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I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Hello. Good afternoon. I’ll call the meeting to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: The first order is the adoption of the agenda. Are there any changes or deletions from the agenda? Hearing none, shall we vote? All in favor please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Alright we have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2014 MEETING

D. Baker: Next, approval of the minutes from the November 5 meeting. Are there any edits to that? Hearing none, all in favor please say aye.

Members: Aye.


IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. Use of Microphones – William Pitney

**D. Baker:** President’s Announcements. The first one will be from Dr. Pitney.

**W. Pitney:** I just want to alert you to some text at the bottom of your sign-in sheets. In trying to get the minutes together for the meeting, and also so everybody can hear because sometimes the HVAC is a little, it makes is a little bit difficult to hear in the back, if you could please use the microphones. And before you speak, just state your name so everybody knows who you are and where you’re from and those sorts of things. It would be appreciated. Thank you.

**D. Baker:** All right, great. Thank you.

B. Ombudsperson Annual Report per Bylaws, Article 20.1 and presentation – Sarah Klaper – Pages 4-13

**D. Baker:** Next we’ve got the ombuds annual report per the bylaws. And I want to thank Mark Rosenbaum and the crew that did that. We reviewed Sarah last year and we’re reviewing her again under Article 20.1. I think the committee did an excellent job and good feedback there. Any comments on that? Sarah and I were joking it’s kind of weird to have your personnel file thrown in front of a large group now three times in one year. The good news is they all came out the same way so that’s a good thing. Sarah, anything you want to say?

**S. Klaper:** I have a little presentation about my office. Okay I know you have a packed agenda so I’ll try to be very quick. First thing to note is the tag line for my office – that we are helping you navigate living, learning and working here at NIU. And that’s to help you note that we work in our office with faculty, staff, students, administrators. (I’m trying to get out of the way of the screen.) We work with everybody on campus: faculty, staff, students, administrators, alumni, families, community members, it doesn’t really matter. Anybody associated with the campus we work with.

There are four main criteria and characteristics of this office, first of all that we are confidential. We are a confidential resource on campus for everyone. The only exceptions to confidentially from my office are that if it is something involving child abuse or if there’s an imminent physical threat to the person who’s coming to see me or somebody else. Then, of course, those things are not confidential. Everything else is confidential. Second thing is that we are a neutral office. Because I work with everybody on campus, I can’t take anybody’s side. I can listen, offer people all of their options on how to deal with the situation both on-campus or off-campus, and then I can offer support when they are going through a process – help them through a process so they know what’s going to happen. But I just can’t be their voice in their process. I can’t represent, I can’t be your attorney, I can’t represent you. But if there is somebody else on campus who could represent you and work with you in another capacity that’s not neutral, I’m happy to pass you off to that person or make sure you know that person exists, like Paul Stoddard, or the faculty and SPS personnel advisor.

Sometimes I get questions about: Well you’re really not neutral because you have an opinion. Well, of course, I have an opinion. I have an opinion on a lot of things. But know that I’m not allowed to advocate for an individual. However, if that individual concern really rises to the level of a policy issues, I am allowed to advocate for fair and equitably administered processes and so
I do that. And so sometimes when I see that one person has come to see me on an issue that’s really a policy issue or multiple people have come to see me on the same issue, I will go to the decision maker on that issue and talk to that person about his overarching policy concern. And they might say: Well I know who came to see you, I know who it is. Well I do my best to make sure that whatever I’m saying maintains confidentiality and frequently who they think came to see isn’t really the person who came to see me. And it might be somebody completely on the other side of campus who came to see me about this issue, but I’m there on a policy level not on that individual person’s concern. How is this going to affect you as a department? I’m there to collaborate and help alter the policy, fill a hole in a policy, help somebody see how maybe this could be applied in a different way that would be more effective and prevent conflict or eliminate or reduce the conflict that’s currently happening.

I’m also informal so if you need to file a complaint against the university, my office is not the place to file a complaint. But I will help you get to the right office so you can file a complaint. I’m not authorized to do anything with anyone’s complaints except for help them advocate for themselves. Empower people to work on their own issues and to work with decision makers on policy issues. However, sometimes people come to see me and they’ll say: You know, I just want somebody on campus to know so that you can do something about this, but I don’t have authority over anybody else’s office on campus. So I’m not allowed to do that and so I’m an informal office.

And I’m independent. I report to the president. I get evaluated by University Council so I don’t belong to a department or division to have a bias one way or the other toward or against anyone on campus.

All right so for this year, the numbers, complex cases are cases that we consider to be somebody who had to come in and actually have an appointment with me or with my graduate assistants. So that’s people who don’t need to just call the office and quick answer, it’s something that takes a little bit more time. I have also helped with policy development in several different areas and department and divisions across campus as well as with University Council and Faculty Senate. And then simple referrals are the ones that are just the quick calls or I’m passing somebody and they ask me a quick question. The Northern Star noted this morning that I noted in my report that I undercount and I walk across campus and people stop and talk to me or I’m at an event and I will have five people come up to me and talk to me and then frequently I forget to go back to my office and document that I talked to these people about these issues. And so I’m working really hard to better document those types of cases, but yeah, so I’m trying really hard on that. But I do note that the ones that I did document that our numbers increased by 145 visits or people from last year. The majority of people who come to my office are students, overwhelmingly, and undergraduates tend to see my graduate assistants and then graduate students, faculty and staff usually see me. The next highest level, of course, is operating staff and then faculty and then SPS.

