

FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES](#) OF THE NOVEMBER 19, 2014 FS MEETING

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. NIU Smoke Free Campus Task Force [draft policy](#) – Dean Derryl Block – Page 4
- B. [Budget Overview and Program Prioritization](#) – Provost Lisa Freeman
- C. Open Access to Research Articles Act (OARAA) Task Force – Gleb Sirotkin – [report](#) – Pages 5-6
- D. Proposed curricular committee revisions – Bill Pitney

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

- A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy [Award](#) – call for nominations – Page 7
Written letters of nomination should be submitted to Faculty Senate President William Pitney no later than noon Monday, February 9, 2015.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report
[November 21, 2014](#) – Page 8
[December 12, 2014](#) – Pages 9-10
[January 16, 2015](#) – walk-in
- B. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, Faculty Senate liaison to UBC – [report](#) – Page 11
- C. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – no report
- D. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and William Pitney – no report

- E. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shortridge – no report
- F. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Dan Gebo – no report
- G. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Greg Waas – no report
- H. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee – William Pitney – report [November 14, 2014](#) – Page 12
- I. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – William Pitney – report [November 17, 2014](#) – Page 13
- J. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Paged 14-15

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – no report
- C. Economic Status of the Profession – George Slotsve, Chair – no report
- D. Rules and Governance – Gary Baker, Chair – no report
- E. Resources, Space and Budget – Stephen Tonks, Liaison/Spokesperson – [report](#) – Pages 16-24
- F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair
 - 1. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the President of Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of University Council – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 7](#) and NIU Bylaws, [Article 14.6.3.10](#) – Pages 25-26
 - 2. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Article 7](#) and NIU Bylaws, [Article 14.6.3.10](#) – Pages 27-28

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- A. Faculty Senate's role in the curricular process

XII. 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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

EXECUTIVE: 01/14/15
STEERING: 01/14/15
FACULTY SENATE: 01/21/15
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL: 01/28/15

NIU Smoke Free Campus Task Force draft policy

As of July 1, 2015, and in accord with the Smoke Free Campus Act, smoking and tobacco use are prohibited on all Campus Property owned, leased, occupied or otherwise controlled by Northern Illinois University, both indoors and outdoors, in university-owned vehicles, and privately-owned vehicles parked on Campus Property. The advertising, sale, or free sampling of tobacco products is also prohibited on campus property.

This policy applies to all individuals, including but not limited to students, faculty, staff, other employees, contractors, subcontractors, vendors, volunteers, visitors, guests, and members of the public and is applicable 24 hours a day seven days a week.

This prohibition does not include (1) smoking associated with a recognized approved religious ceremony, ritual, or activity by American Indians and (2) tobacco use that is exclusively conducted for the purpose of approved medical or scientific research.

The prohibition includes carrying, smoking, burning, inhaling, exhaling, of any kind of lighted pipe, cigar, cigarette, cigarillo, bidi, kretek, hookah, marijuana, weed, herbs, electronic cigarettes, or other lighted smoking equipment. Also prohibited are chewing tobacco (also known as spit tobacco), snuff, and dissolvable tobacco products pressed into shapes such as tablets or sticks.

[Smoke Free Illinois Act](#)

Report of the Northern Illinois University Open Access to Research Articles Act Taskforce

In compliance with provisions of the *Open Access to Research Articles Act*, Illinois Public Act 098-0295, this report is submitted to the Northern Illinois University Board of Trustees, to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, to both chambers of the Illinois General Assembly and to the Governor of the state of Illinois from the Northern Illinois University Open Access to Research Articles Act Task Force.

The text of Public Act 098-0295 has ten specific issues that were to be addressed as well as the issue to “design a proposed policy regarding open access to research articles, based on criteria that are specific to each public university’s needs”.

1. The Northern Illinois University task force has designed such a policy in the document: **Open Access for NIU produced published journal articles**. This policy needs to be approved by the Northern Illinois University Academic Senate [**currently this is pending**].
2. In this policy, there is no restriction on where authors choose to publish the results of their research; there is no limitation, real or perceived, on the academic freedom of the individual author. What is being requested is that authors retain their copyright to their works, rather than turning over the copyright to the commercial publisher so that at a time of the author’s designation or that of the publisher of their article, the article can be exposed to the World Wide Web through deposit into NIU’s Institutional Repository *Huskie Commons*.
3. The reporting and oversight of the policy will be the responsibility of the Northern Illinois University Academic Senate in cooperation and conjunction with the Northern Illinois University Libraries and the *Huskie Commons* administrator.
4. As Northern Illinois University already has developed an institutional repository in *Huskie Commons*, the up-front cost of its creation has been absorbed by the University Libraries. Maintenance of *Huskie Commons* for the duration, especially in light of PA 098-0295 will require a commitment upon the part of Northern Illinois University for personnel and material costs, unless or until these costs are covered by the State of Illinois for the purpose of enforcement of this act.
5. There does exist opportunities for collaboration between public universities for use and maintenance of repositories, and for long term digital preservation. CODSULI (the Council of Directors of State University Libraries in Illinois) is a pre-existing group that could be utilized to explore opportunities for collaboration and cost sharing. Currently it has no such charge.
6. Use of scholarly repositories is twofold. In an open scholarly repository materials that are ingested are also exposed to search engines and web crawlers for discovery. Materials can also be deposited that are accessible only through a security log-on; this follows the standard of access to commercial journal content; it is password secured. Finally, materials can be deposited that are not retrievable by the public, but only by the IR administrator. Sensitive records could be preserved in this scenario. In short an IR can be used for a variety of means and purposes.

