I. CALL TO ORDER

C. McCord: Let’s go ahead and come to order if we may. I am substituting this afternoon for President Freeman. President Freeman was asked to join all of the Illinois public university presidents and chancellors in Springfield for a press conference seeking to highlight the importance of investing in higher education. We all, I hope, can agree this is a worthwhile thing for presidents and chancellors to advocate for. And so she is on her way back from that press conference, but is not here, and has asked us to begin without her.

Meeting called to order at 3 p.m.

II. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM

C. McCord: And we need to begin by verifying quorum. Do all voting members have a clicker? And can you please click 1 if you are here. Click 2 if you are not here. All right, we have verified that we have quorum. Thank you.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

C. McCord: You should have received the agenda for the meeting. Do we have a motion to adopt the agenda.
C. Doederlein: So moved.

T. Martin: Second.

C. McCord: Thank you. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

C. McCord: Any opposed? Thank you.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 3, 2019 MINUTES

C. McCord: We also have the minutes of the April 3 meeting. Do we have a motion to approve the minutes?

K. Thu: So moved.

C. McCord: Moved, Thu. Do we have a second?

J. Wilson: Second.

C. McCord: Second, Wilson. Any discussion, clarifications, corrections to the minutes? Hearing none, all in favor of adopting the minutes, please say aye.

Members: Aye.

C. McCord: Any opposed? Thank you.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

C. McCord: This is the opportunity for public comment. We have received one advance request for public comment from Cathy Doederlein.

C. Doederlein: Thank you. At our last University Council meeting, this body voted to approve a change to Constitution Article 6.5, related to administrative committees. Once approved by council, as per Article 10.3 of the Constitution, a referendum of all faculty was conducted. Faculty are defined in Article 6.1 of the Constitution as “all full-time staff members holding the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor and instructor.” If passed by a majority of those voting in the referendum, which it did, it is then sent to the Board of Trustees for final approval and adoption.

I did not mention this concern in April’s meeting as I didn’t want my comments to appear to be a reflection of support or dissent of the specific revisions being proposed. And I’m commenting as a part of public comment today, rather than during my [SPS] council report, because I’ve not had a chance to confer with my SPS colleagues on their thoughts on this topic.
But I did not want to let the final meeting of the academic year pass without addressing a concern I have about Article 10.3 of the Constitution. While I personally find the idea of a referendum cumbersome and time-consuming, especially given the fact that those who vote as a part of the University Council are elected representatives of their constituencies, I can understand that there might be certain climates, like the climate I understand existed at the time of the initial adoption of the majority of our university’s current Constitution and Bylaws, where that added check and balance of a referendum is important. But to have the referendum only be of the faculty, especially for a non-curricular issue related to the overall operation of the university’s administration, is shortsighted and inequitable.

Again I want to stress that for matters that are curricular in nature, it’s only right and appropriate for the decision to lie with the faculty. As the kids of two faculty members, I grew up understanding the importance of academic freedom and of the voice of faculty for a university. But when the issue is a matter of broader university structure or operation, the voice of staff should be considered too.

I intend to work this summer on creating revised language for this article, which I will forward to University Council by way of the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee for their review and consideration to potentially forward along for a vote of the full body in the fall. But I wanted to bring this concern forward now while it’s still top of mind. Thank you so much for the time in hearing this concern.

C. McCord: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to make public comment at this point? All right, seeing none, we’ll proceed with the meeting.

VI. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

C. McCord: The President’s Announcements – we have a couple of presentations in a moment. I will pass on any sort of from-the-bench presidential announcements. If President Freeman is able to join us later in the meeting, she may have some comments.

A. Recognition of University Council members whose terms are completed, who have been re-elected and who are newly elected

C. McCord: I would like, however, to note as we are at the end of the University Council’s calendar for the year, there are a number of members who are completing their term. There are members who are joining us. There are members continuing. And let me just ask, would those who are completing their terms, please stand. [applause]

Thank you. Thank you for your service. Shared governances work. Shared governance is effort. It takes the commitment of people who are willing to do more than what might be sort of a narrow understanding of their job, to keep shared governance alive. Having participated with University Council now for 12 years, I can say shared governance at NIU is alive. And I can also say that the university administration is very committed to keeping it alive. And so we very much appreciate your time, your effort, your thoughts, your willingness to be part of discussion, and your commitment to continuing a shared governance tradition here. If there are any new members coming in, joining us in the fall, welcome.
C. McCord: We have two presentations. First a Policy Library update. You may recall, right, that actually University Council has played a very real role in bringing us a Policy Library. Those bylaws that Cathy alluded to, I can vividly remember when Greg Long was president of the Faculty Senate. Greg and I were discussing this. We noted that, for example, NIU at that point, I believe, had 171 pages of bylaws. The University of Virginia, which has kind of been at this business for a while, had three pages of bylaws. And there was a sense that we might be able to do things differently. And so we’ve been on a journey for some time now to move to a more structured approach to managing university policies, which are sometimes scattered, sometimes hard to find, sometimes contradictory. And the Policy Library is the upshot of that. And so we have a policy librarian, Becqui Hunt, who will be giving us an update.