So I always give trends and comments at the end of my annual report. And last year I started that section with the morale of campus and I started it with this quote. And I started it again with this quote this year because it applies again. Because the past two years have been years of flux for this campus. We’ve been in a lot of transition. Last year we started off with a lot of optimism. We had a new administration and a lot of new things were happening on campus. And a lot of change has happened in the past year and a lot of that has been really great change. However,
every time there’s change, there’s also pain or perceived pain. And so there’s been some perceptions and feelings of mistrust and fear that comes with change. Some of the change has occurred without a level of communication that a lot of people on campus have wanted or needed, or they weren’t allowed to have that information for whatever reason it was really a private issue. And so that’s caused some feelings of mistrust or fear. And, when you don’t know what’s about to happen, that’s the big thing that causes fear too. You don’t know what’s about to happen and we are continuing through change with the prioritization programming and that’s causing fear on campus of what’s going to happen with my job, my program, my department. We’ve also had a bunch of positive things as far as input and in the community with Bold Futures and the re-envisioning and I’ll get to communication about those things in a second.

All right so for students, the issues that came to our office tended to focus on academic status issues, people being allowed to enroll in programs or classes and then also being dismissed, grades, but then also interactions with faculty and staff. And what became very clear was how key interactions with faculty and staff are to student success. Because frequently it was just something somebody said off-handedly or inadvertently made a comment that they didn’t realize the effect that they were having; or just being crabby or grumpy or something that really dramatically affected the students who came to see me. But balancing that the university has focused in the past significantly on collegiality, more transparency, and students having a voice in process, and, namely, with the student grievance process, but also students being involved on more committees and in decision making more on campus and that’s been a positive.

For faculty and staff, how we treat each other is again one of the main concerns: supervisors lacking some supervisory skills, good communication skills. Communication seems to be at the heart of pretty much every issue that walks in my office. A miscommunication, somebody who feels like they are right and so that’s all that matters. Or I have the power to do it and so, therefore, I am and I don’t really care what any of the rest of you have to say. Or people who were colleagues and then one person got promoted; neither person knows how to deal with the other anymore. How does the person in the authority position deal with the person who’s been their best friend for 30 years? And how does that person who’s been used to talking to their supervisor now anyway they want to and how do they prevent themselves from being insubordinate at this point? Also communication or expectations, we’ve had issues dealing with, a lot of issues dealing with, expectations on campus have changed in the past year and a half or so and the culture has changed, especially in many particular departments and divisions on campus. But the expectations have not necessarily been communicated to everyone. And then what I’ve seen a lot of is that people are getting disciplined for not meeting expectations that they didn’t know they had to meet, so working on those issues. So balancing that with there has been some increased transparency, especially in budgeting and in decision making with more people being involved in many hiring decisions. There’s been an expansion of existing supervisor training and looking to that to grow even more. So increased communication both up at the cabinet level and above in the deans and also all the way down to whatever you would consider to be the lowest level of employee in your department or division. That needs to happen more because a lot of the ill will that I hear about and it’s reported to me is because people feel like all the decisions are being made up here and we never hear about it. And up here might just be at the director of my office but I never hear about it until it’s too late or I didn’t have any input. So having increased communication all the way up and down and when I mentioned that with Bold Futures and all of that increased communication with that as well as to what folks who are the average folks working and going to school here can do, but also what the administration
is doing increasing that level of communication. And then continued expansion of training and profession growth opportunities because I maintain that we will not need so much in the avenue of compliance if we have more training so that people know what is expected of them and won’t make those mistakes that cause them to have to go the compliance route. I think that’s it. Does anybody have any questions? Thank you.

**D. Baker:** Thank you, Sarah.

**C.** UNIV 101/102 & PLUS update – Anne Birberick and Michael Kolb

**D. Baker:** Next we have a presentation on University 101/102 and a PLUS update from Anne Birberick and Michael Kolb. You guys want to take it away?

**M. Kolb:** Hi, good afternoon, Michael Kolb from the provost’s office and I would like to give you a brief update a little bit in regards to where the PLUS Task Force is and the implementation of the various components of the PLUS program. The PLUS Task Force finished its report about two weeks ago. It’s now in the hands of the provost, it will be made public by the end of the week.

We have a series of things that now the vice provost’s office is doing. We’ve parsed out (hopefully you can see this fairly well) we’ve parsed out the various PLUS components and began to submit those to the various curricular committees which are listed up there. So we have the components on the left, we have the CUC, the GEC and APASC are all there. They are the various curricular committees that are overseeing all the various parts. And we anticipate a number of these components will reach the UC. The most important, I’ll give you an update in terms of the gen ed catalog language that’s been vetted and reviewed by the GEC, both in terms of the components of the new general education program as well as the catalog language. It was approved earlier this month. It’s going to the UCC tomorrow and we anticipate that language to be to the UCC in its January meeting on the 28th.

Also the other components that we see also those will be implemented for the fall of 2015. That’s the catalog language for general education. We have a couple components that will go in 2015. The rest will be going in to fall of 2016. We have the UNIV 101 and 201 which is also going through various committees and will reach the UC we anticipate in February during the February meeting again for implementation for fall of 2015. And we’ve got a couple of other, the key requirements, most in particular the pathways focus and minor which will be developed this spring and brought to the UC in the springtime and that will have to go up to the Board of Trustees for approval. We have the University 301 course which is in the report as well which is the career success course that will work its way through committee as well and then arrive here sometime, we think, in the fall as well as the writing infused courses. Those will all be up to the UC, we think, by early fall of next year all for implementation in fall 2016. So as I said all the various components are parsed out and working their way through the various committees and some of those, like I say, most of them the important ones will arrive here for approval.

