I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2017 MEETING

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Disability Resource Center update per resolution approved by University Council on November 30, 2016 – Pages 3-4
   Debra Miller, Director, Disability Resource Center

B. Discover Initiative
   Jerry Blazey, Acting Vice President, Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships

C. Multi-Factor-Authentication (MFA) Project
   Tim Schwartz and Drew Bjerken, Division of Information Technology

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Program Prioritization – Lisa Freeman, Executive Vice President and Provost

B. Follow-up on Faculty Senate response to December 22 Baker Report – Pages 5-11 – Greg Long

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws Article 3.6 – Page 12
   Office of the Executive Secretary
   FIRST READING

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
   Cathy Doederlein, Greg Long, Holly Nicholson, Rebecca Shortridge, Kendall Thu, Leanne VandeCreek
C. Academic Policy Committee – no report
D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – no report
E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Therese Arado, Chair – report
   1. NIU Policy Library – Presentation and discussion
F. University Affairs Committee – Linda Saborío, Chair – no report
G. Student Association – report
   Giuseppe LaGioia, President
   Christine Wang, Speaker of the Senate
H. Operating Staff Council – Holly Nicholson, President – no report
I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Cathy Doederlein, President – report

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board
C. Minutes, Baccalaureate Council
D. Minutes, Board of Trustees
E. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
F. Minutes, Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
G. Minutes, General Education Committee
H. Minutes, Graduate Council
I. Minutes, Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
J. Minutes, Honors Committee
K. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
L. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
M. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
N. Minutes, University Benefits Committee
O. Minutes, Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
P. Minutes, University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

XI. ADJOURNMENT
Disability Resource Center Spring 2017 Semester Updates

1. Two Access Consultants hired beginning March 1 and April 3. They should be fully trained to begin building caseloads by the fall semester 2017.

2. Student testing room furniture has been replaced. Clocks and desk lamps installed.

3. New student computers have been ordered and are in the process of being installed as new software is being purchased and uploaded.

4. Three Braille writers and two new CCTVs have been acquired replacing decades old equipment.

5. Per the President’s Program Prioritization Report: A new position – Adapted Materials Coordinator – has been approved. Further, captioning services for the university will be enhanced.

6. Critical issue TBD: relocation to fully accessible, student-centered space with adequate student and handicapped parking.
December 6, 2016

TO: President Douglas Baker  
   Provost Lisa Freeman  
   Vice Provost Sue Mini  
   Vice Provost Anne Birberick  
   Vice President Eric Weldy  
   Vice President Al Phillips  
   Senior Assoc. Vice President Laura Alexander  
   Vice Provost Murali Krishnamurthi  
   Assistant Vice President Mike Stang  
   Ombudsperson Sarah Klaper  
   DRC Director Debra Miller

FROM: Greg Long, Executive Secretary of University Council

RE: Resources and staffing for the Disability Resource Center

During the November 30, 2016 University Council meeting, the membership discussed and passed the following resolution in support of the Disability Resource Center:

Whereas, students with disabilities have a civil right to an accessible education.

Whereas, increasing numbers of students use services at the Disability Resource Center.

Whereas, there is an expectation that students will be scheduled for appointments within two weeks of initial contact.

Whereas, despite two positions being posted, once filled there will be still be insufficient staffing to meet student needs and outreach to faculty and staff.

Whereas, assistive technology and testing computers are essential for service delivery, however, much of the equipment used in DRC is outdated and/or non-functional.

Whereas, students who are blind and require Brailled textbooks often fail to receive their books until after the semester has started.

Whereas, students who are deaf or hard of hearing require captioned video yet the University has no mechanism in place to ensure that videos created by faculty and staff are readily captioned.

Whereas, technology accessibility (per the NIU technology access policy) is crucial for student recruitment, retention and success.

Whereas, student services should be provided in a centrally located space that is accessible without the need for an elevator.

Be it therefore resolved that the University administration should move to immediately address the staffing, equipment, and related service delivery needs of the Disability Resource Center thus assuring that students with disabilities receive appropriate accommodations, within a reasonable time.
March 30, 2017

To:    John Butler, Chair, NIU Board of Trustees

Re:    Faculty Senate Resolution to Collaborate with the BOT on Presidential Evaluations

From:  Greg Long, President of Faculty Senate

During the Faculty Senate’s January and February meetings, the membership reviewed and discussed the December 22, 2016 Baker Report titled, “Correcting Course—new policies enhance transparency” as well as additional materials shared by President Baker and Professor Haji-Sheikh. In response, the Senate invited President Baker to attend our March 29th meeting to respond to questions and share his perspectives. Following the President’s presentation, the Senate created and overwhelmingly approved the following resolution:

Whereas, the Faculty Senate would like to provide meaningful and comprehensive recommendations to the Board of Trustees regarding the evaluation of the president, and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate seeks to collaborate with the Board of Trustees in an inclusive manner that comprises input from various NIU constituents, including faculty, staff, students, instructors, alumni, and community members, and

Whereas, the faculty of NIU is deeply invested in helping to determine the future direction of the university

Be it therefore resolved, that the Faculty Senate moves to include questions of ethics, the roles of academics and administration, and the future direction of the university in the Board of Trustee’s consideration of presidential contract renewals, and

Be it further resolved that Faculty Senate moves to collaborate with the Board of Trustees per their request in the development of a formalized process involving faculty, staff, students, instructors, alumni, and community members for the evaluation of the president.
John Butler

Yesterday, 6:21 PM
Greg Long; Wheeler Coleman

Inbox

You replied on 3/28/2017 7:04 PM.

