

Northern Illinois University
Huskie Commons

University Council Archives

Administration & Leadership Archives

12-2-2015

UC Transcript 2015-12-02

Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil>

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2015-12-02" (2015). *University Council Archives*. 6.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/6>

This Transcript is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Council Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, December 2, 2015, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Adeboje, Baker, Bauer, Bishop, Block, Brubaker, Carey, Carlson, Chen, Dawson, Deng, Doederlein, Domke, Douglass (for Freeman), Giese, Gilson, Haliczzer, Hanley, Hathaway, Jaffee, Khoury, Lee, Liberty-Baczek, Long, Lupstein, Macdonald, McCord, Mogren, Moremen, Naples, Nicholson, Nissenbaum, Pavkov, Penrod, Riley, Rodgers, Saborio, Scherer, Slotsve (for Farrell), Staikidis, Thu, Towell (for Schoenbachler), Vazquez, Vohra, Wagenecht, Wood

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Arriola, Barth, Bond, Campbell, Cordes, Dhar, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Freeman, Hedin, Jemison, Lagioia, Lezon, Pitney, Schoenbachler, Sto. Domingo, Thomas

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Coryell, Falkoff, Klaper, Konen, Phillips, Weldy

OTHERS ABSENT: Armstrong, Kaplan, Levin

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Baker: Good afternoon. Did everybody get their clicker, by the way? We're going to do some votes that require clickers. Kendall? Not to name names. Just one. Thanks for grabbing those. All right. I'll call us to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

D. Baker: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. And I believe at your table/place is a couple, is a document to amend the agenda to add a couple things. And we'll get into the discussion of those. But there are two additions. One is the temporary appointment or reappointment of Jerry Blazey, and the other for Harlan Teller. I would like to go into discussion with those later on for items C and D under New Business. Do I have a motion to accept that addition?

R. Scherer: So moved.

C. Doederlein: Second.

D. Baker: Any other additions or deletions? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 4, 2015 MEETING

D. Baker: Next is the approval of the minutes. Do I have a motion to approve the minutes?

D. Domke: So moved.

D. Baker: Second? Who wants to second?

C. Doederlein: Second.

D. Baker: Any comments? All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed?

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. Baker: President's Announcements. There was a meeting yesterday in Springfield you saw with the governor and legislative leaders. The big news as far as I can tell is they met. They all came out without any wounds, visible anyway. I think it is good. You continue to see things floating around that they're talking in the background. They're getting ready for January when the session is back, legislative session is back. And I'm hopeful that we will get a budget at that time. So I wish I had more news on budget updates, but that is the budget update. Anything want to add from what they're hearing from Springfield or other places? I know, Dillon, do you want to say anything about the letter-writing?

D. Domke: Yes.

D. Baker: Why don't you from that mic.

D. Domke: I know -- I believe they're in session again today. I was watching some of that through some of my classes today, and I don't think they made any headway on anything. I believe the MAP grant bill didn't pass again. So they're really in a stand-still right now. But nonetheless, we've got a few hundred letters that we have been able to collect from the letter-writing campaign that we had done over the past few weeks. We had tables set up throughout campus, getting students to write letters, personal individual ones because we, as I mentioned, feel that those are a little more powerful than just the chain letters that we oftentimes circulate. So we're going to be working tomorrow and Friday to get those addressed to the specific representatives for the students that they are coming from and get those in the mail early next week so that we can get them to the representatives. As I mentioned before, we are not the only state institution that is doing this. Both public and private institutions across the state, their student governments are partaking in this letter-writing campaign. So over the next week or so the representatives will be getting thousands of letters, individual personal letters from students across the State of Illinois, saying that we need a budget and we need MAP funding. So, hopefully, when they get these letters, they realize that this is important to us and that something needs to be done. And something needs to be done soon. As I

mentioned, we're collecting them from everyone. So if anyone here wants to write one still, we will still accept it. We'll take it. You don't have to write a hard copy one if you want to send one to us via email, my email is ddomke1@niu.edu. We will take care of forwarding that to your representatives so long as your address is on that. But it was a successful campaign. We've got a bunch of letters that we're going to be sending down to Springfield. We're very happy with the product that we've received from the students, from community members, and everyone here at the university in regards to the budget. It's been a real team effort from from all of us. So just, you know, thank you to everyone who's helped over the past semester with all the initiatives that we've had. And the fight isn't over. Unfortunately we're going to lose a little bit of our bite going on winter break here, but there's a few things that I'll talk about in the Student Association report that we're going to try to combat that break.