The GEC has also been working in regards to pathway development. The pathways, themselves, will be implemented in the fall of 2015. This is the approximate timeline. There will be a call next week for various pathways for any group of faculty that wish to propose pathways. There will be an application that will be on the website which will be [www.niu/plus](http://www.niu/plus) and that call will
go out. We anticipate the proposal due date for these pathways will be sometime in mid-February to the GEC who will then review those and then they’ll have some money via the provost’s office for pathway development. So developing of new courses as well as reconfiguring perhaps existing courses. That will occur in spring and summer 2015 and then the final pathway application will go in front of the GEC those are due in early September. Again this is all anticipated schedule. And then the pathways will then work their way through the curricular process both through the CUC individual courses and new courses or modified courses as well as the GEC which must approve all the pathways. And then the final implementation for students will be the fall of 2016. So that’s just my brief update.

A. Birberick: So, Anne Birberick, Office of the Provost. One of the pieces that emerged from PLUS or is included in the PLUS report is looking at UNIV 101 and 201. The changes to UNIV 101 and 201 not only reflect the recommendations of the PLUS, but they also dovetail with other points of feedback. This course, which is a freshman one-credit kind of seminar/introduction to the college experience course, emerged again and again in the bold futures workshops as very important to student success. It emerged also in the various leadership workshops and symposia that took place. It emerged when PLUS was going out on the road, the PLUS Task Force was, and soliciting feedback. Everyone who kind of provided feedback recognized the importance of this course for student success and how it helped students prepare for the college experience. And that was great because it dovetailed very much with the national perspective on courses such as these, even if they’re not called UNIV. Kuh, George Kuh, has developed ten high impact practices or HIPS, and seminars such as these are categorized as one of those high impact practices as a HIP. There’s a lot of national data – and we also have some local institutional data – that if students participate in courses such as these, they have a greater likelihood for success. So we’ve done some revision of how the course itself is structured. We benefited this current fall semester by having four pilot sections of UNIV 101 taught by four presidential teaching professors. Actually one of them is facing your right now and they provided excellent feedback and brought their teaching expertise into the classroom. And we’ll be using what they had to say about teaching the course as we think about revisions to the content and shaping the focus of the course. The other thing that emerged through university-wide discussions about UNIV 101 and 201 is making it a requirement. And we’re working on language for that and we’ve started to talk to different groups about it. So it’s been shared with curricular deans; it’s been shared with the advising deans; it’s been shared with other groups as well. And so if you remember Michael’s chart, that would be one of the PLUS initiatives that would come before University Council in February for your comment. So this is just an update to let you know what’s going on with that piece of the PLUS program. Thank you.

D. Baker: Any questions?

P. Vohra: This is Promod Vohra and I have a comment. Some of the colleges have their own programs similar to UNIV 101. In the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, we have a course: Introduction to Engineering, UEET 101, which serves the same purpose as UNIV 101. So when you consider revamping the UNIV 101, you should also include equivalent courses offered by colleges, which are similar in content to UNIV 101.

A. Birberick: Dean Vorha, yes, that’s been part of the conversation that’s taken place and your college did enter into that conversation. And so, as we have been drafting and refining catalog language, we do have language in there about courses that are considered equivalents. And so
there will have to be some changes made to the engineering course to bring it a little bit more in alignment, but we do realize that certain colleges or even certain departments already have courses very similar to UNIV in play and so we’re taking into consideration.

P. Vohra: Thank you.

B. Donovan: The implementation of UNIV 101 and 201 is a requirement. Would that be applied retroactively to all students?

A. Birberick: No, when we make catalog changes, we don’t apply them retroactively. That would be burdensome to the student. And so what it would be is students who use the 2015 catalog going forward would be held to that requirement.

B. Donovan: Wonderful, thank you.

D. Baker: Any others? Well thanks for this continued work. I know you guys have put a lot of time into this. I think this is a major shift. I know you’re getting some national attention for this work at various conferences around the country. So thanks for showing the flag and doing the right thing for our students.

D. Baker: Okay, I have a few announcements too. I spent yesterday in Springfield. It was an interesting day. What I can tell you is there is a great deal of uncertainty. And Sarah mentioned earlier that uncertainty breeds concern. I guess there’s concern then. Even the old timers don’t know, in Springfield, don’t know exactly what’s going to happen. We have a Republican governor for the first time in some time and two veto-proof houses. And people are not sure what that foretells. There will be the veto session this week. I understand it may even end a day early. The rumor yesterday was that they were going to pass a minimum wage bill that would come into effect on July 1. Governor Quinn would sign that before leaving office and that would be phased in over a two-year period. That being based on the positive referendum in the last election. That will have an impact on us. When it gets to $10 an hour, if that’s passed, that will be about a $3 million increase if we employ the same number of people. So a $3 million increase to our budget responsibility. So we’ll have to figure out how to deal with that.

People are not sure what’s going to happen with the income tax. As you know, it runs out at the end of this calendar year, the increase in the income tax. The rumors are that that is going to run out and then the legislators will look to the governor and his proposed budget on a way to deal with that either with revenues or cuts, and nobody knows what’s going to happen there. We just don’t know and you hear scary things and you hear very encouraging things. And so I guess what I would say at this point is you’re going to hear a lot of stuff and there’s going to be a lot of political theater for the next few months. One day you may see something that you go: Oh my gosh. And then the next day you go: All right it looks like it’s going the right direction. So just brace yourself for that. We are in uncharted territory here. We don’t know how the dance steps are going to go, but there are going to be a lot of back-and-forth dance steps.

So we’ve got some challenges in front of us. We are doing some contingency planning in our budgeting to see if we need to do something to address budget issues if there’s any kind of shortfall we have to deal then we’re looking at scenarios right now. So I wish I had more detailed information to give you on that. Bill asked me if I heard anything encouraging yesterday and I
At the end of a long day, and the day included, well I should tell you how the day started. The presidents and chancellors met in the morning as we do before every Board of Higher Education meeting. And the board met in the afternoon. So we met in the morning. We talked about our legislative agenda and how higher education, the four-years in the state, should work together. What are our common goals around capital and operating budgets? What can we do to maintain the quality of our teaching, research, and outreach in the state? There was a lot of common ground and people do want to work together and our legislative representatives were in the room with us. So I think we’re on the same page there. We’re pulling together, we want to do the right thing.

