to hear over what time course as we move forward. So there were ten people who attended a workshop in Chicago focused on prioritization of programs, both academic and administrative. And the group that went was chosen because of their positions such as the Faculty Senate chair, the chair of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, the chair of the Academic Planning Council, the people in the provost’s office who are responsible for resource, space, budget and academic planning, with the idea that the people who attended the conference would come back and be a coordination team that would help to build the processes on our campus that would be important for overall implementing alignment of our mission and budget through a program prioritization process. The team has had one meeting since they returned back from the Chicago workshop and at that meeting we determined the following: that it’s very important to have an internal communications plan and a communications support team. And, to that end, we’ve already scheduled a session with the chairs who are coming now to chairs’ workshops on November 17; we’re preparing a website with FAQ; we will be bringing this information forward to the cabinet and to the Dean’s Council and to other venues as information evolves; we’ve recognized the need to have a data support team so that we have a consensus about what met data are available to support a process going forward; and we’ve known all along, and this has been reaffirmed by our attendance at the workshop, that, as we build the processes, it will be very important to have resource experts who have knowledge, deep knowledge, of our campus processes, of our resource and outreach activities, and of other things so that we can call on these experts to come in and advise us on building a process.

The first component of what we’ll have to achieve is deciding on what type of criteria are important to us at NIU and reflect our culture, our values, our mission, and our plans. And the process for choosing those criteria and weighting them will be a very inclusive one. We have not yet worked out all of the details of the process, but I can assure you that it will be a very faculty-driven process and very respectful of shared governance. And, in fact, after criteria are circulated, feedback is generated through a formalized and inclusive process, it will, in fact, be the faculty and staff committees of Resource, Space and Budget and Academic Planning Council who will have the ultimate task of assembling the feedback and recommending criteria to the president.

So that’s where we are and I think what I’d like to do is take questions and answers. In the absence of us having a communications plan in place, there’s a lot of misinformation and miscommunication and I’d really like to just be out there with as much information as I can give to address the concerns that people have. As I’ve said a number of times lately, I don’t always know what’s being speculated about so it’s hard for me to address those head on. So here’s a great opportunity for people who have questions to ask.

**D. Baker:** Anybody? Was the description clear enough that…

**L. Freeman:** Stay tuned for the website and the FAQs. I think that will actually help a lot in terms of giving people a little more understanding of where we’re going.
D. Baker: We’ll keep you posted at these meetings too as that progresses. Well thank you, Lisa. John Cheney, I forgot to ask you to do something. So let me give you a pop quiz. Athletics announces a master plan a week or so ago and a few people have asked questions about where is this and where are we getting all this money. Could you kind of clarify what we’re doing? Find a mic. And I should have done it before but I got so excited talking about you I forgot to ask you the question.

J. Cheney: So, we’ve unveiled a master plan, an athletic facilities master plan, last week. In total the estimates, just from the initial conceptual design, we’re in the neighborhood of a $138,000,000 total. That would be if we would start construction say in January of 2015. So, obviously, there’s fluctuation either way and we’re, obviously, not ready to start any construction in January, but the intent would be privately fundraise or specifically fundraise as part of the campaign you mentioned earlier, some of those funds. And the rest would be based off revenue generation because of the expansion in seating and the premium seating areas, those type of things. There’s potential additional, obviously, revenue if and when we would build it and sell those seats and so a lot of that would be self-supporting-based, revenue-based funds. Right now the timeline basically we’ve completed the master plan. The intent was to get that strategically in place so that we would have a plan to go forward with to match up with the master thesis plan and then be able to go along and join that with any strategic planning that the campus pursues going forward to make sure we’re in conjunction with all of those plans. And the timeline is really not set; it will be based on, obviously, how the campaign goes, working with this board, working with this council, excuse me, as well as the Board of Trustees and figuring out what is the proper timeline and expenditures and those type of things. But the intent would be privately fundraising and revenue-based models.