7. In the long run, it is less expensive to pay a fee for Gold open access for a single article than to subscribe to an online commercial publisher journal that may have one download per fiscal year. That said, it has to be noted that among open access journals, only about 1/3 of open access journals are “Gold” and charge a fee, the majority of open access publications have no fee. As the business model for publishing changes with the advent of open access, it is somewhat understandable that some publishers will charge an up-front publication fee to replace subscription fees. However, if this becomes the norm, then there will still exist a “pay-wall” that will restrict scholarly communication.
8. Other than getting down to the granular level when it comes to content and composition of academic journal articles, the major difference in publishing is whether the medium for dissemination of research and scholarship should be through journal articles, conference papers, or monographs. As the pending FASTR (Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act) legislation does not include laboratory notes, preliminary data analyses, author notes, phone logs, or other information used to produce the final manuscript; classified research, research that results in works that generate revenue or royalties for the author (such as books), or patentable discoveries to the extent necessary to protect copyright or a patent; and, works that are not accepted for journal publication, and PA 098-0295 only deals with published research articles, these difference do not need to be expounded in an open access policy other than to exclude them.
9. The preferred version of the research article that should be made publicly accessible is the same version that was published. If this is not possible, deposit of the pre-print version with its permanent link to the published article will be the version used.
10. Determination of which research should be covered should be determined by the Faculty Senate in conjunction with the faculty whose work is being considered.

EXECUTIVE: 01/14/15 STEERING: FACULTY SENATE: 01/21/15 UNIVERSITY COUNCIL: REFER TO:
--

Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award

The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award recognizes an NIU faculty member for special service to the faculty.

Written letters of nominations, identifying the reasons why the nominee should receive the award, are to be submitted to Faculty Senate President William Pitney no later than noon Monday, February 9, 2015. Those letters will be included in the February 18, 2015 meeting agenda packet and the Faculty Senate will vote on the recipient.

Award recipients are commemorated on a permanent plaque displayed in the Holmes Student Center which includes the names of all recipients.

Bob Lane Award Recipients

Dave Ripley – 1995-1996

Ken Bowden – 1996-1997

Lorys Oddi – 1997-1998

Sherman Stanage – 1998-1999

Herbert Rubin – 1999-2000

Robert Suchner – 2000-2001

James King – 2001-2002

David Wagner – 2002-2003

Elizabeth Miller – 2003-2004

Joseph “Buck” Stephen – 2004-2005

Rosemary Feurer – 2009-2010

Charles Cappell – 2011-2012

Report on the IBHE-FAC Meeting, November 21, 2014

The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) met on November 21, 2014, at Oakton Community College (OCC).

FAC and IBHE Updates

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the FAC, Abbas Aminmansour (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign). Several special guests from OCC offered welcome and remarks, including Gloria Liu, Coordinator and Co-director of the Center for Promoting STEM, who introduced the Center's current work with undergraduate research courses, as well as recent accolades. Information on this Center can be accessed at the following site:

https://www.oakton.edu/academics/special_programs/stem/opportunities/student_opportunities/stem_mentor_program.php

Also, Dr. Michael Carr, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs presented on Achieving the Dream (AtD) at OCC. Carr discussed data gathered on demographics and student goals at OCC as well as recent efforts exploring the benefits of online and mandatory orientation sessions. Information on OCC's involvement in AtD can be accessed at the following site:

http://www.oakton.edu/about/student_success/atd.php

FAC members received an update via telephone from IBHE staff member Michael Afolayan. FAC members were reminded and encouraged to announce the IBHE Faculty Fellows program at their respective senates. The application and information for this program are available on the IBHE website:

<http://www.ibhe.org/Fellows/facultyFellows.htm>

Caucus Updates

The Public University Caucus is finalizing two resolutions: one on faculty governance and one on academic freedom. These are planned to be presented for consideration by the entire FAC at the December meeting.

Presentation on MAP Funding

Steven Rock (Western Illinois University) provided a brief overview of MAP funding. Updated information for students can be accessed at the ISAC site:

<http://www.isac.org/students/during-college/types-of-financial-aid/grants/monetary-award-program.html>

Respectfully submitted,

Sonya L. Armstrong
Associate Professor in the Department of Literacy and Elementary Education
NIU Representative to the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council

NOTE: Full meeting minutes, once approved, can be accessed at <http://www.ibhe-fac.org/Meetings.html>.

Report on the IBHE-FAC Meeting, December 12, 2014

The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) met on December 12, 2014, at the Illinois Association of School Boards office in Springfield.

FAC Updates

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the FAC, Abbas Aminmansour (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign). Roger Eddy, Executive Director of the Illinois Association of School Boards, offered welcome and remarks.

IBHE Updates

FAC members received an update from Assistant Director of Academic Affairs Michael Afolayan, who noted that the Academic Affairs Division at IBHE is fully staffed

Candace Mueller, Assistant Director of Advancement, External and Government Relations, reminded the group that there are higher education members on the new governor's transition team. She also reported that there was no higher education legislation in the veto session.

Alan Phillips, Executive Deputy Director of Planning and Budgeting, provided an update on IBHE planning and budget. He noted that the annual state appropriation to SURS is now about equal to the total funding for public universities and community colleges. He noted that the current pension funding system is not sustainable. The number paying into the pension system is not increasing while the number retiring is. A 10-15% budget reduction for higher education in FY16 is a real possibility. He also reported that a FY15 rescission is a possible.

Caucus Updates

The Public University Caucus met and discussed a resolution on Shared Governance. The Caucus talked about academic freedom and a position paper/resolution on this topic. Another interest is documenting specific examples of how the budget situation affects the quality of the student experience. Other topics of interest include the appropriateness of a 15-hour standard for full-time students and IBHE advocacy.

Presentation on Guided Pathways to Success (GPS)

James Applegate, Executive Director of IBHE presented on Guided Pathways to Success (GPS). As background, he referred to the *Public Agenda for College and Career Success* (2009) and the "60 by 2025" goal the *Public Agenda* can be found at the following site:

http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/masterplanning/materials/070109_PublicAgenda.pdf

Applegate noted that college attainment levels in Illinois have increased by 2% but affordability has declined. Gaps for underrepresented groups have not declined and there is a need for more aggressive methods to improve adult college completion, as one-fifth of the workforce has college credits but no credentials.