Then in the afternoon the board met and they had a panel including Ed Maloney who is one of our lobbyists and who is the former chair of the Senate Higher Ed committee. And that panel talked about where they think the legislature is going and what higher ed can do to make its case with everybody else at the table and identify common ground and go tell your stories. And students they like hearing from you, legislators like hearing from you. We’ll try and work you into all of that during the course of the year.

The most positive thing I heard during the day was after those meetings there was a reception held and the reception was at the Sangamo Club. And Representative Pritchard was one of the key people there and he tried to develop a higher education caucus. So he invited legislators and representatives from higher education and many came. I was impressed by how many legislators came. They had an opportunity to have individual conversations with a variety of higher education leaders from all the four-year publics in the state. I think it was good educational session and it was kind of a good session to get everybody on the same page about what we’re up against here. I’m told that’s the first time a caucus like that had come together and they’re going to try and build a strong caucus to be supportive of higher education in the coming session. So I guess that’s the good news. I saw an increasing interest in higher education. But we’ve got a long road in front of us. Any questions about any of that?

Okay, tomorrow our Board of Trustees meets here and one of the key items on the board agenda is setting tuition for the coming year. In the current model that’s being proposed and that was read at the committee meetings a month ago, there’s a slight increase in tuition and a much larger decrease in room and board rates, mostly board, I guess, rates. And if you had had the most expensive board plan in the coming year, your rates will go down by $570 or so. Is that about right? I think that’s what it is. So a significant decrease in your overall bill. So we’re working hard to try and keep those costs down. It’s hard in this environment and we’re going to have to continue to be very aggressive with that. But I think we’re at that point where it’s difficult for our students to pay a much higher tuition even though we can certainly use the revenue to run the institution to provide compensation for you. But I think we’ve got to look at our enrollment, increasing our enrollment, to do that not increasing our tuition. So we’re going to work hard on that.

And in terms of enrollment, it looks like the early returns on the fall confirmed students are kind of evenish right now. We’re not ahead. Some of that may be because we had some speed bumps in the processing of student applications. We got behind for a few reasons. We’re catching up to that now. But, I would also want to encourage all of our faculty and staff to work on recruitment and retention right now. Both are crucially important to us. They are always important to our mission. They are important to us helping students be successful and get ready for their lives and
their careers and they are important to us fiscally. I just want to encourage all of you to be working on that.

December 11, next week, there’s another leadership retreat. That will be the third one this academic year with about 130 administrators from department chairs kind of on up from across all the areas of the institution. Some of you will be attending that. We’re going to look at our strategic planning framework and look at some of the work to date on recruitment and retention activities. So I’m excited by that. We’ve been working on those issues. This will be the third one and I think we’re making some progress. We’ll come back to you with that draft strategic framework for this group to chew on for a while and see how it can be applied. It’s essentially the triangle framework linking our academics and students with the outside world and being supported by all the supportive services inside the institution and really making that a rich relationship. Any questions on any of those pieces?

As we link out in that triangle to the outside world, we often talk about building community and building community right here in our own home town. I had the opportunity to meet with the DeKalb library director recently, Dee. And as you know, they are working on an addition to the local public library – a $30 million addition which is quite an effort for this community. If you haven’t ever been in the local library, it’s an amazing piece of architecture, kind of art deco from the 30’s. It’s just a gem. But it’s way too small for what we need and they’ve got, I think, about $28.5 million of the $30 million that they need. So they’re trying to get that last million and a half. I told Dee I would mention to you and others that they are still looking for donors. So if anybody has a $1.5 million, operators are waiting. They might even put a plaque on the wall for you. But it is an amazing resource. Many of our students go there as a matter of fact. I know a number of our elementary education students use the children’s library resources there on a regular basis. Many of you take your kids there and take yourselves there. There are going to be great meeting spaces and it’s going to be a real gem for the whole university and the whole community. So anyway I just wanted to bring that to your attention if you have interest in it you might look it up.

We had giving day this week and I want to thank all of you who did that and thank Provost Freeman and her husband for the matching gift that they made, a sizeable matching gift. And I think that’s really a noble gesture and I thank her for that. She’s not here today. She’s at a search committee meeting, both the vice president for advancement and the vice president for administration and finance are having the airport interviews today. So their first round of interviews with that first cut. I’m told both pools are very good and that we will have those candidates on campus, the finalist candidates, before the end of this semester, so in the next two weeks. We’ll let you know when those are. We got to see how many candidates and what their time schedules are so we know the timing to bring them in. But I would encourage all of you to attend the public forum that’s appropriate for you to attend and give us your feedback on those folks. So I’m really excited by those opportunities.

Later tonight I fly to Washington D.C. There’s a higher education summit on innovations in higher education and trying to increase access and success for students. That will be held, well it was going to be held in the White House, it’s gotten a little bit big now. There will be 100 schools in attendance so they’re going to move it across the street. It will be interesting to see all the innovations from around the country. The one that we’ve been invited to talk about is on our P-20 partnership. So Marilyn Bellert and Laurie Elish-Piper have been leading an effort that
combines local school districts, community colleges, us, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, a number of advocacy groups, including business groups and public sector groups. We’re trying to see how all those pieces fit together in the pipeline, in a P-20 pipeline, to increase student success all the way across the pipeline and at the various junctions. And we have five working groups in that. We’re about a half a year into that work and I’m very excited about it. One of the innovations is we’re taking a lot of the things that we know work well, but we’re trying to do it in a coordinated fashion in that pipeline in a big enough region to be meaningful, but a small enough region where you can get your arms around it and kind of manage it. So you know the players in the community colleges, you can articulate between them and the K-12 system and us and you can get local businesses that are attached and local governments that are attached, etc. into the system and be supportive. So I’m really proud of the work that Marilyn and Laurie have put together and I’m proud that we’ve been selected to talk about it tomorrow. So kudos to those two and all the team members, we’ve got about 40 people working on this.