R. Hunt: Good afternoon everyone. Up on the screen, you can see that that’s the homepage for the Policy Library. And all the information that you need will be here on this website. Some of you have computers. I will give you the link in just a moment so you can pull it up yourselves. But I just wanted you to focus in on the tab, “Submit or Revise a Policy.” That’s the area that we’re going to be talking about today.

The Policy Library was launched on April 9 of this year. An official announcement went out to everyone in the university community on April 11. And there’s the link for the Policy Library. This particular presentation that I’m going to make is going to focus on the Policy on Managing University Policies. It also went into effect on April 9 of this year.

The Policy on Managing University Policies is the primary document that formalizes the university policy-making procedures. It was drafted in collaboration with shared governance and university stakeholders. It’s intended to provided structure, consistency and transparency to the policy-making process. And it establishes the process for developing, reviewing, approving and maintaining all university-wide policies.

I would like to point out a couple of items from the university policy, itself. It was determined that the Constitution and Bylaws are exempt from this policy. The Constitution and Bylaws will continue to follow the shared governance procedures that are currently in place. And secondly, because the Policy on Managing University Policies is an administrative policy, the president is the approval authority for the policy.

As a part of the Policy Library being in existence, there are some rules and responsibilities of some people that need to take care of managing the policies on the Policy Library website. And first is the policy librarian. She maintains, publishes and notifies the university community of all approved and revised university policies. She establishes a review cycle for the policies. And she works closely with the university archives for proper archiving of policies. And that would be me.

Then there’s the Policy Library Committee. It’s comprised of university representatives who meet on a monthly basis. We’re responsible for reviewing university policy proposals. We recommend approval, revision, rescission, and rewriting of new and existing policies. The Policy Library
Committee considers whether a policy is necessary and consistent with the mission of the university. It recommends the appropriate policy approval authority for final approval of a policy proposal. It also identifies, as needed, content experts or other resources needed for policy development, approval and/or review.

There is a set of policy procedures that we go through. There is a set of procedures that new policies and revisions to current policies go through. If you look on the website, you can see that all of this is posted for your review so that you’re never not sure about how things work.

The policy procedures: Basically, a new policy proposal or revision is submitted using our online policy template. The policy librarian will review the proposal or revision and then submit the policy proposal or revision to the Policy Library Committee.

The next step is that the Policy Library Committee will approve the policy proposal or revision and send it to the policy approval authority. And that could be either the president, University Council or the Board of Trustees. Once vetted, the policy librarian will place the policy proposal or revision on the Policy Library website for 30 days for public comment from the university community. There will always be a link there with the policy for you to log in, to post your comments. And once you log in to post your comments, you’re able to see other comments that have been made.

After the 30 days is up, comments will be reviewed and, if needed, changes to the policy proposal or revision will be made. The final policy proposal or revision is returned to the Policy Library Committee with any relevant changes. If no further consultation is needed, the proposal or revision is sent to the policy approval authority for final approval. And once that is gained, the policy librarian will publish the final approved policy or revision to the Policy Library website. This procedure continues for each new policy proposal or revision to current policies.

Are there any questions?

K. Thu: Thanks, Becqui. That was very useful. I guess my question is, when policies come to the Policy Library Committee, how do we go about determining what’s in the purview of that committee vs. University Council? Is there some sort of a vetting process? It may be something that we just have to work out going forward.

R. Hunt: Well, and I’m not quite sure what you’re asking, the policy can originate from its normal place, let’s say Faculty Senate, for example. And then it would come to University Council. Well at the same time, it will be posted on the website.

L. Saborio: [inaudible]

R. Hunt: We don’t

Unidentified: [inaudible]

R. Hunt: No, we don’t have approve or deny. No, no, we don’t.
T. Arado: Becqui, can I interrupt for a second?

R. Hunt: Yes.

T. Arado: Whoever the original owner of the policy is will be the ultimate body that does it. But, whether it is a UC-driven policy or a provost-driven policy, it will go through the Policy Library Committee, regardless of its origin. The only thing that won’t go through that are things that are in the Constitution and Bylaws, because there is a set procedure already in place for the approval, the renewal of all of those.

R. Hunt: Any other questions? Okay, thank you. [applause]

C. McCord: So this is a day I will cherish – I am not only filling in for President Freeman, I am also filling in for the dean of students, Kelly Wesener Michael. So I’m playing three roles today. I rarely have that opportunity, so I’m going to enjoy it.

You may remember that last spring, issues came before University Council involving the university’s student code of conduct and the procedures surrounding that. In response to the concerns that were raised, I charged Kelly Wesener Michael, as dean of students, to convene a working group to review those policies. We wanted to insure that we had a student code of conduct, and policies for implementing it, that were appropriately grounded in principle and also appropriately operationalized. That is, we wanted to make sure that their intent, their purpose, served the needs of the community, advanced the learning of our students. We also wanted to make sure in a practical vein that they were based on sound legal principals, based on best practices in the student affairs community, based on appropriate process.

So we formed a working group, and that working group worked over the fall, developed recommendations, which they brought back to Dr. Wesener Michael and myself. We have largely approved those recommendations. Many of them have been implemented. Others are now in the process of being implemented. Because this is an issue that came to University Council’s attention last spring, we wanted to report back to make you aware of how this conversation has moved forward to keep you informed.