According to Applegate, Complete College America has outlined GPS and other game-changing strategies for states and campuses. "Game changers" include performance funding to focus on outcomes (completion) not enrollment, co-requisite remediation as an

alternative to the current system, increased state funding and improved campus efficiency is needed to achieve the goals of the *Public Agenda*, “15 to finish” (encourages full-time students to take 15 hours per semester and cap degree requirements at 120 for a bachelor’s degree and 60 for an associate’s degree), and block scheduling (times and days classes are offered). For more information on Complete College America’s “game changers,” see this site:

<http://www.completecollege.org/gameChangers.html>

Applegate noted where we are with GPS, where we need to be, and where we are going. He cited case studies of successful initiatives and the role of faculty. He also noted that for policy advocacy, the IBHE now has committees (action teams) around their four *Public Agenda* goals, one of which is featured at each meeting. A higher education legislative caucus is being set up, and Applegate reminded that everyone associated with higher education needs to speak with one voice in order to be effective. When asked what the FAC priorities should be, Applegate responded with the following:

1. Getting the GPS up and expanded with faculty engagement.
2. Getting the FAC involved in the advocacy piece.
3. Starting a conversation about higher education delivery system remodeling.

Conversation with Dave Tretter

Dave Tretter, President of the Federation of Illinois Private and Independent Colleges and Universities, offered his perspective on the state’s situation: it is up to faculty and institutions to make the case for why funding for higher education matters.

Presentation by Jennifer Delaney

Jennifer Delaney, recent IBHE Faculty Fellow, presented her findings on the impacts of guaranteed tuition policies. Three states have mandated these policies for four-year public universities; Illinois’ is the most comprehensive and has been in place since 2004. These policies front load a student’s tuition. The risk of inflation is shifted to risk-adverse institutions. Delaney looked at the impact between states that adopted this policy and states that didn’t, as well as before and after for the states that adopted. She found that guaranteed tuition policies lead to tuition costs that were 24% higher over the four years; there was also an increase in student fees. The disadvantages based on the findings outweigh the value of predictability.

Respectfully submitted,

Sonya L. Armstrong

Associate Professor in the Department of Literacy and Elementary Education
NIU Representative to the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council

NOTE: This report is based on the minutes taken at that meeting by IBHE FAC Secretary, Steven Rock (WIU). Full meeting minutes can be accessed at <http://www.ibhe-fac.org/Meetings.html>. Please see the full meeting minutes for a more detailed report of the discussions and presentations.

UNIVERSITY BENEFITS COMMITTEE

Abbreviated MINUTES for the meeting of November 20, 2014 (12:00 – 1:45, Altgeld 212)

- I. Pension – SURS representatives are hearing in Retirement counseling sessions that the change to pensions would not be effective until 7/1/15.
- II. The new Money Purchase formula would not take effect until 1/24/16
- III. Human Resources is consulting with SURS on what will happen to those faculty/staff who have already made retirement decisions. HR is also consulting with SURS on what publicity will surround the new dates
- IV. Metra Pre-tax Transit Benefits Proposal – there is continuing conversation with Bill Pittney. He is working to summarize with a cost/benefit analysis in a spreadsheet.
 - a. ACTION ITEM: Need to check into potential for increased bus service to/from Elburn
 - i. Feedback is needed on the real level of interest in utilizing the program
 - b. ACTION ITEM: Check into ability to purchase a parking pass at Elburn station. Maybe there is a group rate, could be pre-tax, or other discounts if sufficient level of interest.
- V. Discussed availability to payroll deduct gym membership dues. This deduction would not be pre-tax. If any employees are interested, a group of at least 25 faculty/staff is needed to begin the deduction. Contact HR for details.
- VI. The elective deferral (contribution) limit for employees who participate in 403(b) has increased from \$17,500 to \$18,000 for 2015. Reference: [http://www.irs.gov/uac/Newsroom/IRS-Announces-2015-Pension-Plan-Limitations-Taxpayers-May-Contribute-up-to-\\$18,000-to-their-401\(k\)-plans-in-2015](http://www.irs.gov/uac/Newsroom/IRS-Announces-2015-Pension-Plan-Limitations-Taxpayers-May-Contribute-up-to-$18,000-to-their-401(k)-plans-in-2015)
- VII. Annuitants Association Report (Spear)
 - a. Email for annuitants – will annuitants have access to email after conversion to Outlook? Yes, but the access will not be within the Outlook program. The software that annuitants will use has not yet been determined. Spear will have an update for the next meeting.
- VIII. Employee Morale
 - a. ACTION ITEM: Borg will communicate a request for a survey and subsequent report with Faculty Senate, Operating Staff Council, and SPS Council. University Benefits Committee will then draw conclusions from reports and potentially make a recommendation to President Baker.
 - b. Faculty Senate – They are working with President Baker to find a place for a faculty “club”. There is a small committee to assist with the search. The “club” would ideally be a lounge with computers or computer access, as well as a safe space to socialize and freely discuss ideas and issues.
- IX. Spring 2015 Meeting Schedule
 - a. UBC will continue to meet on scheduled Thursdays from 12-2pm. Location TBD.
 - b. Meeting dates: January 29th, March 5th, and April 23rd.

**Report on the NIU Board of Trustees
Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee**

EXECUTIVE: 01-14-15
STEERING:
FACULTY SENATE: 01-21-15
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL: 12-03-14

November 14, 2014

The NIU Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment met on Friday, November 14, 2014 in DeKalb. Committee Chair Marc J. Strauss called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 PM. The Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment (CoE) was created so the BOT could possibly identify areas in which they could change or create policy as it relates to the financial sustainability of NIU.

The board received a report on enrollment background and trends, recruitment and retention efforts and scholarship information from Vice President for Student Affairs & Enrollment Management, Dr. Eric Weldy. Dr. Weldy noted the drop in total headcount enrollment at NIU since 2008, and noted that the decline in enrollment has occurred not just at the undergraduate level, but among graduate and law students as well. NIU's highest retention rates of new freshman cohorts occurred in the late 1990s. Weldy explained that recruitment occurs through collaborative efforts of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community partners. Efforts to recruit students were highlighted and included, but were not limited to establishing new articulation agreements, MOUs with charter schools, and developing new initiatives that will utilize NIU alumni and friends.