I think that’s it. Do you have anything else, Bill? Oh yeah. Dan’s been staring at you. Here’s Dan. Dan was named the Illinois Professor of the Year. How about that? So I wanted to thank Murali who got started on this and Doris Macdonald and Melanie Magara for writing this up. Kudos to you. Fantastic job. Anything you want to say? Doris?

D. Macdonald: It was a really easy job to write great things about Dan. How’s that?

D. Baker: Yeah, you know, we’ve got so many outstanding faculty and, when I got here last year, I asked who our last nominees were. And we said oh we haven’t nominated anybody. So thank you for your hard work pulling that together. Outstanding, we’ve gotten a lot of press. This was in the Chronicle of Higher Education and various local media. So that’s pretty cool to crow about it. Would that be fun to have a 101 class from him? Wow. That sets us apart having that quality of faculty and that quality of faculty working with our freshmen. Thanks to him and a great example of how great researchers can be the greatest teachers in the university and inspire people. All right, thanks. And if anybody wants a copy of this we’ll make you a copy and you can put it up wherever you want to put it up. Not on your dart board.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Page 14

D. Baker: All right, Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees, the FAC to the IBHE, Sonya Armstrong.

S. Armstrong: Quick report today. Mostly our meeting week before last at Oakton Community College was information items and presentations so I’ll just direct you there. I tried to include hyperlinks so that you can follow up if you have interest in the particular items. The one I guess action item that we’re working on was in the public university caucus. We’re creating two resolutions, one on faculty governance, one on academic freedom. We meet next Friday in Springfield with the IBHE staff and we will finalize those resolutions at that time. So I’ll be able to share those with you in January. I can answer any questions, but otherwise I think this is mostly informational.
D. Baker: Anybody? All right thanks Sonya.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and William Pitney – report – Page 15

D. Baker: Bill’s next with the BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee.

W. Pitney: Just a couple of brief things that were approved by the committee and will go before the full board tomorrow. The first is that the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee for the Board of Trustees approved our change in degree designation for the Ed.D. in Counselor Education and Supervision actually from an Ed.D. to a Ph.D. And the other item they approved was the Doctor of Nursing Practice. Those are two things we can be excited about.


D. Baker: So, the BOT Finance and Facilities and Operations Committee is just written today. Any questions on that one?

D. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Dan Gebo – report – Pages 18-19

D. Baker: Okay, Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee, Deborah.

D. Haliczer: Okay, hi. Deborah Haliczer speaking for myself and my very illustrious colleague who’s here with us in effigy today, Dan Gebo. The Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee – you have my written report and we had excellent reports about progress in funding for sponsored research and that information will be available posted by the Office of Sponsored Projects. We also heard an excellent presentation from one of our new faculty staff members, Anna Quider, who is our director of federal relations and you would have been very impressed to hear all the things she’s done in four short months, right. So she is looking for opportunities to really enhance our presence in Washington by creating opportunities for us to showcase the work that we’re doing to work on partnerships and collaboration and to really get our students, faculty, staff involved in national and international initiatives about our research. So really you want to come and hear her speak sometime because she was most impressive.

D. Baker: Thanks, and in fact I think she was instrumental in our invitation to the White House. I think we had a great report, but they would not have heard about it had it not been for her efforts.


D. Baker: Deborah, you’ve got the next one on Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs.
D. Haliczer: Okay. Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs. Greg Waas and I are the representatives on that and we heard the annual report of the Office of Internal Audit which every year when we hear the report on the Office of Internal Audit, we hear how many audits were done but, since that information is privileged, confidential, it is only shared in detail with the board members. So there were 21 audits, 19 of which were completed. We also heard a report on risk management on the Clery Report and so Sarah Cliffe of Risk Management and Chief Tom Phillips both shared different portions of the report. And what was encouraging is I know in the past we’ve had some criticisms that perhaps our Clery Report data were not representative of the full range of incidents that occurred. I am, as a person who reads these things every year, I’m very impressed that our reporting appears accurate and that the caveats there were shared by Tom Phillips who says that it’s almost impossible to get totally accurate Clery data because you’re looking at anonymous reports that can’t always be verified. So I think that we’ve made significant improvements on the accuracy of Clery reporting which is really in the best interest of the university and is very much in sync with the efforts on violence prevention and violence against women, so very encouraging report.

D. Baker: Yeah, great and in my Baker Report this Friday I’ll have a piece in there on the Violence Against Women Act Committee and that will be coming out next week. And I am very grateful Raquel served on that and a number of others here. Great work by that committee and we’ll have an implementation group being formed coming out of that to take on the recommendations and get them done, so great report there.

On audit, by the way, when we say we had 21 audits, auditors have a schedule of audit. It’s not like you got picked on because you were doing something naughty. It’s because you go through areas of, cash handling for example, gets audited more frequently than things that don’t. There’s just a standard cycle that you go through and that’s what she’s reporting on and reporting on improvements to business processes and they’re typically very positive. And if there are recommendations, they are good business practices. I appreciate the good work there.