Greg:

I've appreciated the opportunity to speak with you today (and prior) regarding presidential evaluation. We agreed it would be helpful for you to have a summary, from my perspective, of what we discussed regarding an enhanced role for the faculty, staff, students, and other stakeholders in evaluating the performance of the president.

First, I shared with you the Board's interest in establishing a process to involve wider participation in presidential evaluation, particularly concerning the periodic matter of contract renewal. To that end, we discussed the multiple policies that pertain to presidential evaluation and our shared desire to see these policies updated.

Second, after having undertaken multiple annual evaluations of Dr. Baker's performance in accordance with the provisions of his contract and Board Regulations, I informed you that the Board and Dr. Baker agree that a 360 assessment would offer a unique form of feedback particularly useful to the Board's deliberation regarding presidential contract renewal. Our understanding of such assessments is that they are common in the penultimate year of a contract.

Third, I informed you that trustees Coleman and Barsema have been working closely with Acting General Counsel Greg Brady and procurement to devise a 360 assessment that: surveys trustees, direct reports, and individuals with the capacity and authority to represent a larger group of stakeholders; permits candid assessment by respondents (offers a confidential platform); provides for a combination of in-person interviews and electronic survey application; and offers the prospect of both a meaningful and cost-effective engagement. We believe we are close to finalizing an agreement with an external provider who will conduct a 360 assessment. This provider will advise the university on the applicable core competencies to be measured in the assessment, facilitate the assessment, and prepare results to serve as a meaningful source of data in the evaluation of the president's body of work.

Fourth, you expressed particular interest in the manner in which representatives of the faculty, supportive professional staff, operating staff, and students will participate. The assessment pool will certainly involve such representation (as well as trustees, the president's direct reports, and representatives of external stakeholders such as the Alumni Association, Foundation Board, community
leaders, etc.). You further expressed a desire to include faculty, staff, and student input in the design of the assessment. I indicated that the particulars of the assessment service will be defined in more detail once we can begin working in earnest with a service provider under contract. Once that occurs, I am confident that process will involve an effort to accommodate the interests of participating stakeholders.

Finally, you asked about the timeline of the above activities in relation to the presidential evaluation and the Board’s deliberation regarding the presidential contract. The Board’s objective is to complete the 360 assessment in advance of the Board’s regular meeting on June 15, 2017. If the procurement process and subsequent development work concerning the 360 assessment can be completed within the anticipated timeframe, respondents will be engaged in the assessment in the second half of April, and results will be provided to the Board in May. As soon as we have definitive details in this regard, we will make them known to you and other relevant stakeholders.

The evaluation of the president has many dimensions. While I cannot at this time offer you specific milestones concerning the completion of the overall evaluation or the deliberations regarding the presidential contract, I can assure you that the Board takes very seriously its primary responsibility for oversight of the function of the presidency at NIU. The Board is committed to fulfilling that responsibility in a manner that is fair, thoughtful, thorough, and strategic.

As we pursue these objectives, I appreciate very much your rigorous representation, thoughtful engagement, and determination to improve and codify policy. I will endeavor to keep you informed as details emerge. Please do not hesitate to contact me for further clarification as we implement the plans outlined above.

John

John Butler
Policies Applicable to Evaluation of NIU’s President

Presented to Rules, Governance and Elections Committee
March 10, 2017
Compiled by Greg Long, FS President

Currently, there are five separate procedures that relate to administrative reviews. None of the policies or procedures specifies the nature, scope, or amount of input to be obtained from faculty, staff, students, alumni, community members, etc.

1. Constitution and Bylaws—Article 19: Administrative and Faculty Appointments

19.4.3 Review Procedure

19.4.3.1 Unless otherwise stipulated in these bylaws, the performance of each administrative officer shall be comprehensively reviewed at intervals of no more than five years. Each such review shall be conducted by a committee composed of the same representation used in the formation of the search committee which would be established to conduct the selection process to fill that position when it is vacant. A report of the review committee's findings, together with the committee's recommendation regarding the incumbent's continued service in office, shall be forwarded to the administrative officer to whom the person being reviewed normally reports and, if that administrative officer is someone other than the president, to the president.

19.4.3.2 Where no search committee of the type described in section 19.4.2 has been used, a review procedure shall be followed in which the person to be appointed shall be reviewed by the appropriate areas concerned. Whenever possible, existing appropriate bodies of faculty and students shall be employed in the review process. For example, college-level appointments should be reviewed by college-level bodies.