Student retention efforts were also highlighted. These included, but were not limited to Chicago Collaborative for Undergraduate Success, MAP-Works, Early Alert Referral System (EARS) first year composition and various high impact practices.

Retention Summits have been initiated at NIU, starting in Fall 2013 to highlight retention initiatives and student experiences. The goal of these summits is to inform future, integrated plans focused on maximizing students' ability to persist at NIU.

The BOT expressed an interest in: 1) wanting to understand the relationship between tuition and enrollment, 2) the students' current debt load, 3) the cost per credit hour, 4) whether students who have returned to NIU have been polled to learn about their decision making, and 5) cost of academic support as well as factors that predict success rate.

The BOT also expressed an interest in learning about the processes in place to recruit students and move toward best practices in obtaining data to assess recruitment progress.

In 2011, NIU committed \$10 million toward merit scholarships to align priorities with those outlined in the enrollment management strategic plan and several new categories of merit scholarships were established. NIU is working with Noel-Levitz to propose significant changes to the scholarship awarding structures, introducing the use of an academic index that would weight GPA at 65% and ACT at 35%.

An update was provided related to the searches for an AVP of enrollment management and director of admissions.

Respectfully Submitted,

William A. Pitney
UAC Representative

**Report on the NIU Board of Trustees
Governance Ad Hoc Committee**

November 17, 2014

EXECUTIVE: 01-14-15
STEERING:
FACULTY SENATE: 01-21-15
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL: 12-03-14

The NIU Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committee on Governance met on Friday, November 14, 2014 in DeKalb. Committee Chair John Butler called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 PM. The Ad Hoc Committee on Governance was created to recommend a set of comprehensive revisions to the BOT Bylaws, recommend a protocol for BOT self-evaluation, and establish BOT goals and policies related to BOT Member education and professional development.

This was largely an organizing meeting to prioritize governance issues and changes to the BOT bylaws. The committee received a list of suggested changes related to the BOT Administration: 1) creating a presidential succession policy, 2) creating a naming rights policy, 3) updating the records retention policy, 3) updating the university insurance and employment benefits policy, and 4) updating the indemnification policy.

Issues related to BOT Business included: 1) updating the conflict of interest policy, 2) establish/clarify administrative leave policy, 3) board and senior management travel and expense reimbursement policy (risk management), 4) Presidential house (whether to mandate living or not), 5) reform all standing committee charges, 6) BOT desire to understand tenure process, and 7) employee residency requirement.

The role of BOT in tenure was clarified—the BOT is not attempting to insert the judgment of the board into the practical processes used to determine tenure, but rather, it wishes to understand the process with a particular focus on what is reported to the BOT. The residency requirement item was restated to whether a residency incentive for faculty and staff would be worth considering. W. Pitney stated that if this is considered it should be done so with sensitivity toward those who live outside of the community for purposes related to their work. The examples provided were that some VPA faculty live closer to Chicago because it facilitates their creative and artistic activities; some of our scientists choose to live closer to their labs located off campus.

NIU constitutional reform items were also identified. These included: 1) reviewing terms of appointments (article 19), 2) presidential evaluation, 3) revision of grievance procedures, and 4) establish/clarify appeal rights to the board.

Respectfully submitted,

William A. Pitney
UAC Representative

Report on the NIU Board of Trustees Meeting, December 4, 2014

The NIU Board of Trustees met on Thursday, December 4th in DeKalb. Chair Butler called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00 AM. In the chair's comments/ announcements, Chair Butler articulated that NIU is in a period of uncertainty citing the pension legislation that was unconstitutional, the election of a new governor, and a state legislature that is not likely to extend the income tax increase. He stated that NIU must plan and prepare for financial sustainability. Chair Butler also commented on the many positives at NIU including, but not limited to Dan Gebo being named Illinois Professor of the Year, President Baker being at the White House as a representative as NIU's P-20 initiative is being recognized, and the 50th anniversary of the anthropology museum.

Bill Nicklas was recognized by the BoT. A resolution in his honor was passed and the BoT expressed their gratitude to Bill for his leadership and support. Dan Gebo was recognized at the Illinois professor of the year.

Reports were received from AASAP, CARL, FFO, LARI, the Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment and the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance. The report from the IBHE liaison articulated that the IBHE was discussing the impact that the expiring tax increase and minimum wage legislation would have on higher education. The governor's transition team is putting together scenarios pertaining to this. The liaison to the Illinois Civil Service Merit Board identified that there is ongoing discussion about the rules of 3 modifications as well as potential modifications to the exemption process.

The BoT approved the recommendations for the FY16 tuition, fees, and room and board costs. For undergraduate students there is a slight increase in tuition, but a larger decrease in room and board rates; thus for entering undergraduate students, the total Cost of Attendance (COA) is reduced.

The administration recommended structural changes to the graduate and law school tuition to either "...ease the burdens that fall on graduate and law students or of providing pathways to enrollment growth and additional revenue production." The recommendations included, but were not limited to establishing an alternative tuition rate for graduate assistants and fellows equal to the in-state rate and combining tuition and general fee charges into one consolidated rate for graduate and law students.

The recent search for an Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management failed. Because the University is now entering the height of the student recruitment season without someone to serve in this critical position, the University recommended, and the BoT approved, the hiring of Lipman Hearne (LH), a Chicago-based marketing and communications firm that has been identified as a company with the expertise to assist the University in such efforts. Lipman Hearne can provide the University strategic and operational direction in enrollment management and admissions in the service of helping the University achieve its enrollment and retention goals, focusing on Spring 2015, Fall 2015, and Fall 2016. Contracting for the services of LH will provide individuals on campus to direct the enrollment management efforts as well as the

marketing and communication services of the company to leverage and extend NIU's current communication efforts. This service will not replace the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management position—a new search for this position will be launched in 2015. As was discussed at the meeting, having the services of LH in the coming months will likely aid in attracting a highly qualified candidate for this position. The LH contract stipulates that 150K is for consulting services; and 664K for deliverables (eg tactics for increasing enrollment, communications flow, and outbound telecommunications).