I will cut to the chase – I will say that the review largely confirmed that the Student Conduct Office was operating on sound procedures, but that there certainly were opportunities for growth, both in our developing a more clear and more clearly articulated philosophy that undergirded its actions, and also some opportunities for process improvement. So as we go through this presentation, I’ll try to feature both.

The working group drew on an existing body, the Student Conduct Advisory Board, which the individuals aren’t enumerated, but draws on shared governance, draws on the student body, draws on appropriate departments that are concerned with student conduct. Again, this is a standing body. We also supplemented that body by bringing in voices of alumni, by making sure we engaged
outside experts where appropriate. At the end of the process, we presented – or not we, I beg your pardon – the working group presented its recommendations to Student Association leadership. And their feedback was incorporated into the final report.

There were some immediate enhancements that were made. To support students in the conduct process, conduct advisors were made available to help make sure students understood their opportunities, understood their responsibilities, understood how the student conduct process operated.

One of the issues that emerged last year was whether it was appropriate for conduct hearings to be conducted by a single hearing officer or by a hearing board. We did not abolish the option of a single hearing officer, but student organizations that are involved in the student conduct case now have the option. They can elect either a single hearing officer or a board at their discretion.

The third item is reference – some of you may remember last spring, issues about a software program, a database, that the university uses, provided by a company called Maxient. It’s a software that allows the university to record all student conduct issues and track them. And one of the features of that involves notifying people in, say Student Affairs, in Athletics, in various offices across campus, notifying those individuals when students appear in the Maxient database. They might be notified because the student was – I think the proper language is a respondent – that is somebody facing a conduct charge. That student might appear in the database because they are a claimant, somebody bringing a concern against another student. They might appear in the database simply because they’re a witness. It’s not a database of students who are all respondents. It’s a database of students who are involved in student conduct in any capacity.

The task force looking at this found that basically our use of Maxient is the norm across campuses nationwide. We don’t use it in a way any different than anyone else does. What we’re doing differently is being clearer about notifying students about their presence – or the possibility that, should they be identified in a student conduct case, that their information may go into the Maxient system, that people may be notified about that. So we’re not changing practice of using Maxient. We are changing practice about making better disclosure about awareness into it.

So for example, all members of the Greek life community were made aware this fall of the Maxient system. All members of Athletics were made aware of it. So we’re making sure that we’re notifying people about the use of the system.

The last immediate impact that’s on this slide, the changes to the social events policies, this was actually a parallel, related effort launched by the Student Association to review the social events policy. So this was very much a student-driven update to the policy that ran parallel to, rather than part of, the working group.

There is an effort to look, not just at practical issues, but to look at some of the more principled issues. What are some of the guiding principles that inform student conduct? And one of the findings of the working group was that, while NIU Student Conduct Office does, indeed, have guiding principles that inform them as student professionals, they don’t articulate those in any clearly stated way that makes those principles known and makes them consistently available.
One of the principles that does undergird student conduct is the effort that we recognize that individual students or student organizations ultimately have responsibility for their actions. But we are an educational institution, and where we can, we should always seek to educate as part of the process. So what are the educational principles that are part of student conduct? That was one set of concerns. The other was: Where are the opportunities for what sometimes is called restorative justice? Restorative justice looks at the issue of: If my conduct causes you harm, if you will, punishing me is one thing. But insuring that I take steps to repair the damage that I did to you, that’s a different thing. So one of the things that we looked at was: What were the opportunities for really incorporating principles of restorative justice, as well as education, into the guiding principles underneath the student conduct. And we wanted this to be not only, if I may say it this way, not only the sort of be-there, philosophically, but to be grounded in research, to be grounded in student development theory, to be grounded in empirical understanding of what actually works.

So we recognize – I’m sorry, I keep saying we – the task force has observed to the leadership, and the leadership has agreed with them. Understand that that’s what I mean when I say, “we.” That there needs to be a set of guiding principles for the Student Conduct Office, needs to be grounded in principles, and then needs to be validated by evidence. So there needs to be an ongoing assessment of: Do the sanctions, which are ultimately the consequences that flow from student conduct evaluations, do those sanctions actually appear to be effective? Well, effective at what? At modifying harmful behavior. Student Conduct is doing its work best if it is either preventing or changing harmful behavior, either harmful to others or harmful to oneself. So that’s the ultimate goal.

Changes in the philosophy, the guiding principles, are being developed. Those will ultimately feed into the Student Code of Conduct. Changes to the Student Code of Conduct, of course, have to go through a careful process. The Student Conduct Advisory Board has to review them. Legal Office has to review them. We’re still absorbing the mindset of the Policy Library, so whether these will be within the scope of the Policy Library is something we’ll also evaluate. My apologies for leaving it off the slide. And then, ultimately, authority for the Student Code of Conduct has been designated by the president to the dean of students.

So this slide just sort of rounds up this portion of the evaluation, which has to do with really building a set of guiding principles and, of course, in the modern world, your guiding principles don’t do any good if you don’t put them on your website. So we want to make sure that the Student Conduct Office has clearly informed people of its principles and its practices. We want to make sure that the Student Conduct Office website is clear, user friendly. And we want to make sure that student feedback is invoked to validate whether a we’re actually providing clear, understandable information. I think there’s an acknowledgement in that, that the current website is not effective in providing those tools to students and change will be beneficial to help do that.