D. Baker: Thanks. Any questions for Dillon? Yesterday Al Phillips and I attended the Illinois Board of Higher Education meeting. And prior to the meeting, we met with the other presidents and chancellors from the universities, public universities in the state. All the universities are undertaking information campaigns with the legislature and the governor. There will be a meeting next week of our education leaders, along with business leaders, to form a coalition to influence the legislature on these issues and inform them of the impact that undercutting our education is having on the business community. We think that that has some legs that will help. So we'll be doing that next week. In Springfield, we also met with the executive team from the Illinois Board of Higher Education prior to the full meeting. And they have adopted a resolution supporting higher education and getting a budget and getting it by the end of January. So you don't know how far those proclamations go, but at least they're making the noise and saying the right things and trying to move it forward. We appreciate their work. I guess everybody remains cautiously optimistic that something's going to happen in January and that we will get a budget and we will move forward and we'll get some normalcy back.

There's also a push by the Illinois Board of Higher Education to put together a three-year budget for higher education. And they note that that's three cycles for us. That's not, you know, we have long cycles, unlike many other state agencies. And when we're thinking about it, that's not even a graduating class. So if we make a commitment to a student as a first year student, we're only going to get them part way to graduation with that budget. They're trying to push that out. I think there's cautious pessimism that that's going to actually happen, as opposed to cautious optimism, because legislatures don't want to bind the next legislature. But we're trying to push the issue and saying these are long arcs and these budgets have long implications for students, faculty, and staff. And we need to have predictable and strong budgets. We reworded the proposal that the Illinois Board of Higher Education talked to us about earlier about having a robust budget, not just a stable budget. And we continue to try to make the case that the budget's been reduced dramatically in the last decade, and it's time to rebuild, not cut more. We're making those cases and we'll see how it flies. So interesting day in Chicago yesterday for that board meeting. All right. Any other comments or questions on any of that? All right. Let's move on.

Next, I had a couple announcements. Sadly, this is the last meeting for at least five of our members. Let's see if I can get all five without missing people. First is Deborah Haliczzer; and Robin Moremen; and Elvia Arriola; Amy Levine; and and Pat Dawson. Is that right, Pat? I was going to, in January. I don't think we have one in January. This is it. Pat's going off to be in Maryland as well and take a new job at the University of Maryland. So could we all thank them for their service? I know many of

them will be having other going-away affairs. But we wanted to say thank you from the University Council or your years of service here as well as your years of service to the university. And we'll say more at those other events. But thank you. Thank you very much.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approve FS/UC Rules, Governance and Elections Committee [roster](#) per NIU Bylaws Article 2.2.1 – Page 3

D. Baker: All right, on to the Consent Agenda. The first is to approve the Faculty Senate/University Council Rules, Governance, Elections Committee roster. And you've got it here in Page 3, I believe.

G. Long: On the Consent Agenda there's one item to approve the newly merged Faculty Senate/University Council Rules, Governance, and Elections Committee. The members have already been contacted. A special thanks to Therese Arado who's agreed to chair that committee. The Faculty Senate approved this merger at its meeting on November 18. We would like this body to do the same. As a consent item the question is we need a motion to accept it on the agenda. So do we have a motion to accept? Virginia Naples. Second? Janet Hathaway. All right, all in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Okay, good, done.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 15.8.1](#), University Assessment Panel – Pages 4-6
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

D. Baker: I'm going to keep in Greg's hands as we move on to the Unfinished Business. These are second readings. Should we check, since we have to vote on these, and these need at least 41 votes, is that correct? Why don't we have, can we do a practice vote to see how many we have to take a poll to make sure we have enough people? If we don't, then we don't need to vote. So if everybody's got one. Are the polls open? Why don't we all vote yes to see, the yes or 1 button works. Could you all vote? Go ahead and hit the button. I can do it too. We got it? We have 42? Holy cow. Well, I guess we can give them a try. 42.

G. Long: To be on the safe side, mine was not working well when we did that. Can we do a revote just if you're a member, I expect that may be 43 when I add my vote to this; but I want to double-check if we could. May we run that poll again, please? If you're, mine says new channel.

P. Erickson: New channel 41?

D. Baker: Did the letter come up when you hit it? Yep.

D. Baker: Very good. All right. Hit it again. See how many we get. We had 41 again?

P. Erickson: We lost one.

D. Baker: How did we lose one? Greg, did you vote?

G. Long: I did. I'm continuing to vote. It still

D. Haliczzer: I voted

D. Baker: Deb voted early. I think Deb voted twice the first time. Early and often. This will be an adventure. Let's give it a shot. Thank you for the practice run. So the first is a proposed revision in the bylaws, and I'm going to turn it over to Greg to talk this through. Greg?

