

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT**  
**Wednesday, April 1, 2015, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Abdel-Motaleb, Baker, Ballantine (for McCord), Bateni, Block, Brubaker, Chakraborty, Chen, Degges-White (for Schwartz-Bechet), Deng, Domke, Farrell, Feurer, Frascello, A. Freeman, L. Freeman, Giese, Haliczzer, Hardy (for Doederlein), Hathaway, Hedin, Henning, Holly, Jaffee, Kamholz, Khoury, Lee, Lenczewski, Long, Macdonald, Mason, Mohabbat, Monteiro, Moremen, Naples, Neal, Perea, Pitney, Plonczynski, Riley, Sagarin, Schoenbachler, Sorensen, Ueckert, Vohra

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Arriola, Bond, Campbell, Chmaissem, Coronado, Dawson, Doederlein, Donovan, Fredericks, Liu, McCord, Mogren, Schwartz-Bechet, Shannon, Starofsky, Summers

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Armstrong, Birberick, Bryan, Coryell, Kaplan, Klaper, Phillips, Stafstrom, Weldy

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Falkoff, Stoddard

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**D. Baker:** Thanks for coming in on such a sunny, beautiful day and just to cheer you up, I heard it was going to snow later in the week. Gilbert is at it again.

**Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.**

**II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**D. Baker:** All right, can I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

**Unidentified:** So moved.

**D. Baker:** Second.

**Unidentified:** Second.

**D. Baker.** Any additions or deletions? All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**D. Baker:** Opposed? Thank you.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 25, 2015 MEETING**

**D. Baker:** Approval of the minutes, motion to approve the minutes?

**Unidentified:** So moved.

**Unidentified:** Second.

**D. Baker:** Second, thank you. Any edits? All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**D. Baker:** Opposed? Thank you.

#### **IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**D. Baker:** Announcements, the first one I'm going to ask Bill to make some comments on the program prioritization process and where we are with that.

**W. Pitney:** Absolutely, yes, thank you. I just wanted to bring some folks up to date on a few items. In terms of some activities currently undergoing with respect to program prioritization, our data team is currently doing a survey in identifying all of the academic and administrative programs on our campus. Our criteria team has taken the university-wide survey data and worked with APC and the RSB committees and so far we've facilitated three meetings and have one more remaining. The purpose of those meetings is to identify the criteria for use for the process here at NIU. Our communications team has been busy updating the website and addressing frequently asked questions. On a related note, the nomination process was established and nominations are continuing to come in. Thus far, we have 72 nominations with all colleges represented except for the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, so we still have some needs there. For the administrative program task force, all divisions have representatives nominated except for four: Athletics, International Affairs, Marketing, and Advancement.

Lastly, and this relates to the motion that was approved by Faculty Senate, I sent a letter to the provost last Friday documenting the recent motion approved senate to have a proportional faculty representation on these task force and for the selection of task force members to occur at the respective college level. I met with Provost Freeman today and Vice Provost Carolinda Douglass. We've discussed that and the discussions will continue this Friday at the regular scheduled meeting for the prioritization coordinating team. That's still ongoing. So I just wanted to give an update.

**D. Baker:** Great. Any comments or questions? Well thanks for having those discussion and carrying them on Friday. And I know you're going to look hard at those.

I wanted to update you on the Interim Vice President for Research search. Jim Ciesla is chairing that search committee. As you know, Lesley Rigg is moving on to the University of Calgary and we wish her well returning to her homeland of Canada. Jim has that committee. It's got broad representation on it and I think the call is out for nominations for it. And we'll have a couple weeks of the nomination process and then try to quickly review that so we can get a person chosen before the end of the semester. Any comments or questions about that? And then, Lisa, I wonder if you could say a few words about some dean transitions?

**L. Freeman:** Well, let me start by saying I think we have most of the deans here and I see two of our senior deans who have recently announced that they will be leaving NIU to pursue absolutely wonderful career opportunities at other institutions, are here. Before I talk about the process for searching for interim or acting deans in those colleges, I'd first like to ask Dean Holly to stand and be recognized. We don't know if he'll be back for our next meeting. I think everyone here would say that Dean Holly has been an amazing contributor to both the academic and the non-academic life of this campus. He's mentored so many students and faculty members. And he's leaving for an incredibly cool job opportunity at North Carolina State University, which I don't know the actual title of, but I describe as sort of Arts Ambassador/Arts Tsar. So congratulations to you, Rich.

And I see that Dean Jennifer Rosato Perea is also here. Jennifer, would you please stand and be recognized? Like Dean Holly, Dean Rosato Perea will be sorely missed. She contributes extensively, not only in her college, but building academic and non-academic bridges across the colleges and other divisions in this campus. Her expertise on issues related to implicit bias and diversity will be particularly missed. Those of you who had the pleasure to see her recent keynote at the diversity conference know what a great loss we will be suffering with Jennifer's departure in so many dimensions. But again she's leaving us for a wonderful opportunity. She's not quite escaping the northern Illinois winter going only as far as DePaul University and that will at least give us an opportunity to continue to collaborate and visit with Jennifer. So thank you very much.

With respect to what we'll be looking at in terms of leadership transitions in those colleges, it's too late in this year to launch an external search for deans so we will be looking at an interim basis leadership strategy. I have meetings scheduled on Thursday with the College of Law faculty and on Monday with the College Senate and College Council in the College of Visual and Performing Arts to consult with the faculty about how to proceed. And after those discussions occur, we'll have a wider conversation about what the transition strategies will look like.

**D. Baker:** And my thanks and congratulations to the deans. I'm sorry it's only been two years with you. Best of luck in the new positions and we'll come visit whether you want us to or not.

It's been an interesting couple of weeks in Springfield. And we've testified in the Senate two weeks ago and then the House last week. Lisa, Al Phillips, and is this your first meeting, Al? So let me introduce Al Phillips. Al is our new Vice President for Administration and Finance. He comes to us from being the CFO for the Illinois Board of Higher Education. He knows Illinois and the finances and he knows the politics of Springfield very well. So we're very pleased to have him. He has a higher education background having been in a community college as well as the state board and also served extensively in the military. So we're very pleased to have him. The military budgets tend to have B's after them and we have M's after ours so there may be a little difference in scale but he comes to us with an enormous amount of experience and I appreciate you being here Al.

They were interesting presentations. Al and Lisa and I were there. And then we took two students to the Senate and three to the House. Joe came with us to the House last week and did a great job. We talked to a number of legislators before and after the meetings. I met with the Lieutenant Governor and some other folks. And it's clear that people are struggling with a very

large \$6 billion problem that may get bigger with the pension case that's gonna be decided in the Supreme Court. I think there's also a real understanding of the impact that a 31.5 percent cut would have in higher education. And the slide show that I presented to you with the tables, I presented to them. One of the committee members said: You're doing my job for me, we've never seen the budget laid out this way, this is great. So I think they were appreciative of seeing what's the state budget, what's education's budget, what's higher education's budget, what's the university's budget and what is this going to do to us and how could you cope with it?

And so we talked about the great things that you all are doing as faculty staff and students in the university. The students were there to tell their stories about the transformative experiences they were having and I think we made our case well, the students made it better. And at the end of the Appropriations Hearing Committee in the House, both the legislators and the people in the audience applauded and that's the first time that I've seen post-appropriations hearing applause.