At the same time that this urge to create guiding principles, build around restorative justice, build around education, while ultimately recognizing, again, that individuals and organizations must ultimately be responsible. And so restorative justice and education are part of the picture. But at the end of the day, there have to be sanctions – may still include things that are more experiencing the natural consequences of one’s actions.
At the same time, we’ve looked hard at practices. One practice that has been recommended, and we have accepted the recommended changes – right now when individuals are found responsible, there’s a $25 fine. We don’t want anything that creates the appearance that people are being found responsible in order to generate the fine. We don’t want anything that implies there’s a quote, like speeding tickets, where you’ve got to generate enough of them to pay the bills. So we’re eliminating the $25 fine that’s automatically attached to being found responsible.

This does not mean that in all cases fines and fees will be eliminated. But that base fine – if you’re found responsible, you’re fined $25, that will be eliminated. In their feedback from the students, they made it clear that where there are fines, which are sometimes imposed on an organization in a particular situation, they want more transparency about what did that fine go to. How was the fine used to restorative justice? Why was that money spent in order to fix something that was damaged, maybe literally physically, maybe in some other sense damaged. But how is that fine being used for restorative purposes, rather than just to pay somebody’s bills?

The students noted that there were a number of situations where the process seemed lengthy, where there were long pauses where nothing seemed to happen. Very often behind the scenes what’s happening is that that individual, let’s say that hearing officer, is working a number of other cases and can’t get to this one. And so Student Affairs has made the determination to reallocate a staff member to work these issues in order to move students through these processes more quickly, not leave them hanging.

The other piece here is that restorative justice efforts take more effort. You have to work with people. You have to help them understand what the process is that is expected of them. You have to monitor whether they are responding to those expectations. You have to engage them more. It takes more staff time to do that. And so another part of the commitment of moving an additional staff member into this area is to enable the staff to manage those more time-consuming approaches.

On the whole, the finding is that the procedures being used in investigating cases are in line with national standards and are appropriate. But there are a few places where there are some improvements that were identified. One is – this gets a little technical – there are instances where an individual or an organization might have multiple related charges brought against them. And the question is: Should those be treated, for the purposes of hearing, for the purposes of sanction, as one thing or as multiple things? And this becomes consequential in a system where, if you are considered to have previous violations, the sanction for a given violation can escalate, because you have previous violations. If the previous violation was something that happened the day before and the day before that. If each of those is treated as a previous violation that then stack up, not only do you have multiple violations instead of one. But the sanctions can escalate as a result of that. I’m not sure I said that very well, but that’s what this is referring to. So the recognition was that there needs to be more latitude granted to hearing officials to recognize that sometimes those multiple related instances really needed to be treated as one situation, managed as one situation, and if found necessary, sanctioned as one situation, not multiple.

The other change they wanted to make is to make sure that they’re very clearly informing students of their rights and responsibilities in the process. Make sure that, for example, there are often hearings where multiple students are interviewed at the same time. One of the practices is to require
students to check their mobile devices during those hearings. That’s a practice in place, because there can be instances where students are texting to each other during the hearing, “Here’s what you need to say.” And the concern is that, if we’re going to expect you to check your mobile devices during the hearing so that they’re not in use, we need to clearly message those sorts of things. If you have the right to either require or request no to be recorded, we need to clearly communicate that to you up front. So whether or not social media posts are considered valid evidence. So there is sort of a community of practice in Student Affairs over these issues. We want to make sure that, when students are in a hearing situation, they’re clearly informed of what the expectations are, what their rights and responsibilities are.

Another issue is this current Code of Conduct identifies minimum sanctions for a given situation. And what has emerged is: When there is a mandated minimum sanction, that means that the hearing officials have significantly less discretion over saying, “Yes this is technically falls under this rubric, but the minimum sanction really doesn’t seem appropriate in this situation. It seems excessive. But I am mandated by the Code of Conduct that that is the minimum sanction. That’s the least I can impose.” That’s our current structure. We’re moving that to, instead of articulating minimum sanctions, recommended sanctions – baseline that can be deflected either up if the situation is more serious, or down if less serious.

When you afford more discretion like that, that lets you be more nuanced. It lets you be more sensitive to the individual situation. It risks that you become less consistent. It risks that different hearing officials looking at similar cases in different moments will have different sanctions, and that there will be inequities. So in order to make sure to guard against that, at the same time that hearing officials are being given more discretion, there needs to be training; and there needs to be regular check-ins, regular comparing of notes to insure that there is consistency. You know, for faculty, in much the same way that you, when you’re doing a multi-section course and you’re doing grading, you need to calibrate your grading to make sure you’re all on the same standard.

Finally, there is an appeal process. The current protocols have allowed the director of the Student Conduct Office to be the appeal officer. We’re moving away from that to avoid the potential conflict of interest. And the hearing officials who will be designated as appeals agents will be outside of the Student Conduct Office. This again will be clearly indicated on the website with, we hope, user-friendly and accessible information about how these processes operate.

In the main, I think that the task force has brought back recommendations which in both spirit and substance try to move the student conduct process to a process that engages and provides opportunities for improvement, for education, for restorative justice, while still recognizing that at the end of the day, there has to be responsibility. I think both the philosophy they’re moving toward and the practices that they’re moving toward, reinforce that. And I think that is very much in the spirit of where NIU is seeking to be as a learning opportunity that looks for the needs and concerns of its students.