The BoT conducted a first reading of some changes to the BoT bylaws including a presidential succession plan, indemnification updates, and professional development travel and expense policy.

Respectfully Submitted,

William A. Pitney
UAC Representative

RSB Committee Report

Meeting December 3, 2014

Present: President Baker, Provost Freeman, and the RSB committee members.

The committee generated 11 questions to ask to the president and the provost. The questions were mainly about hiring, vacancy hearing, joint hires, salary, and budget.

The president provided the committee with the details of the salary of the Administrative Personnel. The data shows that the total salary starting from FY 2013 is as follows:

FY2013: \$3,519,496.

FY2014: \$3,636,015.

FY2015: \$3,652,336.

After \$3,211,800, after termination/appointment completion two appointment in 2015 and 2017

Please refer to the attachments for more details about the questions and the salary.

RSB Budget Questions received in September

1. Given the vacancy hearings, what will be the composition of faculty hires? For example, how many assistant, associate, full, VAPs, and instructors? Are we following the general trend towards increased number of non-tenure lines versus the growth in administrator positions and salaries?

Sept Q1 Answer:

At the present time, it is impossible to predict accurately the impact of the vacancy hearings on the composition of the faculty. A number of approved searches are in progress, but new faculty hires will not start this fiscal year. With respect to the rank of faculty that may be hired in approved searches, only a handful were at the Associate or Full level. Visiting Assistant Professors and Instructors are temporary positions and were not included in vacancy hearings, pull-backs etc. We can provide a list of requested and approved searches and the outcomes if that would be of interest. For efficiency, let's agree on the positions included and desired format before the material is assembled and shared.

We did pull data related to credit hour generation by tenure-line vs non-tenured faculty for during the accreditation site visit by the Higher Learning Commission. Through that effort, we recognized that our human resources data system distinguishes between tenure-line and non-tenure line faculty, but does not distinguish among clinical faculty, professors of practice, visiting assistant professors, instructors or other categories within the latter group. The Fall 2013 data shared with the HLC team are summarized below. These data may be of interest, although they do not directly address the question posed regarding faculty composition. To provide some context, an AAUP data set released in April 2014 show that in 2011 at doctoral and research universities: full-time tenured faculty comprised 23.3% of instructional staff; full-time tenure-track faculty comprised 7.1% of instructional staff; and contingent instructional staff (full-time non-tenure-track faculty members, part-time faculty members, and graduate student employees) comprised 69.6% of instructional staff.

Background

A drawback of systematically capturing employment types within an HR system is that the actual position descriptions are often categorized generally. This is a condition within the HR data fields, upon which the credit hour distribution report was partially based. These general HR categories work fine for large sets of employee types, e.g. ranked, professoriate faculty are categorized under tenure/tenure track (eligible), and include faculty ranks one would expect: assistant, associate and full professors. But often, reporting of employee types requires a finer granularity, as with the credit hour distribution report. For those non-ranked faculty employee types, unfortunately position names might be listed as clinical faculty, visiting assistant professor, or instructor within the HR system, but all are categorized under the general heading "instructor".

Fall 2013 Data (shared with HLC): Credit Hour Production by College Instructor Rank			
NIU College	Tenure or Tenure Eligible	"Instructor"	Comments
CBUS	59.01%	40.35%	A significant portion of credit hour production is offered via ACCY 206 and ACCY 207 by way of an graduate assistants teaching the course, under the coordination of an instructor (who is mapped to said credit hour production). Similarly, instructional staff teach the UBUS

			310, a 9.0 credit hour course representing a portion of the business core for every CBUS major. Finally, while non-ranked faculty teach a variety of other courses, e.g. MGMT 217, AACSB Accreditation provides rigorous standards for faculty/instructional staff, i.e. doctoral degree, specialized graduate degree in taxation, or for those with no research doctoral degree, substantial specialized coursework in the field of primary teaching responsibilities. Intellectual contributions are required for a substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline (AACSB).
CEDU	46.87%	51.06%	Kinesiology and Physical Education (CIP 31.05) and Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundations (CIPs 13.09, 42.28) have a significant portion of undergraduate credit hours produced by a well-qualified, clinical assistant professor and instructor base. LEPP's School of Business Management was part of US News Best Online Programs in Graduate Education for 2014.
CEET	74.39%	25.53%	CEET programs are taught by professionals who have worked in business and industry. 96% of CEET faculty hold doctorate degrees, and 70% boast industrial experience. Similarly, 60% of our faculty hold professional licenses and/or certifications. No classes are taught by graduate students.
CHHS	43.69%	53.92%	Credit hour production is supported by well qualified visiting assistant professors, clinical and adjunct faculty, and other instructional staff. This is especially true at the lower division level, but also takes place at the upper division level given the importance of clinical work and experiential learning with the Health and Health Sciences fields. Programs in the college are undergo a regular and periodic accreditation across eleven national professional accreditation agencies.
CLAS	52.57%	46.38%	Instructional staff provides support of lower division undergraduate courses, especially in Communication (COMS 100), English (ENGL 103/104), Mathematical Sciences, and to a lesser extent, Foreign Languages and Political Science (POLS 100). The Department of Psychology employs an instructor coordinator and GA teaching for PSYC 102. This allows ranked faculty to be employed in upper division courses including that of engagement and experiential learning, in support of department graduate programs, totaling 22 Master's degree programs and 11 doctoral degree programs, and to allow for a healthy research agenda, that of externally funded research, scholarship and artistry.
CLAW	32.34%	67.66%	A significant portion of adjunct faculty help support the first year curriculum. Similarly, non-ranked faculty in large part represent the clinical experience for the college. While there is a larger visiting and adjunct faculty base, all adjuncts and clinical faculty provide instructional capacity in their respective legal fields, and many support an active research agenda.
CVPA	68.50%	30.29%	Art and Music employ non-ranked faculty to support portions of their lower division credit hour production. For Art, instructional staff support not only Art History survey courses (200 level), but also lower division Studio courses. For Music, ranked faculty produce over half of the total

