I. Call to Order

Policy Librarian R. Hunt called the meeting to order at 1:01pm

II. Verification of Quorum

A quorum was established.

III. Approval of Meeting Agenda

Items (C) and (D) on the agenda to be moved (A) and (B) for the section titled, “New Business.”

J. Royce moved, second by B. Ingram. Motion passed.

IV. Approval of Minutes for September 16, 2019
B. Ingram moved, second by J. Royce. Motion passed. A. Kenney abstained.

V. Public Comment

None.

VI. Consent Agenda

None.

VII. Unfinished Business

a. DoIT – Update on Their Process for Updating Policies

B. Hull notes that they’ve created a policy tracker (who’s responsible) and latest date of adoption. Suggests this process for other departments/policy proposals moving forward.

Discussion:

R. Hunt discusses that most of the policies in the policy library are on a 3-year cycle for review/update. Regarding the area of DoIT, it’s up to the department to decide their process.

B. Hull poses question concerning communication with departments when their policy is up for review.

R. Hunt responds that she reaches out to those individuals when it’s time.

VIII. New Business

a. Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) Policy

R. Hunt notes that Marissa Benson (M. Benson) is out of town. M. Benson will be discussing policies and related issues via phone during the meeting.

R. Hunt asks M. Benson to give a brief overview of policy.

Discussion:

M. Benson acknowledges individuals already use their personal cellphones, tablets, and laptops for work. In order to use a personal device for work, individuals must abide by the Acceptable Use Policy (the Acceptable Use Policy is incorporated into this policy). The biggest concern is security; devices must be encrypted, capable of remote wiping [of information], and screen lock. Policy
does not address the type of data that can be on personal devices. If an individual is going to use a personal device then these are the steps they’ll need to take (encryption, etc.).

K. Thu asks for clarity on remote wiping. M. Benson notes that different operating systems (iOS, Android, etc.) have ability to connect from remote location and wipe information from the device.

B. Hull clarifies this is only for using a personal device. NIU devices (those owned by the university and used by employees) already have these features.

J. Royce questions verification process for ensuring that personal devices have these processes in place for security purposes.

M. Benson responds that there is currently no way to do this and it is hard to enforce. IT does receive an alert when unauthorized information is sent from an NIU network outside the network. M. Benson clarifies that this is a policy issue not a technology issue.

J. Royce questions the ability of employees to be aware of this policy and the consequences of violating when not aware of its existence. M. Benson clarifies that this is the importance of the incorporation of the Acceptable Use Policy.

B. Hull adds that this policy ensures that NIU data is encrypted and able to be wiped for security protection (in situations like an employee losing a [personal] device with NIU data).

N. Bolden questions regarding how this policy applies to student employees. M. Benson responds that the first two bullet points in policy are for the type of data and when student employees have access to private or restricted data [and use personal laptops to view NIU private or institutional data] then encryption and remote wipe capability is important. Additionally, expectation is the same for student employees because the first two bullet points are really about the data being kept on personal devices versus the employee.

M. Benson discusses the ready availability of encryption software on most devices. BYOD policies are geared towards security for that data.

R. Hunt requests motion to post policy for 30-day comment period.

B. Hull moved, second by K. Thu. Motion Passed.

b. Information Security Policy

R. Hunt asks M. Benson to discuss.

Discussion:

M. Benson notes that Information Security Policy takes three existing policies that were highly duplicative and merges them into one policy. It’s now so much
easier to link to policies with the inception of the NIU Policy Library. No change to policy, just de-duplicating and merging three policies into one.

**R. Hunt** requests motion to post policy for 30-day comment period.

**K. Thu** moved, second by **A. Kenney**. Motion passed.

c. Title IX Sexual Misconduct Policy and Procedures

**R. Hunt** notes the updates to the policy including: adding Lindsay Hatzis (Director of Investigations, Ethics and Compliance Office) email address, inclusion of Dan Pederson, DeKalb PD contact information, clarified who can provide amnesty, and a clearer definition on intimate partner violence.

**R. Hunt** request for discussion.

Discussion:
None.

**R. Hunt** requests motion to accept policy.

**B. Ingram** moved, second by **B. Hull**. Motion passed.

d. Visual Arts Building After-Hours Policy

**R. Hunt** discusses rules regarding students being in the building after hours. Only those students in the Visual Arts program are allowed to be in building after 10:30pm. Additionally, Campus Police has been given the list of students allowed to be in the building after 10:30pm. If an individual’s name is not on the list, they cannot enter the building. The purpose of the policy is to ensure that the building is used by students in the program.

Discussion:

**B. Hull** questions how the policy is enforced re: if a student [who’s not in the program] is in the building before 10:30pm, how do they handle it?

**B. Ingram** clarifies that they’ll be asked to leave.  
**A. Kenney** notes that it seems more of a procedure rather than a policy  
**K. Thu** questions whether other buildings have similar rules in place  
**R. Hunt** responds that other buildings do not.
R. Siegesmund notes that the request for this policy came from Campus Police.

B. Ingram: do we have a policy that says when the building is locked, only people with keys have access to the building? A. Kenney and R. Hunt clarify that something like this exists but is not written down.

B. Ingram suggests clarification in implementing for entire campus. J. Royce adds that he believes other buildings have these policies in place.

B. Ingram requests for more information.

R. Hunt motion to table the policy.

B. Ingram moved, second by J. Royce. Motion passed.

e. Student Code of Conduct

R. Hunt discusses the changes to the policy: cannabis on campus (Section 3, Part A7.7 page 16). R. Hunt clarifies that this was added.

Discussion:

N. Bolden questions off-campus activities for student organizations: will there be sanctions enforced on organizations for off-campus events? J. Royce and K. Thu clarify that the policy states that it does not apply to off-campus, however, this policy does not address off-campus NIU activities. N. Bolden questions hosting off-campus events: do organizations need to notify that cannabis may be involved? How is this enforced? Requests more clarity on guidelines for use and notification by organizations to ensure compliance and prevent any sanction and/or liability issues. Additionally, requests clarity on NIU event v. organizations off-campus event. B. Ingram requests 7B removal of two commas from policy and 12 still lists “marijuana” as an illegal or controlled substance. B. Ingram requests clarity on section 7 and 12 (cannabis v. marijuana). R. Hunt said she would take the policy back to the Sponsor.

f. Policy on Managing University Policies

R. Hunt notes comments on policy: (1) the idea of shortening the comment period to 21 days and (2) adding Chief Diversity Officer to committee.

Discussion:
K. Thu expresses no issue with this. J. Royce questions whether this would increase the quorum requirement. B. Ingram notes that giving other offices the chance to read the policy would allow for more input. R. Hunt explains that she has spoken to Chief Diversity Officer who has expressed willingness to join the PLC (Policy Library Committee).

R. Hunt requests motion with changes

K. Thu moved, second by N. Bolden. Motion passed.

Further Discussion:

B. Ingram expresses that policies should already be vetted before arrival to PLC. R. Hunt explains that other universities have Chief Diversity Officer, senior admin, and Title IX Coordinator on their PLC. K. Thu expresses that it’s the onus of policy drafters to speak with stakeholders before proposal. J. Royce questions whether PLC has authority to change own membership. R. Hunt responds in the affirmative.

IX. Announcements

None.

B. Hull suggests merging documents into one PDF versus multiple documents for PLC meeting material packet. N. Bolden suggests using hyper-links within document for quicker access during PLC meetings.

X. Adjournment

J. Royce moved, second by B. Hull. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 1:53pm.