D. Baker: So, when you’re doing a fundraising campaign like this, you have to have something to show potential donors and so that’s kind of what we’ve done. We’ve done some initial planning, a comprehensive plan, so all the pieces are there so that you can start talking to people who might be interested in supporting you. And it has pieces for football, baseball, gymnastics, wrestling, tennis…

J. Cheney: Correct. Pretty much all the sports will be impacted. Golf, there’s three new facilities as far as a new tennis facility, a new Olympic sports facility that would primarily be practice areas for golf, gymnastics and wrestling and then a new baseball facility and upgrades to other current facilities.

D. Baker: So, for those of you who’ve visited gymnastics and wrestling who are in the bowels of the football stadium, it’s not the greatest place in the world to do those kinds of sports. So anyway it’s a plan and we’ll have to see whether there are donors interested in supporting it or not. And that’s the way we’re going to have to fund these kinds of things. I appreciate the hard work. There’s some beautiful ideas in there and, of course, they’re all adaptable over time, but we needed to get something down on paper so we could start talking to people and see if there’s any interest and do that first step out there. And, as we get more interest, we’ll do more work. Any questions for John on that? Thank you, John.

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

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong; Paul Stoddard, alternate – report – Page 46

D. Baker: Shall we get on to the agenda? First agenda item under Reports from the Councils, Boards and Standing Committees is from Paul Stoddard. Paul, your FAC report.

P. Stoddard: So, we met, apparently, October 17 at Governor’s State University. The provost and president both talked to us. They were mostly talking about GSU’s plans to go from being a university that deals with upper-division undergrads and graduate students to being a full four-year undergrad institution. They’ve accepted their first freshman class which has 242 students and they’re instituting a cohort model in which freshmen take three of their five classes with the same group of students, the same cohort. So that seemed kind of interesting. It looked like it might be something we would want to follow in light of some of the plus ideas and so forth. They’ve also started an intercollegiate athletic program. So, if you hear about Jaguars in the South Chicago area, don’t be alarmed unless they’re doing really well and playing us, which doesn’t seem likely.

The main course of business was dealing with academic freedom issues and shared governance issues both of which were inspired by recent events at Chicago State and the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign. Some of these you may have read about in the papers. The U of I case was a professor who had been offered a position, made some, I would say, ill-advised Tweets and they rescinded his offer. That was an academic freedom issue.

And Chicago State, their Faculty Senate, which is equivalent to this body, has gotten into some trouble or they’ve created some friction with the Board of Trustees and the administration. And that body has been effectively suspended.

So we talked about those issues for a while and voted to look into what we might do. And right now we’re leaning towards a statement reaffirming the FAC’s commitment to academic freedom and shared governance at all the Illinois universities. So that was the main thing.

The IBHE liaison, Ocheng Jany, is retiring or just has retired so we had a nice farewell to him. That’s my report. Any questions?

D. Macdonald: I have a question. When you say here what kind of response, do you mean a response from NIU or a response from IBHE?

P. Stoddard: Okay, so when I’m asking for input there, it’s thoughts that individuals generally might have about academic freedom, about shared governance, that you would like to see in some sort of resolution, doing that reaffirmation of our support of those concepts.

D. Macdonald: But the “our” is IBHE?

P. Stoddard: Oh, it’s the FAC, the Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

D. Macdonald: Gotcha, thank you.
D. Baker: And one issue that we have that’s different than the University of Illinois is that our Board of Trustees do not approve hires. So that step is not in our system. Ibrahim?

I. Abdel-Motaleb: This may be [inaudible] related to this report, but this is a question to the president. With the change of the governorship now, what is implication of having a different party as a state governor? Can you speculate on this or just tell us where we are going with that?