So I'm guessing it wasn't because of my brilliance or Lisa's or Al's, although they did a great job too. But I think it was because of the students and the compelling story. Sometimes we can put up pie charts and diagrams and show the impact at that macro level perspective, but when you hang the story of a student on those numbers and what the impact will be on them and their lives in the state going forward, I think it makes a dramatic difference. And so I just want to thank the students for going and being such compelling voices for NIU and really for all of higher education. Joe, thanks to you and your colleagues for that.

Next, any questions on any of that? And maybe just one other comment: They're in recess now. They're on a two-week recess and then they come back and they get after it. There are a number of bills out there that we've been watching closely. One of them is the tuition waiver for faculty and staff. All the universities are working to tamp that one down and I think we're going to make some progress. It did get out of committee and the House and so we'll see if it gets over to the Senate and how it survives there. But I know there's a lot of concern with it in the Senate so we'll see how that goes. But we're watching that carefully and working on it and a variety of other bills.

They're going to struggle with this for some time. They've got to look at the revenue side and they've got to look at the cost reduction side. And so there's gonna be negotiation back and forth. So I warned you at the beginning of the session we're going to be on a roller coaster ride. We've been up and down a couple hills so far and we're going to go through a few more. So when you read the paper understand that it is a roller coaster ride and sometimes you're going to feel like, oh my gosh; and other times you're going to be elated. My sense is there is a spirit to get this right, to find a solution that we can live with. So I'm optimistic at this point that we're going to get to a good place but we'll just have to see.

In addition to the revenues from the state we've got to worry about our enrollment numbers as well. They're not where we want them to be. And so I guess I would encourage you again to really pay attention on the retention side. We can have a big impact there to keep our students here and help them have the transformative experiences they need to prepare for life and careers. And then as we work in through the finalizing of the recruitment phase for this fall, you know, do what you can. When they're on campus, meet with the students as appropriate and reach out to them and show them what a great place we have. It seems like every time we get students and families on campus, they fall in love with the place and they want to stay. And that's because of

all of you. So let's do a good job there and make sure that we can work on the enrollment side too. Okay, any other questions on that?

Okay I'm going to ask Al to talk about the audit report that came out recently as well and I want to say a few words about that. There was a Star article earlier this week and I want to reflect on that. To go back just a little bit, two years ago I interviewed for this job, almost two years ago exactly. And on the day I came to interview, the FBI showed up on campus as you may remember. I think those were not linked. And that investigation still goes on. And HUD and Department of Education were involved in that as well. And I found a university that had declining enrollments, that had had some structural and personnel challenges, didn't have a clear budget or budget process, and had enormous potential. I was impressed with the faculty, the staff, the students. I was impressed with the alumni and how they wanted to lean forward and help the university. I was impressed by the impact that we could make on this state, but there were enormous challenges; still are, and we're working through them. But I really felt like I needed somebody who could come in and help me navigate some of those waters strategically, structurally, personnel. And that's when I invited Ron to come in. And I actually invited him to come in before I got to campus and his employment contract and the compensation for his travel was set up before I got here by staff. And the audit report now indicates that wasn't set up correctly. So we need to take corrective actions on it. I've asked Al to work on that and all the policies underneath it so it doesn't happen again. And, Al, you've been working on this issue. Could you comment on that a little bit?

**A. Phillips:** Well much like President Baker, about two days after I got here, I found myself sitting in an audit with members of the Auditor General's office and McGladrey who is our external auditor. Audits are very common; we go through them every year. As a matter of fact, we just finished one and we're starting one again next month. So they are kind of a reoccurring process. In most cases what they do is they go through and they will select various records or files. They don't do a 100 percent. They would never leave if they were to do that. So they test your documents and they pull various records and they take a look at them and see if they're done correctly and all the money is in the right place and all the transactions are recorded appropriately.

We had a number of audit findings. Most of them were administrative in nature. They can range from an audit finding that you didn't submit a report on time. In many cases we had issues of some of the transactions were incorrectly recorded. That doesn't mean the money wasn't where it was supposed to be, it was just accounted for in error. And there were a couple of findings that were a little bit more significant. One was that we have in the past, in some cases because of necessity and short timelines, started work on contracts before all the proper paperwork was signed and in place, or all the waivers and other things associated with the contract were kept with that. We are in the process of addressing those particular issues. And generally when you have an audit, it's rare that there are not findings. It just means that you have to go back and correct them and fix them. And then the next time those are the things that they look at to make sure that you did that. And like I said most of them are administrative in nature.

With regard to the contract issue, we've already started to pull together procurement folks, legal folks, to rework the process to ensure that all the process and procedures are in place in an appropriate amount of time so that we do not have this problem in the future. Those of you who have had any involvement with the state procurement process are aware that that is a rather

cumbersome, bureaucratic, convoluted process and that doesn't help. And I was on the phone yesterday with the state procurement officer talking about ways we can try to work to help make that better. So we have that underway to fix that particular issue.

Another one was the management of P-Cards, procurement cards. A small number of the transactions, there were some issues with overspending the limit. That had more to do with timing of when the bills hit the, or the invoices hit and what had been purchased at which point in time. We are in the process of revising our regulations to try to make sure that doesn't happen.

The other one that was more significant was we had an individual who was reimbursed for travel that, according to state travel policy, we were not allowed to reimburse him. The finding was that this was inappropriate. There were agreements in place. The understanding was that this was allowable based on the audit and state travel regs which supersede any agreement or contract that he might have with the university. That was a violation of state policy and so the remedy is that we will go back and ask that that money be repaid. We've already had discussions, we are in the process of following them to make sure we have all the numbers and the expenses accurate and correct. But I was on the phone this morning with the auditor general – or the member in his office that we work with and who actually did the audit – to ensure that we are following their guidelines. And once we have resolved the issue that will be in accordance with state policy, statutes, rules, regulations, and otherwise.

We are also going to go back and revisit our policies and procedures to ensure that these kinds of issues and problems do not happen again. Based on discussion with the auditor general office, much like all of the other audit findings, once we make the appropriate corrections, we will be fine. When they come back and do the next audit, they will automatically go back and revisit all the findings from the previous audit to see if we did, in fact, make corrections.

The other thing I will say is that during the audit our controller and assistant controller were interim. They basically were asked to do this on short notice. I will tell you that in my discussions with both McGladrey, who's our outside auditor, and the auditor general's office, they had nothing but exemplary things to say about our accountants and our folks who worked with them through the audit.

Another notable issue is that even though there were findings, one of the comments that they made was there were no federal findings associated with any of our grants or funds that we received from the federal government and that is very unusual to go through an audit and not have a single finding regarding any federal funds.

We have already started the process to address each and every one of these findings. In many cases they've already been corrected as they were administrative in nature or they were bookkeeping errors, and like I said, in some cases if you submit a report late for whatever reason, that's an audit finding. Those aren't the things that I worry about a great deal. What I do feel comfortable with is that all of our funds are being properly accounted for, like I said, aside from the clerical, other issues and other minor problems. The transactions are all being recorded in an appropriate manner. There are a couple of issues procedural and process such as the contracts and the P-Cards, and those kinds of things and the travel issues which we are going back and more specifically working to fix, but by the time we get finished, we will have addressed each one of the audit findings and we will be in compliance with all federal and state guidelines,

criteria, policies, and requirements.