Questions or comments?

**M. Falkoff:** I didn’t come prepared to talk about this, but as it happens, I used to be on the Student Conduct Board and the Student Conduct Advisory Board about ten years ago. And this used to be a
hobby horse of mine. So I just want to make a couple of observations or maybe ask a couple of questions.

So first of all, what kind of student involvement was there in working up the new procedures and policies, because this is really important to students, even if they don’t realize it until they’re charged with something.

**C. McCord:** The task force drew from the Student Conduct Advisory Board, which had defined student membership in it. And then there was also – as the recommendations were developed, they were brought to the Student Association leadership for feedback.

**M. Falkoff:** And again just the process, does the broader community have an opportunity to see the changes and make comments? Or is it – I don’t think there’s another opportunity for that to happen, is that right? Like me, for example, do I get to look at it?

**C. McCord:** Correct.

**M. Falkoff:** Okay. I just want to make a couple of observations then. When I was involved in this process, we often were reminded that this process was fundamentally educational. And I personally found that a little bit odd, because from the student’s perspective, this was a disciplinary procedure that they were facing, and they face real sanctions if they were found responsible for their activities. I rarely saw much in the way of educational development on the part of the students. And perhaps this is changing things and it will be a little bit more educational, but I just think it’s a little bit misleading to think of it that way. So I just want to make that observation.

I was also concerned a decade ago when I was on these boards that students were sometimes being – well I thought with some frequency – being over-charged or charged with offenses, for lack of a better word, I’m not sure what the proper terminology is, not out of any kind of venality, but maybe just because the folks who were in charge of the charging decisions maybe themselves didn’t quite understand the elements of the offenses that they students were being charged with. And it seems like that’s not something that was discussed in this process, is that right?

**C. McCord:** That did not particularly come up. It’s somewhat related to the issue I described, if you will, stacking of multiple instances. That’s a particular instance of over-charging.

**M. Falkoff:** Again, just because the issue came up, I can’t help myself, I’m literally reading a memo that I wrote about 10 years ago. One thing I noticed is that students who were charged under these processes really did not understand the nature of the adjudication that they were facing. I’m sure they had had it described to them, but again, sitting as the quasi-jury on these cases, the students didn’t really have a strong sense of what was going on. Again, I’m just making these observations, and I’m offering them in the spirit that, if we were able to see the particular recommendations that are being made, perhaps we could recommend something different. Now I understand that there were Student Conduct Advisory Board members who were responsible for doing that, so I’m not insisting on it or anything, I’m just making that suggestion.
And one more point, and again just because we’re in public and I can make this point, during training sessions – and I don’t know if this still goes on – but we were, as Student Conduct Board members, we were repeatedly told that this was not a criminal proceeding, the rules of evidence do not apply in this proceeding, this is something totally different, which is, of course, absolutely the truth. There’s no doubt about that. I had a concern. I expressed it multiple times. I don’t know if things have changed. But I just want to make the point that the fact that normal rules of evidence that you’d have in a criminal trial don’t apply, hearsay can be used, for example, is not inappropriate, but it’s an accommodation to the system. And it’s something that makes the system somewhat less trustworthy. And it’s not something that should be celebrated. It’s something that should perhaps be tolerated. Again, I guess it’s simply because having seen that this process has now happened, this is the kind of thing that I personally I think is very important. I think it’s very important to the students. I don’t know how aware the student bodies were that these procedures might affect them, so I know this is Monday morning quarterbacking, but I still just wanted to make those points. Thanks.

C. McCord: Thank you. Other comments? Tristan?

T. Martin: Just had a few. What will the implementation of this new procedure look like?

C. McCord: If there’s anything that’s formal in the Student Code of Conduct, my understanding is that it has to be approved and implemented and, if you will, rather like the university catalog, is implemented on an annual basis. So I think that things that rise to the level of being encoded in the Student Code of Conduct have to go through the approval process and then be promulgated. Things that were strictly procedural issues within the Conduct Office, most of those have already been implemented.

T. Martin: Thank you. I yield for now.

C. McCord: Any other comments. All right. Thank you. And I will now turn it over to President Freeman to turn over to Therese.

L. Freeman: I want to apologize for being late. It is certainly not in disrespect of shared governance. But the university presidents and chancellors were asked to appear in Springfield at two press conferences to support our request for operating funds and capital investment in our campuses. And I felt that it would be inappropriate for NIU not to be represented. I will say I did time this very well so that I am taking over the meeting and resuming the gavel right at the point where I turn to the executive secretary and say, take it from here, Therese.

T. Arado: Thank you, President Freeman. I hope you had a good time in Springfield. I’m glad to see you had a safe trip back up.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

T. Arado: So we are on to our Consent Agenda, and we have nothing under that.
VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Linda Saborío – report

T. Arado: So that moves us to Reports From Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. So the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE, Linda.

L. Saborío: Good afternoon. I left my office in a hurry to get here, and I have no notes so here we go, this will be fun. Our April FAC meeting was held at Bradley University in Peoria. We had the opportunity to speak with the provost, and he did talk to us about the decision of Bradley University to go through Program Prioritization. They decided to look to NIU as a model, in particular when it came to defining the criteria for the Program Prioritization process. And he did specify that they are trying to be transparent and provide ample opportunity for feedback from the campus university.