D. Baker: So, you’re talking about Governor-elect Rauner and the impact of that? That’s a good question. I’ve had a series of meetings today where a lot of smart people that know a lot about state government all scratch their head and said we don’t know what’s going to happen. I actually wore a political tie today. So I see a blue legislature and a red governor. I guess that’s a political tie, I don’t know. You can interpret it that way. You still got super majorities in both houses for the Democrats and you have a Republican governor. And how that plays out I don’t know. It could be that they say we both, you know if we’re gonna get anything done we have to agree and the leaders of both houses come together with the governor and say we’ve got big problems let’s figure out how to work them together. Or they could act like Washington, DC. So I don’t know what’s gonna happen, Ibrahim. It’s gonna be fascinating to watch it unfold. And then we have the veto session and lame duck session in front of us, too, where something is going to have to be done on the tax situation, on the income tax situation. And today people are just kind of trying to get the wind back in their lungs and figure out what’s next. It will be interesting to see who Governor-elect Rauner appoints as his transition team. And that will give us some hints on the tone that’s going be taken here. I wish I knew more but too early to say.

As we left Paul, it just made me reflect a little bit on the state of higher education. You know we’ve got Governor’s State that’s going to a full four years. We’ve got a number of community colleges that are working toward a full four years. We have high school graduates that are flat, at best, over the next decade. And we have declining enrollments in community colleges. And you have declining enrollments in most of the four-year schools in the state. And we’re the second largest exporter of students to schools out-of-state after New Jersey. This doesn’t sound like an equilibrium environment to me. It feels like things are in play right now and people are kind of saying it doesn’t feel quite right. There needs to be some rethinking of the structure of higher education and the delivery models. So, as we have a new governor who may be interested in doing new things, let’s think about that. Are there ways for us to better serve our students to give them great educations, to do it in a cost effective way, to line that up with the needs of employers outside like the PLUS is trying to do with a great undergraduate experience and Student Affairs is trying to do in the co-curricular world? Are there things that we can do to kind of reshape everything? So it’s a dynamic environment right now and it may seem troubling but it’s also one of those times where stuff’s in play. So let’s think about that. What is possible going forward? Are there creative things we can do to distinguish ourselves and help our students and the state be more successful? And I’d also say on the research side as well, what is our scholarship doing to help us move forward? The DMDII, the advanced manufacturing grant that was just let, that our College of Engineering is hooking up with and maybe some of the other colleges as well. What can we be doing to help the state move forward? It’s an interesting time.
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 – William Pitney and Greg Waas – no report

G. Academic Policy Committee – Virginia Naples, Chair – no report

H. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – report – Page 47

D. Baker: Ibrahim, you’re up, I guess, next with the Resource, Space and Budget Committee.

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Thank you. The Committee of the Resources, Space and Budget met on October 17 and first item was the announcement that we are going to meet with the president and provost on December 1 from 1 to 2 p.m. to ask some questions about the budget. The second issue we discussed was the annual statement of the budget and priorities. And we did distribute the previous one and I asked the committee for their opinion on how to shape the next report. And since we are going to have a workshop with Nancy, we felt that we should wait until we have this workshop. The workshop will be November 19. Next we talked about the questionnaire we would like to send to the chairs and the deans and the directors. The committee felt that let’s wait until we have this workshop with Nancy and understand the budget and how the budget is formed and how the revenue are – what are the types of revenues and the cost and so on and so forth. So we postponed this until we have this workshop.

Next I talked about the Academic Impression conference that the provost talked about. At the beginning the committee was a little bit apprehensive and uncomfortable, but when I started to talk about what we did learn and answer their questions, they became somewhat more positive and they are eager to participate in the process. So this was something very positive I got from the committee.

Then we talked about the workshop and Nancy was there on the phone. Nancy gave us some idea of how the budget – the ways that the budget is done at NIU. It is changing to a new model where they would like to know, or they would like to be able to track, every penny, how it was generated and how it was spent. And this model has not been finished yet. Maybe it will – it’s half finished. And she’s going to talk with us about this model. And the people were very positive about this because they would like to know how things are being done. We talked to Nancy and we asked her to give us, for example, summary of revenues and the expenditure, models of other university how they do the budgets, and the possibility of any type of metrics that can be used to measure progress. Nancy was willing to do that and we are looking forward to meet here on the 19.
D. Baker: Any questions for Ibrahim? Ibrahim, I appreciate the committee’s work on this. I think this is the kind of positive dialog we need to have. We all want us to spend the money on the important stuff and move us forward. And we need an open process. And we need everybody involved in helping shape that process whether it be the annual budget process or the prioritization process we’re going through. So, thank you and the committee for you good work on this. I appreciate it.