**D. Baker:** Thanks, Al. Any comments or questions on any of that? I appreciate Al taking this on, head on. It was clear we didn't have a clear understanding of our policies and procedures across the institution. It tended to be more segmented in units and without that guidance I think people were misinterpreting some of the guidelines.

**A. Phillips:** One of the other comments having spent the last four years in Springfield and working on the other end of a lot of these policies and procedures and issues, sometimes it's not always clear what the guidance is. Sometimes it's subject to interpretation. In that case, typically we'll go back and get clarification and work to resolve the issue. There are, in fact, gray areas. And so it is also not uncommon going through an audit to have discussions about what is or what isn't or what the rule says or what it doesn't. And then the case, more specifically the travel issue, there was an interpretation of the rules that turned out to be not correct and so we are going to go back and fix that and make sure we put policies in place so that doesn't happen again.

**D. Baker:** Thanks, Al.

## V. CONSENT AGENDA

## VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – reports  
[February 20, 2015](#) – Pages 4-5  
[March 20, 2015](#) – Pages 6-7

**D. Baker:** All right, should we move on to Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees? First Sonya has one from the FAC to the IBHE.

**S. Armstrong:** Actually I have two. The first one is largely no longer news. Probably the only thing of importance here is that Al Phillips is no longer with the IBHE.

**A. Phillips:** I will tell you that while I was at IBHE getting ready to come here in my new capacity, I was already sending nasty notes to myself at IBHE on the behalf of NIU.

**S. Armstrong:** Okay, so the March meeting which we just had recently at Eureka College, there was a lot of discussion about program prioritization and also a lot of legislative updates which you can see under IBHE updates. They really kind of parallel Dr. Baker's comments earlier. We also had a very interesting presentation on the To & Through project. I did link you there in case you want to check into what they're doing. This is a really interesting initiative. I think the PowerPoint is actually listed at that link. But basically it aims to track students who are enrolled through Chicago Public Schools all the way through to college. Really interesting data that could be informative for us at Northern as well.

For the caucuses, I'll tell you that we spent the entire time in the public university caucus preparing for next Tuesday's meeting with the full board and IBHE staff. What we have done is each caucus has decided on one topic to raise to the board and to the IBHE staff and for public universities it's probably no surprise, budget cuts. That's the plan is next Tuesday to discuss that

with the board. I will entertain any questions, but I think those are the biggest information items.

**D. Baker:** And if you want to know more about our collaborations with the schools in Chicago, Anne Birberick is on the Chicago collaborative and she is our liaison to that group. And they're doing some pretty amazing work but it is sobering to see the success rates – or lack of success rates – for the students coming out of there. And there are so many things we need to do from pre-K on up to when they come here. And we really have to think systemically and pipeline and not just in the pipeline, but the soil that that pipe is in. And sometimes that soil is pretty toxic poverty soil. We've got a lot of work to do there. That's part of what the P-20 collaborative is working on here in the northern region. I know some of you are involved in that and, if you want to be more involved in it, we certainly welcome more folks. But I think it's really good working with the K-12 systems in this region, community colleges and then us and employers. So you get that whole continuum. Thanks.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee –  
Dan Gebo and William Pitney – [report](#) – Pages 8-9

**D. Baker:** Next, Bill, you're up with the BOT Academic Affairs, etc.

**W. Pitney:** Yes, thank you. Just real brief, some things to bring to your attention, the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee endorsed at that point, the Nankai/NIU International College. There will actually be two degrees: one in political science and the other in public administration service. I think this is just a really neat opportunity. They also approved the B.S. in hospitality and tourism management as well as the B.S. in ed and middle level teaching and learning.

They also heard sabbatical reports and also viewed the report on sabbaticals. And that was key because there was a bit of dialog in terms of whether or not sabbaticals were important, rewarding, etc. By the end of the sabbatical presentation and the sabbatical reports, it was very clear that NIU, the faculty and staff and students, have an excellent return on the investment of sabbaticals. So that was fantastic. They also had an information item related to curricular diversity at NIU and learned about the Multicultural Curriculum Transformation Institute as well as some of the potential that the new PLUS program has with respect to addressing curriculum diversity. So that's my report. I'm happy to take any questions.

**H. Khoury:** I have a couple of questions on this one. The first one is: What is the cost to NIU for having the college collaborative in China? Are there travel items, expenses, for administrators to go there or this was not clear so if you can please would you let us know?

**W. Pitney:** Yes, and I might have to defer a little bit to some of our administrators, but as I recall NIU will not have expenses associated with that as Nankai will fund that. Is that correct?

**D. Baker:** There will be no net loss. It will be all positive revenue.

**H. Khoury:** Okay, thank you.

**D. Baker:** These students will pay full out-of-state tuition when they come to campus. So the first two years in Nankai with our curriculum, the second two years here with full out-of-state

tuition.

**H. Khoury:** Okay, thank you. There is another question. On the second page, you are referring to the sixth annual report after sabbaticals. I thought it's a three-year annual report after sabbatical. Is that right or this is something else too?

**W. Pitney:** It is the sixth time the sabbaticals have been reported to the Board of Trustees thus the label that it's the sixth report provided about sabbaticals to the BOT.

**H. Khoury:** I see so it's not per individual who is taking the leave?

**W. Pitney:** Correct.

**H. Khoury:** Thank you for clarifying it.

**W. Pitney:** You're welcome.

**H. Khoury:** The third question is with regard to the last paragraph. Like in the first sentence, it states that NIU has a strong and robust history with a focus on continuous improvement and basically attention to equity, attention to several other components. So what is the need to have a new administrator on board for that purpose?

**W. Pitney:** A new administrator in terms of the Chief Diversity Officer, is that what you're referring to?

**H. Khoury:** Yes.

**W. Pitney:** Lisa, would you like to comment on that?

**D. Baker:** I'll start and then hand off to Lisa. So as you probably know we had a diversity task force. It was a diversity inclusion task force this last fall. And they did a great job. I don't know if you had an opportunity to see the report or not but it's a wonderful report and I encourage all of you to read it. One of the key things that that group called for was this position. The reason was that we have a lot of excellence going on in areas. So somebody is doing something over here, something over here, we're not getting the over arching and integrated activities that we need that could really move us forward and to enhance our students' education, build our culture, build our faculty and staff, work with the community, etc. So we need that kind of coordination. In higher education, it's become a fairly traditional position that we have not included. So we took a position that currently existed and was open, and reshaped it. It's not a new position but a reshaping of an existing budget line. And, Lisa, would you like to talk a little bit more about it?

**L. Freeman:** I think that I want to build on the first part of what President Baker said by pointing out that our diversity mission was fragmented. This was apparent in the diversity workshop that he called three administrators to put together as well as in the work of our academic diversity committees where we've had less leadership in terms of diversity and multiculturalism in the academic side than in terms of enforcement and compliance or perhaps student affairs.