We then met with the Illinois State Senator from Peoria, whose name I cannot recall, so I’m going to refer to him as Senator One. Senator One talked to us about budget, pension, and the need for additional revenue in the state. Three things that he mentioned, in terms of revenue, were: betting, I think it was something to do with sports betting; an increase in the gas tax; and the new state income tax. And that concludes my understanding of what we talked about with Senator One.

Then we met in our caucus groups. And the public university caucus was asked to identify three individuals who may be interested in serving on the IBHE as the faculty rep on the IBHE. So we had two individuals who volunteered. And the third one, we had to twist her arm a bit. We chose someone from Illinois State, Chicago State University, and then the third one was Western [Illinois] University. And their names will be forwarded to the IBHE as potential candidates for the seat, the faculty rep seat, on the IBHE.

And then we concluded our day in our working groups. Once again, I’m with the P-20 initiatives. We are in the process of collecting data from higher education institutions all across the state of Illinois. A lot of questions coming in from individuals who are looking to contribute to our project. And we do hope to provide a preliminary report at the June 4 meeting. The IBHE is meeting here at NIU. It’s going to be a very preliminary report. And then this summer, we’re going to move forward with creating our interactive map.

So if you know of anyone who may be interested in collaborating with individuals at Northwestern and DePaul, in terms of creating this interactive map. Or perhaps even a grad student who is not aware of what he or she is getting into, please feel free to contact me. We’re going to need a little bit of guidance here, as far as developing this interactive map. And I do know that we have someone at DePaul who’s going to be helping us with that as well.

Our next meeting is going to be down in Springfield. The meeting in May is when we go to Springfield. We have a day when we meet with legislators. We have a liaison person who is setting that up for us so that we can meet with individual reps in the state, and senators, down in Springfield. And then the next day we have our meeting.
Any questions for me? Anybody know the name of the senator? I feel bad about calling him One. Thank you. [applause]

**T. Arado:** Thanks, Linda.

- **B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report**
  - Holly Nicholson, Catherine Doederlein, Therese Arado
  - Alex Gelman, Sarah Marsh, Kendall Thu

**T. Arado:** The next item is University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees committees don’t meet until next Thursday, May 9. But if you haven’t seen it in the papers yet, we do have two new trustees coming on to the board. Are they technically on the board already? I don’t know the right wording.

**L. Freeman:** They’re not confirmed by the senate, but they’ve been appointed. And they’ll be sworn in at the next board meeting.

**T. Arado:** And that is Rita Athas and Montel Gayles. And then also John Butler and Robert Pritchard will be returning to the board. Tim Struthers is no longer going to serve on the board. Rita Athas and Montel Gayles are taking the spots of Tim Struthers and Wheeler Coleman, who did not seek reappointment. So that’s my extent of UAC to the BOT.

- **C. Academic Policy Committee – Vicki Collins, Chair – no report**

- **D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Jim Wilson, Chair – no report**

- **E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – report**
  1. **Election of 2019-20 Executive Secretary of University Council per NIU Bylaws, Article 14.5**

**Kendall Thu**

**T. Arado:** Our next report is from Rules, Governance and Elections. Richard?

**R. Siegesmund:** It is time to elect the 2019-2020 executive secretary of University Council, who also serves as the president of Faculty Senate. We will use our clickers for this election. I notice that we’ve had some members come in since the quorum vote, so please get your clickers now. We are following Article 14.5 of the Bylaws that makes it clear that University Council is either to accept or reject the candidate that has been put forward from Faculty Senate. And that final nominee for the office of 2019-2020 for the executive secretary of University is Kendall Thu. And his letter of acceptance is included in your agenda package.

As chair of the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, I would like to move to accept the nomination, to close the nominations, and to approve the election of Kendall to this position. And can I have a second for that motion? [R. Scherer seconded.] You got that, Pat? Okay, thank you. Is t
here discussion? Hearing none, I would like to move to a vote, so Pat’s ready. So 1 or A is yes to accept the nomination of Kendall Thu. Two or B is no. And 3 or C is abstain.

Has everyone voted? Then let’s close the poll. Congratulations to Kendall Thu. [applause]

Yes – 32
No – 8
Abstain – 3

T. Arado: Thank you, Richard, and congratulations, Kendall. I hope you have a fabulous year next year.

F. University Affairs Committee – Hamid Bateni, Chair – no report

G. Student Association – report
   Khiree Cross, President
   Tristan Martin, Speaker of the Senate

T. Arado: Our next report is from the Student Association, Khiree and Tristan?

T. Martin: Greetings everyone. I apologize – my colleague cannot be here. Unfortunately, I believe he had some sort of meeting. But you get me today. Thank you everyone. I hope that you are all doing well. Since the last time that I was up here, a lot of things have happened. First off, from our University Council meeting on April 3, right after that meeting I actually had a few of my colleagues and I meet with the City of DeKalb to plan a few things for the future. Moving forward, I believe that there will be efforts for the Student Association to work alongside the City of DeKalb and members of administration here at NIU to insure that the 2020 census accurately accounts for students living in DeKalb, because of this meeting that we had that Wednesday. I’m looking forward to having that move forward. I know I’ve let our speaker-elect, Ian Pearson, in on that, so that he will be working with the City of DeKalb.