G. Long: All right. We have a second reading for proposed revision to NIU Bylaw Article 15.8.1, the University Assessment Panel. I need a motion to approve.

D. Haliczzer: So moved.

V. Naples: Second.

G. Long: Any discussion on this? It's basically a move, as we talked about before, to put things in line with what current practice is. All right. Well, call for a vote, then? Okay, on this voting A is a yes, and B is a no, and C is abstention. I don't know if I'm supposed to say this in my role, but when we're talking about bylaws, since this is a bylaw change, it would require all, it would require unanimity. If we have less than 41 votes on this, it won't pass. So just as a heads-up, we already know the clickers work. So please don't be one of those people that click no just to see if it works. It works, okay? No offense. So all right. So if you're in favor of this, please push A. And if you're opposed, B. And C is an abstention. Oh, 42.

D. Baker: We got all the votes.

YES – 40

NO – 2

ABSTAIN - 0

G. Long: So that did not pass. Bill?

W. Penrod: Probably late in asking this, but since this is a bylaws motion, if it fails on this one as it did there, can it be brought as, is there going to be a second reading?

P. Erickson: This is the second reading.

W. Penrod: This is the second? So the motion fails?

G. Long: So this motion fails now. So we now have a situation where the University Assessment Panel, as currently constructed, is not in compliance with our bylaws because they're acting as they have for a while. Would that be correct, Chris?

C. Parker: With one exception, yes. So part of the motion had two additional members. One was the associate vice provost, Ed Klonoski is currently serving in that role. And the idea was to bring

an awareness of what's going on in terms of assessment with NIU Plus, and the General Education program along with the current work that the UAP does related to programmatic assessment, and to make sure that we were taking advantage of having those processes be as efficient as possible.

The other addition was the director of accreditation, and there again same logic applies with that position and the idea of having accreditation be efficient with respect to the assessment processes that the university degree programs are undergoing. So that's the, now functionally what that will mean is that these folks will serve as guests on the panel.

G. Long: Promod?

P. Vohra: I sense we have a difficult situation right now. Since all of these are nonvoting members, what is stopping them to still attend the meetings as advisors?

G. Long: There's nothing that stops them from attending a meeting.

P. Vohra: We can still have them attend the meeting until the resolution is addressed in a formal way.

G. Long: Correct.

B. Proposed revisions to NIU Constitution, [Article 2.2.3](#), Membership on the University Council – Page 7

SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

G. Long: Then we have another item for a second reading. Proposed revisions to the NIU Constitution article 2.2.3, has to do with when we gather data for reapportionment of seats, because within this body each college has proportional representation depending on the size of the college. In the past, we have gathered data in January while the process actually happens in the fall. So for us to do it in a more timely basis this is a change that suggests we gather the data from September. So that's the only change in this revision is that we're gathering data from the most current data from September versus going back to gather data from January. And I probably should ask first. Motion to approve? Sorry. I've got a script and I still screw it up. So? Holly Nicholson.

P. Vohra: Second.

G. Long: When we clean this up, we'll get it right. Further discussion on this? Now it's an interesting side point on this, this is a change to the constitution, not the bylaws. And we actually hold constitutional change to a lower standard than bylaw changes, which is a really hard thing in that a bylaw change requires two thirds of the entire membership, right? A constitution change requires two thirds of those of us present and then we send it electronically as a referendum out to faculty. But thus far all the referendums come back positive and we have no limit on our minimum number of faculty who have to respond to a referendum. So just so you know, as a legislative process, what we're talking about here is a proposed revision to the NIU Constitution, second Reading. All we need is a majority of those, two thirds of those present in the room right now. So we got 42 people voting.

P. Erickson: Two-thirds of those who vote.

G. Long: Two-thirds of 44.

P. Erickson: It's a calculation.

G. Long: Okay, so on this let's take a vote.

B. Jaffee: Are we going to have discussion? I just had a question. "In September" is not as precise as January 1. Is that a concern?

G. Long: No, because it will, we'll be using the data that comes out as early as September as possible. They're seen as the most accurate.

D. Macdonald: The date, January 1, is more accurate than saying September 1 or something like that. More precise. But September 1 would be before the official ten day count in most years.

G. Long: The basic thought is we were advised by the provost's office to not have an exact date so there's no conflict with payroll, we get in the -- the information that would be associated with the -- essentially would be the September 1 payroll. But we wouldn't have to say we're taking this on September 1. So it just, like I say, it gives us access to more current data. Other discussion on this? Okay, call for a vote. Okay, if you're in favor, press 1 or A; opposed, 2 or B; 3 is abstention. All right. So we have 45 people vote, surprisingly. So two thirds of that, we need 30. So, it passes.