I. Rules and Governance Committee – Jana Brubaker, Chair – no report

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

K. Student Association – Joe Frascello, President – report

D. Baker: All right, Joe, you’re up next with the Student Association.

J. Frascello: Hi. So we have a few items for you today. The first one I’d like to share with you is a brief letter that I wrote to representatives from the student center regarding costs for students to have their organizations’ events held at the student center. It is clear that NIU is dealing with problems with student enrollment and retention. I believe that prospective students are more likely to enroll if they see how engaged and active our student population is today. Additionally, students who are more involved on campus are more likely to stay and, hopefully, graduate. But how do we get our current students more engaged? How do we show prospective students that NIU is the right choice? It appears that strong student organizations with many active members are attractive to both current and prospective students alike. Although we may have many student organizations on campus, only a few of them are thriving. I believe this is because the organizations are not able to utilize their campus in an effective way to attract new members and keep their current membership involved. It is also because many student organizations are prevented from hosting events on campus, particularly the Holmes Student Center, because the food costs are too expensive for them to afford. This semester alone, I’ve allocated $12,000 to student groups most of which is going towards food costs to host organizational events. I’d like to remind you that we are only in the second quarter of the academic year. It does not seem like the most appropriate way to be using student funds. It is my hope that we can find a way to make events more affordable for student organizations to host so they can thrive. This will not only allow our students to be fed, but it will also improve the overall health of our university’s future.

The second item I would like to share with you is a brief update of the “It’s on Us” campaign that Raquel Chavez, vice president, and I have been working on lately. On Monday we hosted the round table discussion as Neptune Central that went very, very well. We had representatives from all over the university, we had students, we had faculty and staff; we had the police department…

D. Baker: And, Joe, some people might not know about that campaign. Could you do a thumbnail on it?

J. Frascello: Sure. Let’s see here I actually have it written down here. So the “It’s on Us” campaign was actually brought to our attention by the NCLC which is a part of the, it’s actually a part of Barak Obama and Joe Biden’s initiatives to make college campuses across our country
safe. The campaign’s goals are to recognize that non-consensual sex is sexual assault; to identify situations in which sexual assault may occur; to intervene in situations where consent has not or cannot be given; and to create an environment in which sexual assault is unacceptable and survivors are supported. So this is something that Raquel Chavez and I have been working on in conjunction with many different departments and students around campus. We’ve had a lot of support so far. We look forward to keeping that going. Raquel, did you want to share a little bit about that? If not it’s all right. Okay I guess I covered it. So the week of action is November 17 through the 21, I believe it’s through the 21. That Monday is November 18 and we’ll be having a week-long week of action which is several events, one on each day focusing on sexual assault prevention and what to do in those situations. For example, one of those days we’re going to have a self defense instructor be available for students to participate in that seminar. We’ll also have the police department, athletics, Greeks, whoever wants to participate in their own events, whether that be a seminar or lecture or whatever, or whether it be something a little more creative such as a – if we look at another college campus, Rachel, I forget which campus it was that had the mattress, do you remember? Columbia, they did an interesting campaign where one student actually carried around a mattress with writing on it and the whole idea was to get attention to the subject of sexual assault. If we can get creative about this, I think we can really reach a large amount of students and then get some discourse going about this situation that’s affecting, not only our campus, but around the country. I’m sorry did you have something?

D. Baker: No, go ahead. I’ll comment when you’re done.

J. Frascello: Okay, and the third item that I had, I actually will yield to Ben Donovan who is our director of governmental affairs and he’s going to be talking about his involvement.