And on the Clery reporting, I echo Deborah’s work. I know the new Chief Phillips has done a lot of work to try and improve that. He did have an interesting statistic he gave about burglaries in DeKalb versus where he’s been. He’d been at the University of Illinois Chicago and looked at a similar geographic area and found that last year around that area in Chicago there were 460 some burglaries, and in DeKalb and that similar area, over three years there had been 43. So he was saying sometime, when he came here he thought this was like a crime-free zone and then when he got here, he heard people saying we have a lot of crime. So he said I guess it’s your frame of reference. I know they’re working hard to reduce crime though. We still have real and perceived issues and he and the local DeKalb police and regional police are all working hard on that, but it was an interesting kind of anecdotal fact.

F. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee – William Pitney – report – Page 21

D. Baker: The Board of Trustees has two ad hoc committees. One is enrollment and obviously that’s key to what we’re doing at the institution. The other is on their own governance. Most boards like this have a governance committee that looks at their bylaws, looks at how they evaluate themselves, what standard of behavior they set for the individual board members, how they assess individual board members, not just the whole board itself. I’m proud to say this board has taken that on. It hasn’t existed in the past. They’ve been to two association of governing
board meetings and that’s helped them shape their thinking about these two ad hoc committees and how to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the board. So I’ll have Bill report on the actual activities they’re undertaking.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. The Ad Hoc Committee for Enrollment was largely created to help the board create policy as it relates to the financial sustainability of NIU. The meeting was largely informational and organizational in nature. They received a report from Dr. Weldy, our vice president for student affairs and enrollment management, as well as information from Dr. Lisa Freeman and Dr. Anne Birberick as well. The information that the board received related to our enrollment trends and recruitment and retention efforts here on campus. And a lot of the information largely was reflective of what we’ve learned in some of the earlier town hall meetings this semester. Dr. Birberick identified some student retention efforts and highlighted many of those for the board and they learned about the retention summits that had been created beginning fall of 2013. And then from there they identified some additional information they would like, that’s certainly in the report, but they wanted to understand, for example, the relationship between tuition and enrollment; the students’ current debt load, and those sorts of pieces of information. And so that information, I believe, is going to be compiled and will be shared at the subsequent meetings.

**G. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – William Pitney – report – Page 22**

**W. Pitney:** Moving on to Item G, the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, that’s on page 22 of your report. As Dr. Baker mentioned, that’s largely for them to identify where some changes need to be made in terms of the governance structure of the Board of Trustees. And Dr. Jerry Blakemore identified several areas that would potentially be worth examining for the health and well being of NIU and the governance structure of the board. It was largely an organizational meeting in that there were many items listed for them to examine and they prioritized those. Some of those items of business included, for example, updating their conflict of interest policy as well as some of their reformation of all their standing committees. They want to examine that. I do want to just make clear that one of the items on the list was related to tenure. And after a lot of questions were answered and things were fleshed out, the end result was that the board is interested in understanding more about the processes of tenure and promotion and also getting more information about the outcomes of the tenure and promotion process. For example, as it currently stands, they receive a list of faculty that are identified for promotion and tenure and then the board votes on that. What they want also is an understanding of how many folks, for example, might have been denied tenure or promotion, etc. and so I just wanted to clarify that. So that’s my report.

**D. Baker:** Any questions on either of those?

**H. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – no report**

**I. Academic Policy Committee – Virginia Naples, Chair – no report**

**J. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – no report**

**K. Rules and Governance Committee – Jana Brubaker, Chair – no report**
L. University Affairs Committee – Greg Long, Chair – no report

M. Student Association – Joe Frascello, President – report

D. Baker: Okay, there are a number of committees that don’t have reports. Our next one is Item M, Student Association. Raquel, are you doing that?

R. Chavez: All right, so, Raquel Chavez, here for Student Association on behalf of Joe. I just want to talk about a few things that we’ve been doing. The sexual assault prevention campaign, the It’s On Us Campaign, I’m sure you all have heard of it at least by now. It was really successful. We had our Week of Action the week prior to Thanksgiving break. That was a week of events that we could not have pulled off without the help of the university. We contacted several different areas of campus: athletics, the police, everywhere. We honestly utilized just about every resource we had. We dipped our hands in just about everything so we’re wanting to, right now we’re working on some sort of sustainability plan for it. We had a meeting with Dr. Weldy. Joe and I had a meeting with Dr. Weldy and Dr. Wesener Michael a couple of days ago and we kind of talked about this trying to keep the longevity of this type of program, campaign, what-have-you, just to make it a part of our campus culture and how the Student Association can work with the current NIU administration, faculty, staff, whoever, in order to maintain that momentum. Because obviously we’re graduating in May so we want to make sure there’s also a good transition from our administration to the next because we were told that so far it’s been working very well and we want to keep that momentum going as well. And then also it’s been brought to my attention as of recent that we’re gonna be working with Ron Walters. It’s still in the planning stages – a Spring Welcome Back Days type of thing. So just trying to get students because spring is always a little different than fall. Trying to get that same excitement, even though it’s cold, back when students come for the spring semester.

D. Baker: You’re gonna meet on that next week?

R. Chavez: Yeah.

D. Baker: Raquel, are any of you, do you have a feel for the impact of the information campaign, It’s on Us?

R. Chavez: I think, I mean a lot more people are talking about it, only because I was one of the spearheads of it. I’ve been hearing a lot of great things. As far as media coverage goes, Paul Palian and a lot of different students have been coming in even to ask for journalism projects like oh so what do you think about this. So students are talking about it a bit more now, but it definitely still needs to be broadcast more and that included having faculty and staff in on the conversation as well. It’s not just an NIU administrative and NIU student deal. Like it’s everybody and I really want to make that point, to get that across, because faculty and staff deal with students more than they think they do. Yeah we interact with one another, but like student-to-student, but ultimately we have our professors that we confide in and perhaps tell things to and it’s that relationship that could go back to retention. You have professors that you confide in over a topic that’s maybe not the easiest to talk about, whether it happened or didn’t happen to you. It could happen to somebody else in your family and your friend group, anybody. So I think it’s still a conversation that needs to be had. And just, regardless of your viewpoint on it, it’s still a campus safety issue and a community thing too and we’re trying to get safe passage in on the
D. Baker: Good. Well really important work. I hope to write about that in the Baker Report too. We need to build momentum, you’re right, it’s a cultural transformation and thanks for your efforts on it. Any questions for Raquel?