YES – 43

NO – 2

ABSTAIN – 0

G. Long: Yes, all right. So on this, then, this is going to then be, since we supported it, will be sent out as a faculty referendum via email voting. And if it's passed, assuming that it will, be presented to Board of Trustees. So that's the process for what we're doing right now.

C. Reconsideration of proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, [Article 15.8.1](#),
University Assessment Panel – Pages 4-6
SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM

D. Domke: I'd like to make a point of order to reconsider something previously decided upon. Seeing as how there are now 45 people here and present, I'd like to reconsider the first bylaw change that was brought up to the body. I believe that needs a two-thirds vote to reconsider that, of those present and voting. Okay?

G. Long: Dillon has brought up a motion. And Deb Haliczzer, second. The idea is that we need two-thirds of the body to say yes we'd like to reconsider.

D. Baker: The first

D. Domke: Correct. The first item of business.

G. Long: The University Assessment Panel, the revised organization. All right? So, come again?

D. Baker: We've got to agree to vote.

G. Long: Right. We're going to vote right now to see if we're going to vote again. So this vote right now is simply to say are we willing to vote again on the University Assessment Panel bylaw change. For this, we need two-thirds of the body to say yes we're going to reconsider this. So if you would, if you agree to do this, vote A or 1. If you disagree, 2. And abstain is 3.

YES – 37

NO – 7

ABSTAIN – 1

G. Long: So this is unprecedented in my experience. So now we go back to that. And I need a motion at this point, or do we need a motion? We just had it. Ferald, what's my process here?

F. Bryan: Reconsidering the revision to the bylaws.

G. Long: All right. So at this point now we're going to vote to to reconsider the NIU Bylaws Article 15.8.1, the University Assessment Panel.

P. Vohra: So moved.

D. Domke: Second.

G. Long: Further discussion on this? Questions? You want to explain it again? Okay, hearing no questions, we call the vote again. If you support this, push 1 or A. If you don't, push 2. And if you abstain, that's a 3. You can see which one -- I already voted. We're aware there's two people who just voted.

D. Macdonald: Simply just -- Get another clicker. The clicker is broken.

G. Long: Sometimes if you click it before the polls opens, it doesn't record correctly. All right. Now we have 44. Okay. Is it a wrap?

D. Baker: Everybody okay? They work?

YES – 37

NO – 7

ABSTAIN - 2

G. Long: So the reconsideration fails as well, it appears. May I ask something just by virtue of our use of the clickers, one of the frustrations in my role (I'm going to stand up and tell some other frustrations) but it's difficult when we have a situation like this. If you oppose something we have no idea of knowing what the opposition is. We have discussion and no one said I think this is a bad idea or I see a concern here. So from my standpoint, it's kind of frustrating because it seems to be a

very straightforward kind of a change, and yet there are apparently some of you who disagree, which is fine. I'm not frustrated with the disagreement, I'm frustrated with, if you disagree, perhaps say something so we can then figure out how to address it. Because right now I have no clue what your concerns are relative to this particular issue. So feel free to forward them to me. Because again, this seems very straight forward. I'm not understanding the no's. And so if you would, if you're comfortable. If not, that's perfectly fine too. I'm not, there's no force here. But I would like to get a better sense of why things like this fail. Okay?

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws [Article 14.5](#),
University Faculty Senate Officers – FIRST READING – Pages 8-9

G. Long: Let's see. Under New Business, there's a proposed revision to NIU Bylaws Article 14.5. It has to do with basically making our election process that we've been using since 1999 consistent with what's actually in our bylaws. If you look at pages 8 and 9, you'll see the rationale as well as the revised language. From an experience standpoint, none of us would experience anything differently if we vote to approve this because it's what we've been doing for the last 16 years. But we do have a desire to make things in agreement so that it also puts us in compliance with the Constitution we're in right now. As currently written it's not. So those are some basic issues on this. As a first reading, it didn't require a motion. So I didn't give that one up. But I would open it up for other questions, comments, discussion on this. Are there any concerns with the idea of basically making our Constitution and Bylaws fit with our practice? Okay, seeing none, let's move on. We will schedule a second reading of that at our next meeting.

- B. Review of NIU Constitution and Bylaws – refer to Rules, Governance and Elections Committee

G. Long: The second item on the agenda is the review of Constitution and Bylaws. And I'd like a motion to approve a referral to the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. Janet [Hathaway]? I need a second.