			<p>undergraduate credit hours, and near all of the total graduate credit hours (51 percent and 95 percent, respectively; Delaware Study NIU Fall 2010 participation). Faculty and graduate student research has produced many grants and awards including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mellon and NEH Fellowships • Art Educator of the Year by the NAEA • Fulbright Research Award • NEH Research Grants • Illinois Arts Council Fellowship Awards. <p>The doctoral program in art and design education is one of the few doctoral programs in the country housed within a School of Art.</p>
--	--	--	--

2. Can we get listings of hires and their salaries?

Sept Q2 Answer:

This information can be found in two places.

(1) Fiscal Year 2014 Working Papers All Funds (Fiscal Year 2013-2014). The most recent copy came out early in the fall. There is at least one copy in the Founders Library.

(2) IBHE web site has the Public University Administrator and Faculty Salary and Benefits Database which provides salary and benefit information for full-time and part-time administrators and instructional staff at Illinois' public universities as required by Public Act 96-0266. This act requires that each public university report to the IBHE the base salary and benefits of the president and all administrators, faculty members, and instructors employed by the college or university.

<http://iccbdbsrv.iccb.org/salarysearch/home.cfm>

3. There is a general perception among faculty that some administrative hires were not done constitutionally or according to the proper process.

Sept Q3 Answer:

President Baker addressed the hiring of the Provost and the Vice President for Research previously with the faculty senate. With respect the administrative hires that are currently in progress, none are being conducted without a search. The search committees for Cabinet level positions (VP for Administration & Finance; VP for Advancement) include faculty members. Within Academic Affairs, searches are being requested for acting and interim positions at the Associate Vice Provost, Associate Dean and Department Chair levels. Note: The Provost Office expects to conduct an internal search this spring for the position of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (Murali Krishnamurthi has been acting in this role since July 1, 2014 as the result of reorganization of the Provost Office).

4. While it is not anticipated that the "vacancy hearing" process last year will become standard practice, faculty would like to know what or have some idea what the process will be in the future?

Sept Q4 Answer:

In the future, NIU will not return to across the board cutting as the standard way of dealing with budgetary shortfalls that occur because of declining enrollment and/or declining state appropriations.

We are working to develop the data-informed culture and processes necessary to align strategic priorities with budget. Vacancy hearings based on criteria aligned with the University mission and Bold Futures priorities were a first step towards achieving the overall objective. A formal program prioritization process will be in place to drive budget decision in Spring 2016.

5. Related to item 1: how many hires are joint hires and does this presage combining programs? What are the problems associated with joint hires?

Sept Q5 Answer:

Historically at NIU, there have been joint hires between centers and departments, as well as joint hires between departments and the national laboratories. The expectations are specified in MOU at the time of the hire, so that there is a common understanding among the units making the hire and the faculty member. As intended, these hires have been relatively successful in promoting interdisciplinary research/scholarship and teaching, as well curricular innovation. Problems have been largely related to HR transactions.

It is unclear why joint hires should be seen as movement towards combining programs. In the past, NIU has made joint hires without combining programs and NIU has combined programs without first making joint hires. The joint hires that have occurred or that have been proposed by deans over the course of the past year were related to established collaborations (ex: Accelerator Physics) or to newly proposed programs (Health Information Technology). In the past, NIU has made joint hires without combining programs and NIU has combined programs without first making joint hires.

6. Can there be an accounting of recent raises and new hires in the administration? Is it truly costing more than the previous administration? Can we compare?

Sept Q6 Answer

The working papers and the IBHE web site referenced in the answer to Q2 are available for different years, and the NIU administration is available to address specific questions regarding the data. In addition, President Baker and Provost Freeman have provided the attached spreadsheet for consideration.

7. Is there more concern with equity for administrators than there is for faculty and staff? Why can't we have a spreadsheet of salaries, for faculty, staff, and administrators on an annual basis?

Sept Q7(part 1) Answer:

Recently, there have been a number of administrative hires and reorganizations that have focused attention on salary equity, but this is not evidence of more concern for equity among this group of employees than others. Human Resource Services (HRS) and hiring units regularly look at the salary ranges for operating staff to see if there is need to adjust salary ranges for a classification and salaries for individuals within a classification. Moreover, the Provost collaborates with HRS to produce a salary equity study for faculty to ensure that our salary structure is reasonably equitable and these data have shown that our salary structure is legally defensible when the University addressed inquiries from the Office of Civil Rights and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

A Chronicle of Higher Education study indicates that our faculty salaries are in the fourth quartile when compared to other institutions. Moreover, the benchmarking of NIU faculty salaries that took place as part of Vision 2020 indicated that NIU is competitive with a majority of MAC institutions at the assistant professor rank, but becomes less competitive within that comparison group at the ranks of associate and full professor. The current administration acknowledges that NIU should strive to achieve the Vision 2020 benchmark of having faculty salaries for assistant, associate and full professors among the top eight of the thirteen MAC institutions by 2020, and endorses the Vision 2020 plan for accomplishing this by maintaining its competitive position with assistant professors while addressing salary compression by focusing on rewarding and retaining the most meritorious associate and full professors. Collaboration among the Divisions of Finance, Human Resources and Academic Affairs will be important to achieving this goal.

Sept Q7(part 2) Answer:

The data being requested are available publically from the sources cited above in the answers to question 2 and question 6. We also understand that at a benefits committee meeting, Professor George Slotsve said that he had been assigned a graduate student (either through University Council or Faculty Senate) to take the salary info on the IBHE web site and/or the Working Papers and put it in a format that the university community would find more useful than the published format. We look forward to supporting this effort.