That said, as the task force came out with the recommendation for hiring a new administrator, I think we're all cognizant of the concern of administrator salaries. The data on how this salary line was created were provided to the Northern Star. There should be an article coming out. But when I became the provost, I eliminated a number of lines in the provost's office: a position of deputy provost; two special provostal appointments that were part-time positions occupied by retired provost staff; the coordinator position for the diversity committee which was a partial faculty buyout, a position which really lacked the gravitas and the reporting structure necessary to really move our diversity position forward; and there was another special provostal assistant. So there were actually five lines all together that were eliminated. I don't have the numbers in front of me, but the salary associated with those lines was slightly about \$300,000 and the chief diversity officer position is being advertised with a range on the HR paperwork of \$100,000 to \$175,000 with the idea that we'll get people with a broad spectrum of skills and so we need a wide range on the initial HR paperwork.

**H. Khoury:** Thank you.

**D. Baker:** Anything else on that one? The Diversity Task Force I think was very excited and really impressed upon us the need for this position after taking a deep dive into these issues. Again I would point you at that report and encourage you to read it. I think it's a good piece. All right, Bill, anything else?

**W. Pitney:** No I think that's it.

**D. Baker:** Any other questions?

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee –  
Jay Monteiro and Rebecca Shorridge – [report](#) – Pages 10-11

**D. Baker:** Next we have a written report from the BOT Finance, Facilities, Operations Committee and I'll point you to that on pages 10 to 11. Any comments or questions on that one?

D. BOT Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee –  
Deborah Haliczzer and Dan Gebo – [report](#) – Page 12

**D. Baker:** Hearing none, the Legislative Affairs, Research and Innovation Committee, Deborah?

**D. Haliczzer:** Questions?

**D. Baker:** Any questions for Deborah?

E. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee –  
Deborah Haliczzer and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Page 13

**D. Baker:** The next one is the Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs, Greg Waas, written only though. Anything on that one?

F. BOT Enrollment Ad Hoc Committee – Bill Pitney – no report

- G. BOT Governance Ad Hoc Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Bill Pitney – no report
- H. BOT – William Pitney and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Pages 14-16

**D. Baker:** Okay so jumping down, Bill you've got the BOT report.

**W. Pitney:** The BOT report starts on page 14. You'll see a laundry list of items that were ultimately approved by the BOT after they came through the committees with endorsements. Starting on page 15, you'll see some things I thought were worth highlighting, one of which is they improved the student health insurance fee totalling \$1,052 per semester for students. The second item below relates to that.

And then on the bottom of page 15 you'll see tuition remittance program for the Ph.D. in health sciences. The funding structure for that program is different than the funding structure for other programs and eventually that program will become self-sustaining. To that end, there was concern that unrestricted employee tuition waivers could impede that program's ability to sustain itself financially. And so what was proposed, this is an information item, so mostly a first reading at the BOT meeting, was a new tuition remittance program that if an individual is an employee and they want to seek a degree in that particular program, that the department would pay that employee's tuition and there would be a memorandum of understanding generated that would articulate and stipulate that that employee, once the degree is conferred, would serve a number of years afterwards as an employee in that position. And it's a model used by many hospitals and other health agencies. I just wanted to draw that to your attention. So I think that's all my report. Any questions?

**H. Khoury:** I have one question about the student health insurance fees. Is this comparable to what other institutions will be charging and isn't it a bit too high for individual students to pay that much in addition to activity fees that they have to pay in addition to tuition fees? Because maybe they can't take personal insurance policies and they may not have to pay that much. I'm sure you looked at that.

**W. Pitney:** I'll get started and then I'll ask Dr. Eric Weldy to chime in a little bit. With respect to your concern about the level of the student health insurance fee, you're not alone. That concern has bubbled up and that prompted me to reach out to Dr. Weldy to clarify that fee. And before I sent him that question, I looked at what the fees were at others institutions. So, for example, at University of Illinois it's substantially lower than ours. So I raised that. And then the other, I think I compared it to the fees at Western Illinois, for example, and that sort of thing. Dr. Weldy, I'll ask you to clarify for me but, if I got it right, the volume of students at the University of Illinois, both at the Urbana-Champaign and UIC campus, allow them to get a reduced rate for the fee. I think that's one of the factors, right, the number of students?

**E. Weldy:** Yes, that's correct. That's one of the factors. Some other things that impact cost are the Affordable Care Act as well and some of the requirements in regards to certain things that we need to provide our students through the health insurance. The other thing as well has to do with, I'm trying to think of the term for it, in regards to the number of claims that are submitted by our students, which is very high. And to be up front, the insurance companies really are not making any money off of the student health insurance, but the claims are very high and so that impacts the cost as well.

**H. Khoury:** About how many of our students take the NIU insurance?

**E. Weldy:** On average, we average about 6,000 students that end up opting in to the health insurance.

**H. Khoury:** Because with that number and what NIU will be paying for the insurance company eventually we can get about 13,000 students insured so that's where I'm thinking could it be too high maybe.

**D. Baker:** If I could comment on that, this price was arrived at by going through an RFP process, so we put it out for bid and this was the lowest bid. So I think we had six bids that came in. So there was a competitive bid, this isn't something we set, this is a pass through. We collect the money and then pay the insurance bill. I think the Affordable Care Act included a number of things that weren't in there before and that's why it's driven it up and, if we compare our next year insurance bill per student to last year's insurance bill by other schools, it's probably not a fair comparison, because the Affordable Care Act is coming in and ratcheting everybody up. But it is something we're going to have our procurement office look at. Are there things that we can do to tweak the policies, whether it be deductibles, or how we write it, or whatever it is. And I know they've played with that some in the past, but I've asked Eric and Michele Danza, our procurement officer to go back and see what can we do in there to still provide adequate insurance for your students but drive the cost down. And so they're going to do that on the next round that we go through to see if we can reduce it. I think it's a very good concern. It went up a few hundred dollars this year.

**H. Khoury:** And one other thing, are these PPO types of policies or HMO? Or do they have just to go to the NIU health department.

**E. Weldy:** PPO's. The students they're not paying anything out of pocket when they come to the Student Health Services. Something else too I want to add as well, is that some of the other universities and the last institution that I worked for did this, is that they some institutions are able to subsidize their student health insurance in order to lower costs for students. But not every institution is able to do that.

**D. Domke:** I have two questions regarding this. Kind of one going off that are students able to use this healthcare or insurance at other health care facilities or just specifically at the Northern Illinois?

**E. Weldy:** No, they can use their health insurance at other facilities but they end up, you end up having to pay more out of pocket.

**D. Domke:** Right.

**E. Weldy:** For like co-pay and so forth.

**D. Domke:** And the second part of my question is: What direct benefits are more, are the students getting, because it's nearly a \$300 increase. I have to be able to go back to my constituents and say well you're going to be getting this more than you were last year. There

needs to be a justification as to why there's an almost \$300 increase.

**E. Weldy:** As I noted through the Affordable Care Act, we're required to provide additional things for students in regards to services. One perfect example is, for example, in the past if you had a pre-existing condition, the insurance would not cover it. That's not the case now, it's covered. And plus in utilizing our health services as I stated before, is that you don't have to pay any money out-of-pocket. I think that's something that's very helpful. Another thing too in regards to the RFP that went out, one of the things that was important to the committee that helped make the decision, was that it was important to lower the out-of-pocket or co-pay that students were paying so that was initially very important to them. And there were also some other things that proved very important.