B. Donovan: Apparently, I’m not quite as tall as who this mic was made for. So I’m the director of governmental affairs and one of my responsibilities is maintaining relationships with the DeKalb city government. And for those of you who are unaware, there was a little bit of a snafu at the City Council last week. The city and county of DeKalb right now are in the process of applying for the State of Illinois Enterprise Zone. And one possible area that would have been included in the application was the John Street area. And the Enterprise Zone, in short, is just an area that would be designated by the state for business and commercial development. It would come along with a whole bunch of benefits to try to encourage businesses to come to the area. And the John Street corridor was under consideration. It was eventually removed after several residents voiced outrage, but one particular part that came up was consideration of dredging the east lagoon to make the Kishwaukee River not flood the John Street area to make it more attractive to businesses. And we just wanted to state publically here at University Council that the Student Association is not necessarily opposed to alteration of the lagoon, but any Student Association support of alteration would require a very compelling argument. Furthermore, we believe that, if any alteration occurs, it much not compromise the integrity and intent of the lagoon. It’s where the recycled boat race is held for homecoming. Many alumni get married on the lagoon and it has a huge value to the greater DeKalb community as well, and we believe this should be taken into account if any alteration is considered.

J. Frascello: Thank you and we yield and we’ll take any questions.

D. Baker: Great, any questions for them? Just a couple comments from my side and then we’ll see if there is any more. On the food services in this building and the costs, part of what Joe is
talking about is they’re required to buy from Holmes catering, so there’s some concern about that. And John Cheney, the new facilities director, is smiling at you from the back row and it does report to him at this time and you may want to speak to Kelly too. I see Kelly here and I bet she’d be happy to maybe get a triangle going with you three together and talk about those kinds of issues. So go for it and see what’s possible.

On the violence against women issues, Raquel sat on that committee this summer. Thank you for serving on it. There’s a great report coming out of that and I like the way these are kind of coming together, similar themes and the students are picking up the communications on your part of it. This week watching some of your communications on e-mail, I did ask interim vice president for marketing and communications, Harlan Teller, to work with you all and see if there is any way to magnify your voice and get it out even further. If he hasn’t been in touch, feel free to be in touch with him and see what we can do on that. And then we’ll try and carry that on as we take the work of the committee out to the university and the broader community.

And the lagoon I agree with. Any other questions or comments? Okay, great thanks.

L. Operating Staff Council – Jay Monteiro, President – report – Pages 48-49

D. Baker: Operating Staff Council, Jay.

J. Monteiro: Good afternoon. Our report is in your packet but I wanted to touch base on a couple things. Operating Staff Council has had a paper newsletter that has been distributed to all operating staff council members and administrators on campus and we’ve been doing that for probably 30-plus years. And beginning in February we’re going to edge a little closer to the 21st Century and we’re going to be sending electronic newsletters out. And, along with that, there will also be an electronic link that will be listed in the Monday morning NIU official announcements. There will still be some paper copies distributed and those would be to people in areas that don’t have access to computers on a regular basis. And that would be in our housing and dining areas, building services, our trades people in materials management. And then we also have an off-campus list that we do mail to.

The other thing I wanted to point out was at our last meeting Matthew Parks and Sabrina Hammond from ITS attended our meeting and they presented a proposal of the new cellar service stipend policy. And that policy eliminates assigned NIU cell phones and would move to a three-tier monthly stipend that would be approved at the division or manager level and that stipend would appear on employee’s paychecks and would become taxable income. That’s my report.

D. Baker: Great. Any questions for Jay?

M. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczer, President – report – Page 50

D. Baker: In that case let’s move on to Deb with Supportive and Professional Staff Council.

D. Haliczer: Okay, Deborah Haliczer, SPS Council. Our written report is in your packet but I wanted to highlight a couple of things. If you’ve been listening to me for the last year or so we’ve been talking a good deal about morale in every category of employees on campus as well
as our students. And what I want to encourage you to do is to consider nominating people for the awards that are going out. We had a solicitation for faculty awards that Provost Freeman sent out. Think about nominating your colleagues. The SPS deadline for not just our four presidential awards but five additional awards is December 1. If you have not gotten that solicitation or if you didn’t see it in NIU Today, e-mail me and I’ll make sure you get that because in all of our discussions which SPS Council has been having and all the other councils and in Faculty Senate is about morale and morale issues which reflect a lot of different concerns but one of them is recognition for the work that we do. One way of giving recognition is to nominate people for an award. Nominate women students for the Outstanding Women Student solicitation which will come out in December. January the operating staff awards will be requested. So think about it. I know that it’s a hard thing to do when we’re all as busy as we are. Think about it. Nominate someone for these awards.