I want to announce that we have also elected our president-elect for the 51st session. And I would like to congratulate Naomi Bolden on being elected. So please join me in a round of applause for her. [applause] Congratulations.

Additionally, the Student Association was represented during NIU Cares Day, and we want to thank everyone who was able to attend. I know we didn’t organize the events or anything like that, but it really just shows that NIU does care. We greatly appreciated the presence, and we were happy to be able to help others around the community. Personally, I, along with a few of my colleagues, worked at the DeKalb gardens location next to the Annie Glidden North, further north of here. I believe there was a lot of work accomplished, and it really felt well with me after the day was done.

A couple of others things. We had our student choice awards yesterday. We were able to have a decent amount of turnout for that. We were able to congratulate student organizations and students that were recognizable for their work that they have been doing over the past year.
Additionally, we also had our NIU Advocacy Day. Thank you to everyone who was able to attend. I think it was a really, really strong presence. It was a really good thing for us to have done. I know that we didn’t have as many students as we had wanted; but we from the student side were greatly appreciative of all of the things that we were able to get accomplished. Seems that they were in caucus a lot. They had a lot of committee meetings, so we weren’t able to meet with everyone that we wanted to. But I think everyone that I talked to, met with at least one legislator, so I consider it a success, especially since we lobbied on behalf of higher education for some of the gains that NIU was hoping to make, some of the things that President Freeman was talking about for her press conference that happened this morning, were things that we were lobbying for yesterday. So I’m really happy for that.

Beyond that, a lot of the month of April has just been transitioning from the old 50th session to the new 51st session. We’ve been working on that and making sure that that transition is as smooth and seamless as possible.

There were a couple of things that the Student Association has been doing, or the senate, specifically, has been doing, as well. We had a fairly large agenda the last Sunday that we met, April 28. And as seen in the Northern Star, the senate passed with unanimous approval, the Student Association Resolution #50067. And it was a resolution to urge NIU to move forward – well to move the Disability Resource Center to a more accessible location on campus. I want to stress today the importance of this resolution. The way that I understand that making physical change on campus isn’t as easy as simply passing a resolution through the student body government. And though I understand that I am leaving office shortly as this is my last University Council meeting, I hope to see advancement on this issue. There have been a number of complaints that I have received throughout the year sporadically about the lack of accessibility within the DRC. I can put it into terms like this: One senator during discussion and debate on that resolution even said, “It’s kind of ironic that there are points at which the Disability Resource Center is inaccessible.” And I want to see that issue pushed forward.

Finally, I want to give a thank you to everyone in this room. As I graduate within the next few weeks, I have plans to pursue graduate school within Washington, D.C., as I am a political science major hoping to pursue international relations. But serving as the Student Association speaker of the senate has been a roller coaster of an adventure, and I am extremely humbled and grateful for all of the interactions that I have had with members of this body and other members of shared governance over the past year. I know that things haven’t really been perfect per se, but I am happy to say that we are making progress towards issues that have been continually covered up in the past. And I hope that everyone here does realize that, as individuals, as stated, the Student Association isn’t just student government. We are the advocacy of students on campus. And I’m happy to have been able to represent that. The physical, tangible change that we have attempted to embark upon this year, I will hope that change moves further than just any one organization with just any one fraternity, sorority or anything else. So with that being said, to all members of this spectacular university, and from one Huskie to another, I thank you. And I will yield. [applause]

Are there any questions for me? Seeing none, thank you.

**T. Arado:** Thank you, Tristan.
H. Operating Staff Council – Holly Nicholson, President – report

T. Arado: Our next report will be from Operating Staff Council, Holly?

H. Nicholson: First I’m going to take a page from Cathy’s book at Board of Trustees, and say, “ditto” to her comments about the faculty referendum. And I’m hoping she’ll allow me to work with her over the summer in drafting that language. So thank you for saying that.

I want to also say congratulations to Kendall, and thank Therese for your excellent leadership this year. It’s really been wonderful to work with you, and you’ll be missed.

Also I appreciated the opportunity to serve the past few years on University Council, and the other opportunities that serving on this body has allowed me to be a part of. And I hope to serve again in the future.

Our election for Operating Staff Council is coming up in the next few days. And on July 11, we’ll elect new officers, and new representatives to University Council.

I also want to announce the winners of our Operating Staff Outstanding Service Award. I’m sorry, I always forget the name of the award – the Outstanding Service Award for Operating Staff. We have four winners: Ron Barshinger from the libraries, Ellen Cabrera from Public Administration, Marjory Holliday from Psychology, and Patricia Kee from Leadership, Education Psychology and Foundations. These are just excellent, excellent people and colleagues. And we’re thankful for their service to NIU.

And then finally, I want to acknowledge our scholarship recipients. We were able to give two scholarships this year. First is Sam Hancock, and he is the son of Barb Hancock in Housing and Residential Services. And Maggie Rapp, who is the daughter of David Rapp from Campus Dining Services. So we’re very excited to be able to award those. Feel free to come to – I don’t know if it’s open – but May 7 is when we’re going to acknowledge all of these people publicly and give out our service awards. So we look forward to that. Thank you.