2. 19.7 Performance Reviews

19.7.1 The President The president shall be subject to a comprehensive review of that officer's performance in office at the beginning of the sixth year of service in the position, and at the start of each fourth year thereafter. The comprehensive
review shall be conducted under the auspices of the University Council and shall provide opportunities for input from all appropriate segments of the university community. The results of that review, together with the University Council's recommendation regarding the president's continued performance in office, shall be forwarded to the Board of Trustees. The University Council may meet in executive session to formulate its conclusions and recommendations regarding the performance of the president.

3. **Board of Trustees Regulations**—Section II. Subsection B. Conditions of Employment, Board Review and Evaluation of the President

**BOARD REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE PRESIDENT**

It is the policy of the Board of Trustees to review and evaluate the performance of the president on a regular basis. This review and evaluation process provides (1) a means by which the incumbent may review performance with Board members, (2) a procedure to establish new short-, intermediate- and long-term goals for the ensuing months and years, and (3) an opportunity to receive comments and ideas from Board members and others as to possible ways in which the management and planning functions of the university might be improved. Materials and personal information developed for these processes are confidential and regarded as exempt from public disclosure as restricted employment information under law.

a. *The Annual Review and Evaluation*

(1) The annual review and evaluation of the performance of the president shall be conducted by the Board at such time as the chair of the Board designates. In preparation for this review, the chair may seek input from such internal and external constituencies (e.g., faculty, students, staff, legislators, community leaders, etc.) as he/she deems appropriate. The annual review and evaluation shall be presented and discussed in a closed meeting of the Board as allowed by law.
(2) In order to aid in the annual review and evaluation by the Board, Annual Goals Statements as described in subtopic 7.b. of this Section of the Board Regulations shall be prepared jointly by the president and Board chair and submitted to members of the Board by the president prior to the president’s annual review and evaluation. Any additional material such as annual reports or other documents may be included at the discretion of the president.

b. The Annual Goals Statement

The president and Board chair shall jointly prepare an Annual Goals Statement. Information in the Statement should include:

(1) The objectives, stated very briefly, with the understanding they may be elaborated upon during evaluation sessions.

(2) The implementation schedule associated with the Annual Goals Statement is to include a very brief statement as to what action will be taken during the period in question for a particular objective, and when that action is expected to take place.

c. Other Reviews

The periodic reviews provided for in 7.a. and 7.b. above shall not be interpreted to preclude other or additional reviews or evaluative measures from being undertaken at any time.

4. Board of Trustees Bylaws—ARTICLE VII. PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

SECTION 3. Board and Presidential Assessment

The Board and the President shall establish short- and long-term goals for the benefit of the Board and the University, and the Board and President shall periodically review the Board and presidential goals and their respective performance related thereto. These goals shall cover a period of between three and five years, and the Board and the President shall conduct a review of the progress periodically, but not less than every three years.
The review of the President shall include assessment of the President’s compliance with Board and University policies and procedures, as well as compliance with federal and state statutes and regulations.

The Board and the President may, as part of its goals assessment, consult with representatives of the various constituents of the University including, but not limited to, University Council, the NIU Foundation, the NIU Alumni Association, representatives of student and community organizations, and any other persons or entities which the Board deems appropriate.

5. **President’s Employment Contract (July 1, 2013-June 30, 2018)**

On or before December 1, 2013, and thereafter as of June 1 of each year of this Agreement, the Employee shall provide to the Board of Trustees a list of three to five proposed goals and objectives for the one year period beginning June 1. The Board of Trustees or its designees (referred to in this section 4.0 as the “Board,” and the Employee shall discuss the Employee’s goals and objectives, after which time the Board and the Employee shall agree upon goals and objectives for the coming academic year. On or before May 1 of each calendar year, the Employee shall initiate the evaluation process for the period that began on June 1 of the previous calendar year by submitting to the Board a self-appraisal of said period’s performance. This appraisal shall address the Employee’s performance related to each of the goals and objectives determined the preceding June. After the Employee has submitted this self-appraisal, the Board shall evaluate the Employee’s performance during the previous academic year based on his achievement of the mutually agreed upon specified goals and objectives and such other criterial as the Board deems appropriate. To aid the board in its annual evaluation, the Employee agrees to furnish to the Board such additional oral or written reports as it may request.
Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws, Article 3.6

This proposed amendment brings the bylaw into alignment with current practice and expectations of the office of Executive Secretary of University Council, which requires a 12-month commitment. To accommodate the 12-month contract, the University Council budget funds three months’ salary (not two).

NIU BYLAWS
ARTICLE 3: OPERATING PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

3.6 Office of the Executive Secretary

3.6.2 The executive secretary shall be paid from the budget of the academic department in which the individual holds rank and tenure for a regular nine-month full-time appointment. That department shall be compensated by a transfer of funds from the budget of the University Council to support instructional costs incurred by the department as a consequence of the executive secretary’s assignment to University Council duties. The actual allocation to the department shall be determined on the basis of discussions involving the department chair, the dean of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the Office of the President. The budget of the University Council shall also fund an additional two (not three) months’ salary for the executive secretary.