**D. Domke:** But I want to kind of just go off that as well. Wasn't before this, there were no out-of-pocket fees already worked into the plan using NIU's facilities?

**E. Weldy:** Well, from the standpoint of NIU, but I'm talking from the standpoint of, if students, for example, if you go home and whether you're on break or at home for the weekend and you go see the doctor or you go to the emergency room, obviously there's going to be some sort of co-pay out-of-pocket. Where if you go to health services, as I noted, there is nothing out-of-pocket.

**D. Domke:** But that's always been that way correct?

**D. Weldy:** Yes it has always been that way. I can also provide a list of just all of the initial services through the new health plan that will be provided to students.

**D. Baker:** That might be useful to show last year's rate sheet so to speak and this year's and what you're getting and why the price went up. And then you'll have something to go back to your stakeholders with and rightfully so. And again we may be able to do this RFP process next year and drive some of those costs down by going back to some of these assumptions about what's important and not. So we would invite students to be actively engaged in that front end process where we're kind of setting the parameters that we want to go out in the RFP with and there's going to be tradeoffs whether there's co-pay or not co-pay or how big the deductible is and that kind of stuff. And you can opt out. You asked that question. You can opt out if you have other insurance. So if you're under 26 you probably got a good deal somewhere else if you parents have insurance. Okay anything else? Thank you.

I. Academic Policy Committee – Virginia Naples, Chair

1. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws [Article 15.5 and 15.6](#) – Pages 17-41  
Standing Committees of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council  
**FIRST READING**

**D. Baker:** The Academic Policy Committee, Virginia.

**V. Naples:** Hello, can you hear me? Yeah I don't have a lot of additional things, the report is the same one we have presented before and is on page 17 and 18. I do call most of your attention to the revised flow chart which is an attempt at streamlining the process of approval of items in the

curriculum. This actually is a process that has been undergoing for several years with quite a number of different people looking at it and trying to find a way to allow us to accomplish all of the missions of these various committees, reduce redundancy, and be more efficient in the amount of effort for the people who are involved in the various committees. One of the things is that a lot of them take a lot of time and need careful thinking about the issues. And some of them work in partial overlap with one another. So it makes sense to streamline the process and it will also, I think, help with getting people to be able to accomplish these committee goals more efficiently and more quickly so that the approval process will speed up. This has been a complaint in the past that it took a very long period of time to get something through the approval process and we would like to eliminate that particular problem as much as we can. I don't have other specific comment. If any of my co-committee members or other contributors would like to add to this I would welcome their comments.

**D. Baker:** Others?

**W. Pitney:** I'll add a few comments here. When Virginia said this has been a process that's been ongoing for several years, over two years ago now when I was on the CUAE Committee, I was on it for two years. The first year I was on it over three years ago, I was just struck that in many instances we struggle to find tasks to engage in and things to do. And we heard reports from lots of folks and it really was just an advisory committee. And so at that point in time, the dialog started in terms of examining the viability of merging the CUAE and the CIUE committees together. And so that's kind of the genesis of that.

And then over the years some other folks started looking at the tasks and responsibilities of APASC and the CUC committees and the extent to which colleges should be addressing some of those things. And if we've got a committee like the CUC that's going to examine the curricular materials anyway, could they not only look at it for curricular overlap and redundancy and have the college view, but also double check and screen that the regulations and policies were being met? And so it made sense to a lot of folks that looked at, yeah that's probably one committee that could address that. And then the discussion kind of went there right in terms of you know maybe we could even take this a step further and think about being as just as thoughtful but protecting some of our most valuable human resources in terms of time, right, so that's where that came from.

**V. Naples:** That was precisely the goal. We want everyone who is interesting in serving on any branch of any committee to have the opportunity to serve. But we don't want to over task people or to have them do things that make them think that their contribution isn't as valuable as it ought to be. I also do want to mention one other thing that I think we have mentioned in the past, is that this new structure is also pretty much paralleling the structure for the graduate programs and that might make a little bit more clarity for people trying to understand what is happening and what are the steps involved.

**W. Pitney:** Yes, that's. I'm glad you raised that point. That process seems to work great. We've got a lot of smart people at the table at the department level, the college level, and then at the university level. I think if we can change some of the redundancies and streamline things and it should work well.

**D. Baker:** Dean Block.

**D. Block:** I'm on the committee too and it's estimated that this can decrease the time for approval for new programs by a number of months. This is very important in our economic situation and the higher ed situation that we be as nimble as we can be and that's another plus to this new organizational scheme.

**D. Baker:** I would like to complement the committee. I think this is the right spirit to take it on. You know none of us want to spend or waste time in a committee if we're not moving things forward. You've got other more important things to do with your life than sit in a committee that's not doing anything. So let's streamline it and if it works, great. And if it turns out that it's not working so well, we'll change it. I like – let's try. And this is probably a good example of what we need to be thinking about for a lot of processes inside the institution, not just in governance, but in everything we do. And I've asked Al Phillips to take that on, to chair a committee to look at reengineering key processes in the institution where we could really streamline things and make all of our lives easier. With these budgetary pressures it would be nice to free up your time to do the right stuff instead of just churning and being inefficient. So Al's going to take that on and I appreciate him doing it. Another thing that I really appreciate about Al's background is that he has that process reengineering background in his experience so I think he'll be an excellent lead for that. Anything else for Doris, or I mean for Virginia? Or Doris? Thank you, Virginia.

J. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair

1. [RSB Budget Survey](#) – Pages 42-45

**D. Baker:** Resource, Space and Budget, Ibrahim.

**I. Abdel-Motaleb:** Thank you. We have two items and I'll talk about the first one, and Bill will talk about the second one. The budget committee, after going through educational process with the CFO and with the provost, now they decided that we need to have a survey to know what are the problems related to the budget and the hiring process. So we created a survey that you can see on page 42 and we sent it to all the deans, chairs, directors, about 266 of them. Today was the deadline for it. I would like to inform you that the response was very, very high, that we received about 60 percent of the people we sent them the poll. We have not yet looked at the data. We are going to sit and start working on the data to see what the people did say and we will present it to you next time.

**W. Pitney:** On page 46...

**D. Baker:** Oh we had a question on that. I'm sorry.

**H. Khoury:** I would like to ask why faculty were not included in this process.

**I. Abdel-Motaleb:** The committee decided to poll the people who are directly involved with the budget. Faculty may not be involved with the budget directly. So the chair, for example, or the business manager, we would like to see what are the problem they face when they deal with the budget. The deans and the chairs deal with hiring. So this was our rationale for it.

**H. Khoury:** Thank you. But again faculty are being impacted by the budget and hiring or no hiring for new faculty are related to the budget. So it would be nice to acknowledge the voices of the faculty in this process I think. That's my opinion.

**I. Abdel-Motaleb:** This is a good point. I'll take it to the committee and we will discuss it.

**D. Baker:** And, Ibrahim, I assume that the report that comes from this data will be presented here for faculty input.

**I. Abdel-Motaleb:** Yes. The senate will be involved also as a faculty representative.

**D. Baker:** So they can respond to what the people that are handling the budget are saying?

**I. Abdel-Motaleb:** That's right, yes.

**D. Baker:** Maybe that's one place to have that input and, if we need more faculty input, the committee can consider that.