RSB Budget Questions received on November 26, 2014

1- Some drawbacks were noticed when the salary of retired or resigned faculty and staff are transferred to the general account. In some cases, this caused the failure to meet the teaching and/or the service obligations. Would the university be open to some of the suggestions to address these drawbacks? Examples:

- a. Postpone the transfer of all/majority of the salary for one year for faculty to ensure the continuation and effectiveness of the education process. After one year a request for rehiring can be submitted.
- b. Keep the salary of the staff with the unit to ensure providing the continuation of providing services to students, faculty, and parents. Request for permanent hiring can be submitted during this year.
- c. Request that this year delay be used to rethink the unit's priorities.

November Q1 Answer:

It would be helpful to have specific examples of how the automatic pullback of salary associated with vacant positions hurt the teaching and service missions. To our knowledge, there have been no instances where instructional staffing needs have not been met. Moreover, such gaps shouldn't happen because the Office of the Provost and the Division of Finance have provided mechanisms for the Colleges to request discretionary funds to support instructional staffing and mission critical activities. It was understood from the beginning that the Colleges would need discretionary funds to replace the "float" provided by the salary associated with vacant lines.

It should be noted that the funding returned to the central pool (general account) is being used to support the universities operating expenses/balance the operating budget and, as a result, is not available to remain in the Colleges.

2- Does the university have any plan for enhancing auxiliary funding and use the revenue to improve the overall financial stability of the university?

November Q2 answer:

The administration is committed to improving the overall financial stability of the university, by increasing enrollment (and thereby increasing the revenue associated with tuition, room and board), by enhancing revenue opportunities associated with convocation center, HSC and auxiliary facilities, and by enhancing philanthropic efforts.

3- Does the university have a plan for research beyond having research as a component of the students' success plan? Do you think we need initiate an effort similar to "Prioritization and Reallocation" to address the issues of research?

November Q3 Answer:

Research remains a university priority, not only in terms of student engagement but also because one of NIU's competitive advantages is its commitment to the creation and application of new knowledge. Evidence of this commitment can be seen in a number of recent actions. The research administration units completed an extensive external review this past summer and among the findings being vetted by members of the Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships and its faculty advisory groups are recommendations focused on strengthening NIU's research infrastructure and increasing research support. While this activity is ongoing, it is notable that programs that currently exist for these purposes have been sustained despite the resource-limited environment; these include research and artistry grants, PI Academy, and A1 reviews. The NIU leadership is working actively to improve the University's position in the regional innovation ecosystem, to increase faculty access to external resources and industry partnerships. Similarly, the federal relations function of the university has been revamped to emphasize connecting researchers to federal agencies and programs.

With respect to Program Prioritization, research and artistry will be included in one or more of the criteria used to prioritize academic programs, and established research centers will be considered by the process as academic programs. In addition, the Division is collaborating with others on campus to develop competitive processes for supporting research clusters and targeted hiring to support research excellence.

4- The provost is meeting with chairs regularly to provide them with information and listen to their concerns. Is it possible to have a similar process for the budget, but at the individual level, to provide feedback from the units and for the chairs to know about the details, rules, and regulations of their budgets?

November Q4 Answer:

In addition to the Provost meeting with the Deans Council and the Chairs on a regular basis, the Provost meets individually with the Deans, and the college budget managers meet regularly as a group and individually with key members of the core budget team. When Deans, Associate Deans and Chairs request additional meetings with members of the Divisions of Academic Affairs or Finance, these are

granted. Collectively, these meetings and meetings that occur within Colleges should provide adequate opportunity for constructive dialogue and feedback.

Compensation Levels for Administrative Personnel

NAME	FY2013	FY2014	Past/Present FY2015	After terminations/ appointment completion	Comments
Peters, John	\$423,988				
Baker, Doug		\$450,000	\$450,000	\$450,000	
Asst to President Walters, Ron	\$99,510 \$8,125	\$275,000	\$180,000		Previous earned \$99,510 Term ends 12/31/14
Williams, Eddie	\$313,700				
Suttonfield, Nancy		\$165,000	\$145,000		Term ends 12/31/14
Alden, Ray	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	Term ends 6/30/2017
Freeman, Lisa	\$238,500	\$266,167	\$280,000	\$280,000	Salary increase reflects new Exec VP role
Rigg, Lesley		\$161,321	\$214,800	\$214,800	Salary increase reflects new VP role
Blakemore, Jerry	\$235,000	\$235,000	\$235,000	\$235,000	
Buettner, Kathy	\$230,972	\$230,972	\$153,981		Resigned 9/8/14
Teller, Harlan			\$250,000	\$250,000	Term ends 6/30/16
Malone, Mike	\$230,555	\$240,555	\$250,555		Term ends 6/30/15
Kaplan, Anne	\$207,000	\$207,000	\$207,000	\$207,000	
Cunningham, Steve	\$280,000	\$266,667	\$160,000		Admin Leave ends 2/27/15
Nicklas, Bill	\$204,000	\$204,000	\$51,000		No VP Replacement
Coryell, Brett		\$96,667	\$290,000	\$290,000	\$34K retirement contribution
Czerniak, Wally	\$193,800	\$76,000			Full time salary listed. As retiree/rehire, Wally earned \$96K in FY 13 and \$76K in FY14
Weldy, Eric		\$205,000	\$205,000	\$205,000	
Brian Hemphill	\$229,344				VP full time salary listed if Brian had stayed. (Acting VP Wesener-Michael earned \$175K)
Frazier, Sean		\$256,666	\$280,000	\$280,000	\$20K Retention clause - 5yrs
Compher, Jeff	\$325,000				AD Full time salary if Jeff C had stayed (Acting AD Spears earned \$175K)
Subtotals:	\$3,519,494	\$3,636,015	\$3,652,336	\$2,711,800	
				250,000	New CFO
				250,000	New VP Univ Advancement
Totals:	\$3,519,494	\$3,636,015	\$3,652,336	\$3,211,800	Projected Totals

ARTICLE 7: PERSONNEL REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES

The Faculty Senate under the provisions of University Bylaws 14.6.3.10 has the responsibility for annual reviews of the Executive Secretary of the University Council and the Faculty Personnel Advisor. In the case of the Executive Secretary the Senate evaluation shall constitute the total personnel rating for that portion of the year the position is held. In the case of the Faculty Personnel Advisor the Senate evaluation shall constitute one-half of the personnel rating for that portion of the year the position is held. These evaluations shall be forwarded to the executive vice president and provost who shall determine the annual salary increment for the Executive Secretary and who shall determine the salary increment for the Faculty Personnel Advisor after receiving the evaluation given for other professional activities by the Faculty Personnel Advisor's academic department.