The next one that I wanted to mention, of course, is the other hat that I wear is ethics trainings deadline is November 12, 5 p.m. Please don’t wait until November 12 to do it because, if you are one of the November 12 people, you know that that’s the day that five students will come in in the last hour when you thought you’d do ethics training. You know that the day your car will break, your computer will go out, or as has happened several times, the HR website has gone out so you can’t get into the training. Please do it sooner and don’t wait until November 12. Thank you.

D. Baker: Any comments for Deb?

D. Haliczer: We’re doing very well. We’re at 75 percent already.

D. Baker: That’s great. That’s good news. Moving on the University Benefits Committee, there is a written report. It’s written only. There is no verbal report. Any comments on that one?

N. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, FS Liaison to UBC – report – Page 51

O. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Mary Beth Henning, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Committee on Multicultural Curriculum Transformation – Proposed revisions to committee composition, NIU Bylaws Article 15.9.1 – SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM – Page 52

D. Baker: Okay, seeing none, Unfinished Business. I’m going to turn it over to Bill for his two pieces here.

W. Pitney: So we had a first reading at our last meeting for these two pieces that are represented on pages 52 and 53 of your packet. So this is our second reading and I need to start by accepting a motion to approve the changes as identified on page 52.

Unidentified: So moved.

W. Pitney: I heard a motion. Can I have a second?
Unidentified: Second.

W. Pitney: Thank you. So in terms of discussion, there’s been some structural changes. We now have a vice provost for faculty affairs. In the past, our director of faculty development and instructional design had participated on the Committee for Multicultural Curriculum Transformation and it was suggest that we just make this change to remove the director of faculty development but add in vice provost for faculty affairs. So it’s a change to the composition to this particular committee. Any questions, comments or concerns? Seeing none, we need to vote on this. So you’ll need to use your clickers, please. For voting on this item in A of Unfinished Business, A on the clicker would be your vote to approve the motion; B on the clicker would be a vote against the motion; and C would be to abstain. So A is approve, B is reject, C is abstain. Pat, are we ready? Please vote now. And we’re ready to close the vote. Everybody all set? So we’ll close the vote.

Yes – 37
No – 2
Abstain – 1

D. Baker: Congratulations.

W. Pitney: Well, maybe.

D. Baker: Did we need more people?

W. Pitney: We needed 39 votes to pass.

D. Baker: Now you tell us.

W. Pitney: Yeah, yeah, so. So is that the correct interpretation, Ferald? Okay. We were two short. So the motion does not pass.

B. University Assessment Panel – Proposed revisions to committee composition, NIU Bylaws Article 15.8.1 – SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM – Page 53

W. Pitney: I’m wondering if we should postpone the vote on B. Move to table.

D. Baker: Is it table or postpone?

W. Pitney: Postpone.

D. Baker: Table, it doesn’t come off.

W. Pitney: So perhaps we. Could I have a motion to postpone? Thank you. Rachel second. All in favor to postpone signify by saying aye. We are postponing it to the next meeting. Any other comments, questions? All in favor to postpone signify by saying aye.
Members: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed, any abstentions? Okay, thank you.

D. Baker: That was very deft of you. All right thanks. Let’s all bring our friends to the next meeting.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

D. Baker: Any new business?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: Any, what’s that? Is there a question? We just postponed the second action item. Any comments or questions from the floor?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Annual Report, Athletic Board
B. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
C. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
D. Minutes, Athletic Board
E. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
F. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
G. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
H. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
J. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
K. Minutes, General Education Committee
L. Minutes, Honors Committee
M. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
N. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
O. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
P. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
Q. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Hearing none, I’m willing to entertain a motion to adjourn.

Unidentified: So moved.

D. Baker: Second. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.