**I. Abdel-Motaleb:** Yes, correct

2. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 2.8](#) – Pages 46-48  
Resources, Space and Budget Committee

#### **FIRST READING**

**D. Baker:** And, Bill unless there were other questions for Ibrahim.

**W. Pitney:** Very good, thank you. So on page 46 we've got a first reading of some changes that we're proposing for the Resource, Space and Budget Committee. Let me give you just a very brief and precise history related to this. When the state budget was announced, the magnitude of the cuts raised lots of concerns. One of the other concerns that came out was the fact that we've got a body that's a joint committee with the Faculty Senate and the University Council that is designed to be at the table to provide input to our administration in terms of budgeting, budget priorities, etc. And the operation of that committee is typically structured around the academic calendar, so nine months. And knowing that the state appropriations may not be, at least this year, made very clear until well into June, we wanted to try to identify a process that would allow for having members of that committee that have been apprised throughout the academic year about the budget issues at the table for advice on several different issue to the administration. The other thought was that, as we think about state appropriations and trying to balance a budget, etc., it may not be just about cutting but also whether or not there's some revenue generation opportunities.

And so with that we're proposing to add two tasks to the Resource, Space and Budget Committee: items D and E. D is to advise the President and Executive Vice President and Provost on critical, time sensitive, budget issues affecting the university. And E to participate and advise the President and Executive Vice President and Provost on resource allocation matters and revenue generation opportunities that arise. In addition, what we're proposing is that we as the primary governing body at the university allow this group to function outside of the academic year without a quorum providing there are at least five voting members, the majority of

which must be faculty. Alternates would be allowable. Now in addition to that, back on page 46, we're also suggesting we increase the number of faculty from eight to 12. And the reason we've done that is because faculty tend to be on nine-month contracts as compared to staff. Their availability outside of the academic year tends to be a little bit more problematic. In order to be at the table, we thought that increasing that number from eight to 12 would perhaps result in more individual being able to pull away from the summer or outside of the academic year and serve on those advisory capacities. So that's the nature of the changes. It's a first reading. Yes, Barbara?

**B. Jaffee:** I wasn't aware that the number, that we were also proposing that the number of faculty be increased. And I guess I was wondering if you're going to increase the number of faculty if it wouldn't make sense to go back to an older model in which there was a representative from each college, because we're almost there with this change from what it is six...

**W. Pitney:** From eight to 12. Remember it's a joint committee so we've got to have four from University Council and four from Faculty Senate. Moving to 12, obviously, we're looking at six from each body.

**B. Jaffee:** Right, so if you had six you're almost at one representative a college if you wanted to make it that model again. That was point.

**W. Pitney:** Okay. Any responses to that?

**D. Domke:** Not a response to that but just as a member of the committee I can't remember if we came to a decision. I know we were speaking about kind of call-in or if you're away, if you were a faculty member that has family obligations or things like that over the summer months, or you're not on campus, would a phone-in constitute as being present for quorum?

**W. Pitney:** I might have to ask Ferald for any guidance on this one, but I'm inclined to think that this day and age not allowing for phone-ins or FaceTime or Skype or those sorts of things, to me it would seem just kind of silly. I think we should allow for that sort of thing. Ferald, any thoughts on that?

**F. Bryan:** Well, Roberts Rules has made it to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century and they recognize that. Although I would also point out the state has had some concerns about Board of Trustees not showing up and so forth. But Roberts does allow for that if you wish. It's allows electronic meetings and people to even register votes by electronic means so that's now in the new edition of Roberts Rules.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you.

**R. Feurer:** I think it would be a nice feature to someone insure the diversity of representation. So I'd like to make that a motion if that some measure be considered for this to insure the diversity. If not absolute representation from each college, that we don't have a pool of people from one college. I think that would be...

**W. Pitney:** So across eight individuals from Faculty Senate and University Council just insuring

that each college is represented?

**R. Feurer:** Right.

**W. Pitney:** Okay.

**B. Jaffee:** Can I second that?

**R. Feurer:** I don't know how it word it exactly, but I'd like to at least discuss it and I don't know if you want me to have a specific motion or if I can just...

**Unidentified:** I don't think we're talking about eight; we were talking about...

**W. Pitney:** I misspoke. Across the 12 faculty, make sure that somebody from every college is within that 12 faculty right?

**R. Feurer:** Right. Can somebody repeat that back?

**W. Pitney:** Unless I – as a first reading I'm going to have to look over to Ferald again here to reel me in to make sure I don't do something crazy. But I think as a first reading there might be some latitude to make that slight modification and have the language for the second reading?

**F. Bryan:** Yes, the principle in Robert's Rules is notice. The fact that notice has been given that we're going to amend the constitution. And you're quivering over the number. That's the important thing the next meeting we will vote to amend the constitution on this particular budget so it's certainly appropriate to make clear statements about what that number will be.

**R. Feurer:** So, could I just make a motion to add a clause that or a sentence.

**F. Bryan:** There's a motion on the floor already and it's was seconded.

**W. Pitney:** Promod, is that a second?

**P. Vohra:** Yes, I second

**W. Pitney:** Okay. So the motion is to add a clause that each college be represented amongst the 12 faculty members. So we've got a motion and a second. Do we need to approve that now Ferald now?

**F. Bryan:** You can approve that wording now, yes.

**W. Pitney:** To change it here and then it would appear on the second reading for the approval of the amendment.

**F. Bryan:** Correct, yes.

**W. Pitney:** So we've got a motion on the floor. Any other discussion? Again just to remind everybody, the motion is to add a clause here to make sure that amongst the 12 faculty members,

each college was represented.

**F. Bryan:** And this does not approve the amendment, just the working change.

**W. Pitney:** Just that change right. So seeing no discussion.

**F. Bryan:** This requires a majority.

**W. Pitney:** A simple majority. So all in favor of approving the addition of that clause say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? We didn't need the clickers, did we? I mean we moved forward. So you guys want to use the clickers? Is that what I'm hearing or you okay with the oral vote? I think it was pretty clear. So I will add that language in. Again, that does not approve amendment, it's just to add that clause in. I will do so and that will show up in the second reading. Thank you.

**D. Baker:** Was there any other discussion on that item? The provost and I appreciate, if you end up voting for this, appreciate it. The legislature is going to do its thing probably well after the end of the semester and come up with a budget after it. And so it's important to have this kind of input to us as we're trying to make decisions in whatever budget environment we end up in. I appreciate that.

**B. Jaffee:** I'm sorry is it too late to have any comment?

**D. Baker:** Sure, go ahead.

**B. Jaffee:** It's just sort of an unintended consequences thing. When we talked about this in Steering Committee, this 2.8.4, the last bit about alternates for the committee operating outside of the academic year will be selected by the Executive Secretary of the University Council, the reasoning, the rationale behind that was that if you didn't have representation from every college, that it would be important that there be a way to sort of insure diversity in the event of needing alternates. The language elsewhere in the constitution is that alternates are selected by the member themselves. That's what we were trying to compensate for, but if we're going to have representatives from every college, maybe we don't need that last sentence.