7.1 The annual evaluation of the services of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor shall be conducted by a committee composed of three members of the Faculty Senate chosen by lot and one member of the SPS Council. The annual evaluation of the services of the President of the Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of the University Council in performance of that role shall be conducted by a joint committee composed of seven (7) members of the Faculty Senate and University Council chosen by lot; two (2) will be faculty members from the Faculty Senate who are not members of the University Council, two (2) faculty members from the University Council, one (1) SPS member, one (1) operating staff member and one (1) student member from the University Council. The committee is empowered to seek and receive individual recommendations from the members of the Senate and University Council, and to seek such other information as it may find necessary in order to complete its task. The completed evaluation shall be presented to the Faculty Senate for its endorsement, and then it shall be forwarded to the executive vice president and provost of the university for appropriate action as provided in the University Bylaws Section 14.6.3.10.

NIU BYLAWS

ARTICLE 14: UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

14.6 Duties and Responsibilities

14.6.3 To achieve the purposes stated in Sections 14.1 and 14.6.2, the specific functions of the Faculty Senate shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

14.6.3.10 To evaluate annually the services of the faculty and SPS personnel advisor and the president of the Faculty Senate/executive secretary of the University Council. Three faculty members from the Faculty Senate and one (1) member of the SPS Council shall constitute the evaluation committee for the faculty and SPS personnel advisor. Two faculty members of the Faculty Senate who are not elected faculty members of the University Council, two faculty members from the University Council, one (1) SPS member, one (1) operating staff member, and one student member from the University Council shall constitute the evaluation committee for the president of the Faculty Senate/executive secretary of the University Council. All members shall be voting members of either the University Council or the Faculty Senate. The members shall be selected by lot at the September or January meetings of the Faculty Senate and University Council depending on the evaluation period. If any member so selected cannot serve, another member who meets the same criterion shall be selected by lot. These evaluations shall constitute one-half of the personnel rating of the faculty personnel advisor and the total personnel rating of the president of the Faculty Senate/executive secretary of the University Council for those portions of each year during which they held those offices. These evaluations shall be forwarded to the executive vice president and provost who shall determine the annual salary increment for each individual. In so doing, the executive vice president and provost shall consult with each affected faculty member's department regarding the evaluation to be given to that faculty member's other professional activity;

ARTICLE 7: PERSONNEL REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES

The Faculty Senate under the provisions of University Bylaws 14.6.3.10 has the responsibility for annual reviews of the Executive Secretary of the University Council and the Faculty Personnel Advisor. In the case of the Executive Secretary the Senate evaluation shall constitute the total personnel rating for that portion of the year the position is held. In the case of the Faculty Personnel Advisor the Senate evaluation shall constitute one-half of the personnel rating for that portion of the year the position is held. These evaluations shall be forwarded to the executive vice president and provost who shall determine the annual salary increment for the Executive Secretary and who shall determine the salary increment for the Faculty Personnel Advisor after receiving the evaluation given for other professional activities by the Faculty Personnel Advisor's academic department.

7.1 The annual evaluation of the services of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor shall be conducted by a committee composed of three members of the Faculty Senate chosen by lot and one member of the SPS Council. The annual evaluation of the services of the President of the Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of the University Council in performance of that role shall be conducted by a joint committee composed of seven (7) members of the Faculty Senate and University Council chosen by lot; two (2) will be faculty members from the Faculty Senate who are not members of the University Council, two (2) faculty members from the University Council, one (1) SPS member, one (1) operating staff member and one (1) student member from the University Council. The committee is empowered to seek and receive individual recommendations from the members of the Senate and University Council, and to seek such other information as it may find necessary in order to complete its task. The completed evaluation shall be presented to the Faculty Senate for its endorsement, and then it shall be forwarded to the executive vice president and provost of the university for appropriate action as provided in the University Bylaws Section 14.6.3.10.

NIU BYLAWS

ARTICLE 14: UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

14.6 Duties and Responsibilities

14.6.3 To achieve the purposes stated in Sections 14.1 and 14.6.2, the specific functions of the Faculty Senate shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

14.6.3.10 To evaluate annually the services of the faculty and SPS personnel advisor and the president of the Faculty Senate/executive secretary of the University Council. Three faculty members from the Faculty Senate and one (1) member of the SPS Council shall constitute the evaluation committee for the faculty and SPS personnel advisor. Two faculty members of the Faculty Senate who are not elected faculty members of the University Council, two faculty members from the University Council, one (1) SPS member, one (1) operating staff member, and one student member from the University Council shall constitute the evaluation committee for the president of the Faculty Senate/executive secretary of the University Council. All members shall be voting members of either the University Council or the Faculty Senate. The members shall be selected by lot at the September or January meetings of the Faculty Senate and University Council depending on the evaluation period. If any member so selected cannot serve, another member who meets the same criterion shall be selected by lot. These evaluations shall constitute one-half of the personnel rating of the faculty personnel advisor and the total personnel rating of the president of the Faculty Senate/executive secretary of the University Council for those portions of each year during which they held those offices. These evaluations shall be forwarded to the executive vice president and provost who shall determine the annual salary increment for each individual. In so doing, the executive vice president and provost shall consult with each affected faculty member's department regarding the evaluation to be given to that faculty member's other professional activity;