N. Operating Staff Council – Jay Monteiro, President – report – Pages 23-24

D. Baker: Okay, Operating Staff Council Gina.

G. Shannon: I’m Gina Shannon, member of the Operating Staff Council. Jay Monteiro sends his regrets. Our minutes are listed in the agenda packet and I have nothing further to report.

D. Baker: Jay got off easy didn’t he? Anything on the minutes?

O. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczer, President – report – Page 25

D. Baker: All right, Supportive Professional Staff Council, Deborah you’re back on.

D. Haliczer: Okay, back again. Hi Deborah Haliczer, SPS Council. I want to thank Vice President Coryell for coming and joining to the SPS Council and speaking about the many initiatives that his division is doing. And my colleagues were all very excited and look forward to a lot of changes and we will all assist the campus together in making those changes.

Next I wanted to let you know that ethics training was completed with a very good result and that’s mostly done for the year. I also wanted to thank all those who nominated people for the SPS awards. We had 14 nominees and they’re all excellent and the council will be looking at those and speaking to President Baker about that award as well as the other awards that are coming up. I know people are busy, I know how hard it is to put the time together to make nominations for the rounds of awards we’re all working on, but it’s well worth it because just being nominated for something makes a difference. And the Outstanding Women Student Awards have been nominated. Please think about that because the deadline is coming up soon.

Next we are working on and continue to work on morale issues. All three of the employee councils are all considering questions on morale. Contrary to what the lay person might think, it’s not always about salaries or pensions even though you’ve heard me talk a lot about that. It’s about communication and recognition and taking the time to engage in a commitment to meaningful, constructive, written employee evaluations which are really part of the cornerstone of employee career success. And we will be speaking a great deal about that as we look at supervisor training, increases and expansion on supervisor training, other professional development, and leadership development training. So we have a lot of things in the works and SPS and Operating Staff Council are very invested in these initiatives.


P. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, FS Liaison to UBC – report – Page 26

D. Baker: There’s a written report from the Benefits Committee. Any questions on the written
report?

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

D. Baker: Seeing none, we’ll move on to the Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, Mary Beth Henning.

M.B. Henning: Hi, I just wanted to make a brief report that we still have an opening for a University Council representative from Visual and Performing Arts because we had an unexpected retirement and nobody has expressed an interest in running. We did have a special election in the College of Education to replace a retiree and Laura Hedin has joined the University Council from the College of Education.

D. Baker: So were you asking for anybody to volunteer for anything?

M.B. Henning: Well, everybody who is here is already here, so we need a new person to be recruited from the College of Visual and Performing Arts.

D. Baker: Okay, got it. Thanks.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. University Assessment Panel – Proposed revisions to committee composition,
NiU Bylaws Article 15.8.1 – SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM – Page 27

D. Baker: All right, Unfinished Business, University Assessment Panel. Bill do you want to take that?

W. Pitney: Yes, absolutely, thank you. This is a second reading for this item. You can find it on page 27 of your packet. Basically it’s just a small housekeeping item, it’s a small composition change for the composition of the assessment panel. Why we’ve got the voting members displayed is: For a very similar item at our last meeting, we actually had 50 voting members in attendance, but only 40 votes cast so we came up a little bit short of the number of votes required to make this bylaw change. So if you see your name up here, and you don’t have a clicker, please grab a clicker. But don’t push any buttons on the clicker. A little tutorial here: It is ready to go, you don’t have to turn anything on to vote. So with those housekeeping things out of the way, this is a second reading so we actually need a motion to approve the suggested revisions to the composition of the University Assessment Panel.

Unidentified: So moved.

W. Pitney: Thank you I’ve got a motion and Raquel, second. Any discussion on this item? Okay, my last tutorial:
1 on the clicker is to accept or approve the motion, 2 is to vote no, and 3 is to abstain. So 1 is a vote for yes, 2 is no, 2 is to abstain. So now we’re ready. You can push the button for your vote. Your selection will come up. So if you press 1 or A, A will come up as an example, and then you’ll see a smiley face. Now you can push that as many times as you need to, you can actually change your vote until it closes. If you get a no channel we might need another clicker perhaps. So I think we’re ready to close the vote. Did everybody vote hopefully? Yeah
the motion passes. Thank you. I think we’re ready to move onto New Business.

Yes – 43
No – 1
Abstain – 2

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Reconsideration of Committee on Multicultural Curriculum Transformation – Proposed revisions to committee composition, NIU Bylaws Article 15.9.1 – SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM – Page 28

D. Baker: Yeah, new business Bill. Do you want to take those, Reconsideration of Committee on Multicultural Curriculum Transformation?

W. Pitney: Yes, thank you. So, Item A was the one we voted on last time and we came up a little bit short. As a reminder that’s where we had 50 voting members in attendance but only 40 votes were cast. I would like us to reconsider this. Could I have a motion from the floor to reconsider this item?

R. Chavez: So moved.

Unidentified: Second.

W. Pitney: I hear a motion from Raquel and a second, thank you. Any discussion on that reconsideration? So the reconsideration is just to get this item back in the hopper so we can vote on it. So we actually have to approve the reconsideration by majority vote, that’s just going to be an oral vote. So all in favor to reconsider this say aye.