**W. Pitney:** And, we wouldn't need that because why? The person from the college would select their own alternate?

**B. Jaffee:** Right, because all the colleges would be represented and so there would be an opportunity to maintain the diversity that the new clause is insuring.

**W. Pitney:** I think because we're allowing for folks to operate without a quorum providing there are at least five, three of whom must be faculty, in those instances and again that was the spirit of that was to make sure we had a small group that could address Item D in particular of the new task and that is on time-sensitive budget issues. In that instance we're not going to have broad representation across colleges for that small group anyway, so I think we could still operate with

it as it is.

**B. Jaffee:** But if people are identifying their own alternate, we have a better chance of that happening. As someone who actually proposed that last sentence, I just want to make it clear that I'm not against it in principle. I actually argued for that in Steering Committee. I'm just now realizing you know when you make a change it has other effects.

**W. Pitney:** Anything else?

**B. Jaffee:** I'd like to move that in connection to the clause that was just added, we could eliminate the last sentence under 2.8.4.

**W. Pitney:** So we have a motion on the floor, any second.

**R. Feurer:** I'll second.

**W. Pitney:** So we have a motion and a second. Any discussion on that? I think we've heard some rationale and some counter points.

**D. Baker:** I just had a question, I was whispering to Bill which was the process by which faculty would go through like in the summer to identify people if you're not here. Is it easier to let the chair do that as opposed to trying to rally, and then you have to get into the complexities of how many people in college have to vote to get the person in and I don't know it just sounds kind of cumbersome, but you guys can do what you want.

**W. Pitney:** Okay. Let's go ahead and pull out your clickers so I don't get in any problems here, so go ahead and get your clickers. We're going to go ahead and do that. So the motion is to strike the last sentence about alternates under Item 2.8.4. And again we're not approving or disapproving the amendment to the bylaw, the standing motion, it's just to strike that we're not. So for our vote Pat are we ready right? So before you vote though let's clarify this, one or A would be to support the motions and then that sentence would be struck; two or B would be to vote no for that motion and that sentence would stay, three or C is to abstain. So go ahead and vote now please. Is everybody done? All set? No? Are we ready to close the vote? One or A is yes; two or B is no; and three or C is abstain. Okay let's close the vote please.

1 – Yes – 13

2 – No – 21

3 – Abstain – 3

**W. Pitney:** So the majority was B. So the sentence stays. Thank you. So I think we can move on.

K. Rules and Governance Committee – Jana Brubaker, Chair – no report

L. University Affairs Committee – Greg Long, Chair – no report

M. Student Association – Joe Frascello, President – report

**D. Baker:** Thank you. Student Association, Joe boy it's been an interesting week.

**J. Frascello:** So I don't know if you've heard, but S.A. elections just ended recently so I'm just going to give you all a brief update on what has come of that. So there were two tickets, the Voice of Change and Standing for Every Student. Both of these tickets represent the passion and desire of the student body to participate in their governance. For their participation, we thank each of the candidates and encourage them all to continue down the path of student leadership in order to make the campus stronger. Following the S.A. Supreme Court's decision to overturn both the appeal from the Voice of Change ticket and the petition from the Standing for Every Student ticket made last night during a public hearing, the Voice of Change ticket has been declared the victor of the S.A. executive election by popular vote. Full voting results of the election, I will go over those in just a moment.

The S.A. strives to best represent students and their interests, while still maintaining our bylaws. We are sworn to protect the sanctity of our bylaws and often struggle with the sometimes conscious decision between upholding the spirit and the letter of the law. Now I will read the results, the official results, from the election. For president, Nathan Lupstein of the Voice of Change ticket with 1,682 votes is the winner. Benjamin Donovan of the Standing for Every Student ticket had 633 votes. For vice president, Reginald Bates, Jr. from the Voice of Change ticket had 1,802 votes and he was the winner. Robert Kreml from the Standing for Every Student ticket had 507 votes. For treasurer, Mark Calvey of the Voice of Change ticket won with 1,397 votes against Gladys Sanchez from Standing for Every Student with 857 votes. And finally, for student trustee, Raquel Chavez on the Voice of Change ticket ran unopposed and won with 2,150 votes. If there is any question, Dillon and I would be more than happy to answer those. Any questions at this point? Okay and then Dillon also has another comment.

**D. Domke:** I just wanted to add as well kind of going off Joe's thing, this was the first year that we did have online elections so the process was a little rocky. I guess the good thing was there were a lot of people talking about the Student Association. So I guess we can live by the motto "No press is bad press." Nonetheless, we will be looking at some things to kind of shore up some different things to minimize the gray area. I know I heard somebody mention that earlier about the gray area. But I also wanted to say thank you to Al Phillips. It sounds like we got our first crack at him, he came out to the Student Senate this past Sunday, so I feel honored that he was there before he even made his first appearance at University Council. One final thing I'd like to add, we finally have our two students representatives to the program prioritization coordinating committee. I, myself, will be the undergraduate representative and then Brian Cunningham, who is a retired Navy veteran in the Law School, will be the graduate representative to that. So we look forward to working on the committee and then further more down the road developing the student review panel that was discussed with the administration.

**D. Baker:** Great. Any questions for the students? I had one for Joe. Joe, this is I think the first time you testified in front of the legislature?

**J. Frascello:** That's correct.

**D. Baker:** What were your reflections on it? I know you're a political science too so you were kind of a kid in the candy store down there?

**J. Frascello:** Yeah, it was interesting and, as you mentioned, there was, I believe it was the

chairman of the committee there that said that you all did the work here for us with all the fun charts and graphs and whatnot. So it was a good experience to see the professional committee in process and to be a part of it, and also we always welcome applause whenever we show up anywhere so I kind of fell like a rock star so it was kind of cool.

**D. Baker:** I did have a meeting with the other presidents, a telephone meeting, it was official, we met on the phone, and they asked about you. They said: Did you take students? We didn't take students, and we read about you in the Springfield paper. I never read the article, I guess you got some applause in the Springfield paper or something for what you guys did down there.

**J. Frascello:** I think it's great that NIU brings students and like you mentioned, other universities tend to comment saying maybe we should have done, that's a great idea.

**D. Baker:** I think they are starting to think that now, yeah.

**J. Frascello:** They are going to steal our thing we got going.

**D. Baker:** Well, I think it's good for higher education if all the students come, I mean if all the schools bring students. We're really trying to show the impact that we have on lives in communities in the state. Who better to do it than students who are going through the process now? So thanks for going down and taking the time.

**J. Frascello:** Thank you.

N. Operating Staff Council – Jay Monteiro, President – [report](#) – Pages 49-51

**D. Baker:** Okay, Operating Staff Council, Jay.

**J. Monteiro:** The full report is in your packet to read but I wanted to point out a couple of highlights from our last meeting. President Baker was our guest and he addressed a list of questions that the council had given him ahead of time. And I thought it was a very productive dialog that day. As you can see in your packet, you can read the questions that were given. Many of those were answered by the aid of a PowerPoint presentation regarding the state budget and related items. I want to point our number 5 on the list there. Employee morale was addressed with a presentation from the council's ad hoc committee on employee morale. We presented a two-part plan, and part one consisted of requests to the president and his cabinet which included support for the operating staff personnel advisor position, recognition of potential employee morale issues during the program prioritization process. Also we were requesting an addition of a comment or a suggestion form on the resources for faculty and staff web page at niu.edu, which I believe has been done. An improvement of communication through the inclusion of important and timely employee information, specifically looking at using the payroll advice forms to share important information.