T. Arado: Thanks, Holly.

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Catherine Doederlein, President – report

T. Arado: And if you can, pass the microphone over to Cathy.

C. Doederlein: I’m pretty sure that Holly was cheating and copied my notes. So I want to congratulate Kendall on his election to the role of Faculty Senate president and do also want to thank Therese for her hard work in her role this year. You’ve been incredibly collaborative, thoughtful, engaged, and a great advocate, not only for faculty, but also for staff. And it’s much appreciated.

We are less far along in our election process, because, as I mentioned last time, our numbers seem to be a moving target. So it makes it harder to figure out proportional representation and all of those
good things. But we are moving forward with still the goal and effort to have our new council members elected as of our July meeting, because we do meet over the summer.

And the only other note I have is that Senator One is David Kohler.

H. Nicholson: If you don’t mind, can I let the record show that I don’t participate in cheating or plagiarism. [laughter]

C. Doederlein: Duly noted. Thank you.

T. Arado: Thank you, Cathy.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

T. Arado: We have nothing under Unfinished Business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Temporary appointment timeline waiver request per NIU Bylaws, Article 19.5.2.2
Janet Hathaway, Acting Associate Dean, College of Visual and Performing Arts
Paul Kassel, Dean, College of Visual and Performing Arts

T. Arado: We have a couple of things under New Business, the first of which is a temporary appointment timeline waiver request from Dean Kassel. Dean Kassel is not here today, so I am taking on a role like Provost McCord just did, and I’m going to play Dean Kassel right now. And what he has requested is the temporary appointment timeline waiver for the position Dr. Hathaway is currently in. She was appointed to the position of acting associate dean on July 1, 2018. And per Article 19.5.2.2, is requesting a waiver of the timeline restriction outlined in Article 19.5.2. Dr. Hathaway reports directly to Dean Kassel as the dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts. And after a discussion with the College Senate on April 1, 2019, and through electronic discussion via email with the College Council completed by April 1, 2019, the continuance of the acting appointment was recommended unanimously by both groups.

Therefore, I am making a motion to waive the timeline – I have temporary appointment timeline waiver written down here – to waive the timeline per Bylaw Article 19.5.2.2. May I have a second? Richard [Siegesmund] has seconded there. Is there any discussion of this?

All those in favor of waiving the timeline, say aye.

Members: Aye.

T. Arado: And any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, the motion passes. Thank you.
T. Arado: The second item under New Business is the student grievance annual report. And this year in the UC office, we had two student grievances filed. One was withdrawn. One was presented to the Student Grievance Panel [Committee], and they concluded their work in the early part of this year. That’s it.

I think that brings us to the end of our New Business.

XI. INFORMATION ITEMS

T. Arado: I love Pat – I just want to get that on the record. If anyone hadn’t noticed, there were extra refreshments out in the hallway for this meeting. I’d like to thank President Freeman for providing those for us. Thank you very much. She’s always very thoughtful – she’s always very thoughtful, but also recognizes that the end of the year, that something a little special kind of makes the day a little better. So thank you very much – I appreciate it.

And I want to thank you all for a great year. I’m just taking advantage of this now. It has been a great experience, one I will not soon forget, probably not ever forget. So thank you very much, and I wish you all well. And I’m going to give it back to President Freeman to conclude our meeting.

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, Student Senate
M. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
N. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
O. Minutes, University Benefits Committee
P. Minutes, Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
Q. Minutes, University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure
R. Documents, Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE
T. UC 2019-20 dates: Sep 11, Oct 16, Nov 6, Dec 4, Jan 29, Feb 26, Apr 1, Apr 29

XII. ADJOURNMENT

L. Freeman: Before I ask for a motion to adjourn and invite everybody out to the refreshments in the hallway, I also want to add my congratulations to Dr. Thu on his election. Congratulations,
Kendall. I look forward to working with you. And I want to express my thanks to the number of really dedicated shared governance leaders who are going to be leaving this body, at least temporarily.

Thank you, Holly, very much for your service. Thank you, Linda, for your service. We’re really going to miss your travelogues as you go along. And I hope the next faculty representative has as colorful a communication style as you do. Pat, we would completely remiss if we didn’t thank you for making sure University Council happens and continues to happen. Ferald and Sarah, we appreciate your consulting as parliamentarians when needed. Therese, you’ve just done an amazing job as the Faculty Senate president and the University Council executive secretary. It’s been an honor and a pleasure to work with you. And I also want to acknowledge acting executive vice president and provost, Chris McCord, who will be completing his term at the end of this academic year, the beginning of the next fiscal year. You can really judge the integrity of a person who steps up when there is a great need, and no one else stepping forward to fill it, and who embraces the role, and does everything asked and more. And I’d like to acknowledge Chris for his many, many contributions to the university during his term of service. And let’s give all of those folks, and ourselves, a big hand. [applause]

And with that, I will ask for a motion to adjourn.

**H. Nicholson:** So moved.

**L. Freeman:** So moved, Nicholson. It’s going to be her parting gift to us. Second?

**J. Wilson:** Second.

**L. Freeman:** Second, all right. All those in favor, vote with your feet. Thank you and have a great summer, and we’ll see you back in the fall.

Meeting adjourned at 4:14 p.m.