Members: Aye.

W. Pitney: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Motion carries. So now that item is ready to go. This will be an action item for us. Again this is on page 28 of your packet. This is a small change in the composition of the Multicultural CurriculumTransformation Committee. So I’d like a motion to approve this change. Thank you, we’ve got a motion on the floor. Second please? A second. Any discussion on that. Okay seeing none, we’re going to vote. I guess this is a constitutional change we’ve got to use the clickers. Again 1 or A is yes, 2 or B is no, and 3 is abstain. I think we’re ready to vote, Pat? You may vote now. Are we all set? Okay so we’ll close the vote. We’re on a roll, that motion passes. Thank you.

Yes – 42
No – 2
Abstain – 3

B. Open Access for NIU-produced published journal articles Proposed policy – Page 29

W. Pitney: We have one more item of new business. If you’ll check out page 29 of your packet, you will see a resolution that was accepted at Faculty Senate. This resolution was developed by
the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee under the leadership of Sarah McHone-Chase from the library. This is basically a resolution that introduces a policy. For a lack of a better word, we’re calling this our open access policy. The policy is actually the six items that you see on page 29. We’re encouraging faculty to maintain their copyright when they submit journals for publication and then we’re going on to require that faculty, where possible, make their published articles available in the Huskie Commons Repository so that they’re accessible to all and this came about from Public Act 098-0295 of the State of Illinois and it’s pretty straightforward I think. Because it largely impacted our faculty, that’s why I had it sent through Faculty Senate first. And at Faculty Senate really the only item that came up was related to the mechanisms that will be put in place to get the articles to the Huskie Commons or alert the library that the articles might be available already in an open access journal. I think those are some logistical challenges that Patrick Dawson has assured us that will be ironed out and taken care of as easily as possible. I would accept a motion to approve this Open Access Policy for NIU. This would then go to the Academic Policy and Procedures Manual Committee.

Unidentified: So moved.

W. Pitney: I hear a motion.

Unidentified: Second.

W. Pitney: And a second. Any discussion on this item?

C. Campbell: My name is Cynthia Campbell from the College of Education and I was wondering if it says in here articles that are published or articles or products that have been produced, is this just only those that have been published and, if yes, is it after it’s actually out or do you impress or how does that work?

W. Pitney: That’s a great question. Patrick Dawson has an answer for me thankfully.

P. Dawson: According to the act, it’s for published material. It’s not pre-publication, it’s something that’s been accepted and been published.

C. Campbell: This is a follow-up. So published means online as well as print?

P. Dawson: Yes.

C. Campbell: Okay, thank you.

W. Pitney: I think there was another question back there. Did I see a hand? No, okay. Any other questions? Okay seeing none, we’d like to call this and vote on this item. Again we’re going to use the clickers, the last time. 1 is yes to approve, 2 is no, and 3 is abstain. Pat, are we ready? So are we ready to close the vote? We’re all set. Great, motion carries. Thank you.

Yes – 46
No – 1
Abstain - 0
IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Course Syllabus Accommodation Statement – Greg Long – report

**D. Baker:** All right, congratulations by the way in getting all those voted, I’m impressed. Any comments or questions from the floor tonight? Greg, where is he? Did you have one, Greg?

**G. Long:** Hello, this is Greg Long from School of Allied Health and Communicative Disorders and I just wanted to share some good news. Last year we had a project within a class I teach, Disability and Society, where we collected 400 unique syllabi from across the university and looked at them in terms of the presence of the accessibility statement for the Disability Resource Center. And at that point, we saw that there was a 77 percent inclusion rate. So about three out of four had the statement, which from our standpoint, really wasn’t sufficient. And so I brought that information to Faculty Senate and ultimately to this body and back in April University Council did pass a resolution saying that the syllabus statement is now a required component of course syllabi. This fall we collected data again. Jaclyn Segura here, who’s sat through our entire meeting very patiently and quietly, is one of the honor students on campus. And she helped compile and write a report for us on this. But last year we were at 77 percent, this year we’re at 91 percent across the university, so a 14 percent gain. So I would just say congratulations to the campus. A special tip of the hat to Visual and Performing Arts, Education, and Health and Human Sciences, because they came in at 100 percent and 98 percent with at least 50 syllabi being reported. So nice change and, as we had said last year, I think that a lot of this was due just to a lack of information, there was no malice. And so now that we’ve made it you know that people are more informed about it, we’re seeing a lot better compliance with the idea. So just thanks.

**D. Baker:** Jaclyn, do you want to say anything about what you’ve learned in this process?

**J. Segura:** I don’t have a whole lot to add, but it was really neat to see the improvement from the policy and I’m just glad that the percentage has gone up so much.

**G. Long:** One thing that Jaclyn did point out as she was reviewing the syllabi is that the DRC they have an actual statement on the website that’s also on the accessibility portal. Here’s the exact wording that we would recommend. There were a fair number of syllabi that included wording that people had used on their own that used the term, “special needs,” instead of “accommodations.” And from within the disability perspective, talking about someone as having special needs is seen as much more patronizing than describing them as simply needed an accommodation. And so one recommendation that we would have as a result of looking at this is obviously keep including it but try to avoid the term, “special needs.” It’s a student with a disability, a student who needs an accommodation, but to be referred to as having special needs is not really appropriate in this environment.

**D. Baker:** Good, thanks. Any comments on that or any questions? Thanks for your efforts both of you on this. That’s great, fantastic. Any other comments from the floor?
X. INFORMATION ITEMS

D. Baker: All right, and then we’ve got the information items.

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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: And then adjournment. If there’s nothing else, then I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Unidentified: So moved.

D. Baker: Second.

Unidentified: Second.

D. Baker: All in favor, please leave. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.