And then part two of the plan that we presented was the council's initial action plan steps that we looked to do which would include implementing a series of brown bag luncheons, specifically designed for Civil Service employees. We also want to continue to develop the relationship between the University Council and Operating Staff Council so that we are communicating clearly and promoting communication between the council and our own Civil Service

employees. One of the ideas we have come up with is rotating our monthly meeting three times a year to different locations on campus. That way we get out and see our own constituents and they see us and we become more accessible. One of the other items is adding an e-newsletter which the last month we did try that and it worked very well. We are continuing to send paper copies to areas that do not have computer access. And then encouraging efforts to recognize employee accomplishments, especially at the supervisory level. In the vein, coming up shortly we will be announcing our recipients of our outstanding service award winners.

**D. Baker:** Any questions or comments for Jay? I want to thank the Operating Staff Council for taking time, you guys spent a lot of with me and I really appreciate you doing that. The committee, the subcommittee on the morale issues, I thought did an outstanding job and actionable items came out of it that we're putting in place. So thank you so much for doing that.

O. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczzer, President – [report](#) – Page 52

**D. Baker:** Okay, next is Deborah with the Supportive Professional Staff Council.

**D. Haliczzer:** Jay and I are doing our tag team. Okay SPS Council you have a written report. A couple things that I would like to highlight are: I would like to invite all of you to come to our April 14 awards reception where we will be recognizing four presidential recipients, five other staff awards, 30 certificates of recognition, and our service award from the council. You're all invited. It's down in the ballroom. It's a good morale event as was the Wellness Fair today.

Flex time policy, we're having discussion about flex time policy. Many of us have a great deal of flexibility to attend campus events. That is not true for a lot of Civil Service, particularly hourly employees, and so we are working with Provost Freeman on creating a flex time policy, looking at communication issues, and clearly communicating that all absences for any event requires supervisory approval.

Hot off the press, let me announce that the NIU Annuitants Association and the HR Center for Training will be offering a series of noontime brown bag discussions on retirement questions and so we are not talking about retirement planning or finances or SURS, these are about how do I decide when it's time to retire, what sort of personal things change in life and how to make decisions about living arrangements, family and then a career planning workshop for people who are anticipating retirement in the next five years or so. So you'll all be getting an invitation to that so it's open to everyone. Thank you.

**D. Baker:** Any questions for Deborah? David?

**D. Long:** I just wanted to clarify the NIU Cares Day is April 18 this year. It's listed as April 19 on the report and the committee is still looking for volunteers to help out with check in.

**D. Haliczzer:** I apologize for my typo.

P. University Benefits Committee – Brian Mackie, FS Liaison to UBC – no report

Q. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Mary Beth Henning, Chair – no report

## VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 9](#) – Page 53  
Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor  
**SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM**

**D. Baker:** Let's move on to Unfinished Business, Bill.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. We've got one item under Unfinished Business and it was just to do a little bit of housekeeping for our constitution and make sure that Supportive Professional Staff was embedded throughout the language under the duties of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor. One of the good things about my role and the position I'm in is I can see when people leave and when they don't come back. And, unfortunately, we don't have the necessary folks here right now that we did before to make sure the motion would carry because we need two-thirds vote in order to change the bylaw. So I would accept a motion to postpone the vote for this item under unfinished business.

**J. Frascello:** So moved.

**D. Haliczzer:** Second.

**W. Pitney:** Thank you. all in favor say aye

**Members:** Aye.

**W. Pitney:** Any opposed, any abstentions? Thank you.

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 2.3](#) – Page 54  
UC-Minutes Committee  
**FIRST READING**

**D. Baker:** New Business, Bill?

**W. Pitney:** Yes, please, so these are some first reading items here under New Business. The first one you'll find on page 54. The spirit of this particular change is again to save one of our valuable resources of time and not duplicate efforts. Right now what happens is we have a full transcript of our sessions online and we also have minutes. I do the minutes off of the transcript and then it comes back to this body for a full vote. And so the proposal here is to take out the Minutes Committee as one of the standing committees of the University Council. So that's the first item there. Any questions?

- B. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Articles 2.2 and 2.5](#) – Pages 55-58  
UC-Rules and Governance Committee  
UC-Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee  
**FIRST READING**

**W. Pitney:** Seeing no questions, let's move down to Item B. Item B is on page 55 and what we're proposing is to do two things, the first of which is to consolidate the Elections and Legislative Oversight of the University Council with the Rules and Governance Committee. So that would become one committee of the University Council to consolidate their roles. The duties and responsibilities of the Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee are such that our office, and I should say Pat, Pat has everything in order, structured, taken care of, I's are dotted, T's are crossed, everything is all set for that committee to operate. And so the extent to which they've got a lot of work is really minimal. The Rules and Governance Committee is such that when we discussed this at Steering Committee we thought governance elections, we looked at the work that they have done, we thought they could be consolidated pretty easily. So what you see here is the consolidation of those two committees.

But there's more. What we're also suggesting is that that same thing be done at the Faculty Senate because in both Faculty Senate and Rules and Governance, we have Elections and Legislative Oversight as well as a Rules and Governance Committee. If we consolidate those in both bodies, in the spirit of working smart and protecting time, but also having voices at the table to take care of charges that come to these bodies from Rules and Governance and Elections and Legislative Oversight activities, we are looking at joining those.

So it would become a joint committee, so it would be the Faculty Senate University Council Committee on Rules, Governance, and Elections. It would operate just as the Resource, Space and Budget Committee does. We're proposing eight faculty members, four from University Council, four from Faculty Senate, and then the other committee composition would be as it is with University Council. So that's a little history of that and what we're proposing. Any questions, comments? So really on page 55 and 56 you see the new committee, that joint committee and then the other pages are the requisite strike outs that would happen. So that's a first reading.

- C. Proposed revisions to NIU Constitution, [Article 4](#) – Page 59  
Standing Committees of the University Council  
**FIRST READING**

**W. Pitney:** And we've got one more. So on page 59 you will see a proposed change to the NIU constitution. What we're proposing is that instead of listing every standing committee of the University Council we just simply, and by the way the list that currently is in the constitution is incomplete. Not all the committees are listed there first of all. Instead of messing with this too much, what we're proposing is that we strike out the actual names of the standing committees and we just simply insert that the standing committees of the University Council shall be as defined by the NIU Bylaws. Anytime we do any committee changes, modifications, etc. down the road, it's a bylaw change not a constitution change and the reason that might be helpful is for a constitution change we not only need two-thirds vote here, but we also have to have a faculty referendum. So there you go. Any questions, comments about that? Thank you.

**D. Baker:** Congratulations. I think a lot of good thought has gone into that, Bill. Any comments from the floor?

## **IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

## **X. INFORMATION ITEMS**

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

## **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**D. Baker:** Could I have a motion to go out in the warm air? All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**D. Baker:** Opposed. Thank you. Go enjoy the sun.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.**