H. Nicholson: Second.

G. Long: Okay, and now for discussion. I'm going to take advantage of my position and the fact that I can't stand to sit down and do this. I have to talk. To start off with, I have a confession to make and one I'm not necessarily proud of. This time last year I had no idea I would be the Faculty Senate president, executive secretary of University Council. Also up until I assumed this position in July, here's the bad part I had not read the Constitution and Bylaws cover to cover. I suspect I'm not the only person in this room that says that. I am assured the rest of you do it regularly. Like I say, now that I'm in this position, I am very familiar and have read our Constitution and Bylaws very closely and have also read a number of other institutions' bylaws and constitutions. Having done so, I need to let you know with my deepest heart we have a serious problem with our governance documents as they currently exist. I have talked to you before about this I think a little bit when we talked about voting. We just saw it momentarily a few minutes ago with regard to our first vote on the University Assessment Panel as a bylaw change. Logically it's a hard thing to understand how you can have a vote of 40 to 0 to 2 and have something fail. If you think of our membership within this

body, you've got over 90 percent of us in here saying hey this is an okay thing. So voting has been an issue with regard to the bylaws because the other part of this is we have a membership of 62 people. We have then 41 that are required of this body to change any sort of bylaws. Our typical attendance is 45 people. We've done that over the last five years and when you have a typical attendance of 45 people, you're starting off on any vote with roughly 15-16 nays. And that means that one or two people, three people can, you know, change a vote in a particular way because if you're not here and voting, you're a nay. So voting I thought was the particular issue. And that's where I focused a lot of my attention. I will say, however, that I had an epiphany a couple weeks ago. And it was this: It's not just the voting. There are two other issues that are, I think, equally as important for us to attend to. They deal with specificity and structure, all right? As a little bit of background information, in 1985 when our current set of Constitution and Bylaws were put together, in talking to some of the authors at that time, they said it was largely a politically motivated act so that they could, you know, make things as resistant to change as possible because we were under threat of being subsumed within a regency system. So our goal was let's take what we've got now and codify everything that we can so that basically we're set for any sort of interference from outside people. That was how it was put together 30 years ago, all right? That was done intentionally, and tip of the hat, they did a damn fine job. They have really set up a system that makes change difficult. Let me give you an example. The specificity issue, maybe a little corny here, this is the University of Virginia Constitution and Bylaws. This is Illinois State University, Western Michigan, Kent State, NIU. We have a 171-page Constitution and Bylaws. We have 22 pages devoted to grievances. Now, those aren't bylaws, those are policies. They've created a document and put working rules as bylaws. So, for example, I've been working with the University Affairs Committee and Karen Baker and others to make some change, tweaks in the grievance policy, right? Now, a lot of effort has been made to make tweaks in the grievance policy. That's going to have to then come before this body as bylaw changes. So what if in our experience over the last couple years we understand where things need to be shored up. Groups of people have put this together, and then it comes here and we get a vote of 40 to 0 to 2, so that our bylaws have to remain inadequate because they're seen as bylaws not policies and procedures. From my standpoint, that is the specificity that we have in here, makes our ability to respond to things very, very difficult. And not to be on a soap box, although I am I recognize, with a budget impasse, program prioritization, the changes in higher ed generally, if we don't become more nimble, and figure out how to respond to things, we're going to die. We will not be a viable institution that public universities. As a public university, we need to be able to respond quickly, and we don't. The aforementioned grievance policy, it took 11 years. The student grievance policy from inception to actually a vote, that was an 11-year process. Crazy. Voting issues with bylaws, specificity issues in terms of everything being codified as bylaws instead of policies and the other thing that works against us is this two-tiered system of having a Faculty Senate and University Council. And looking at other universities, academic decisions, curricular decisions rest with the Faculty Senate. That's not to say that a University Council body to deal with broader issues, that's certainly reasonable and appropriate. But right now our Faculty Senate has no policy-making authority, has no teeth. It's a caucus group. We have the ability to talk, but we don't have the ability to do anything about that other than send things up here. So my request is that we send this to the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee and have them begin a discussion on what we might do about this in a bigger picture perspective. Because, like I say, I'm here not because I want to redo the Constitution and Bylaws. Trust me, on my bucket list, that's not there. On the other hand, we talk about the servant leadership kind of thing. In this role in the last five months, I've really paid a lot of attention, talked to many of you individually. I get that we're frustrated; I get morale issues. But the only way we can deal with it

is through shared governance. And the only way shared governance can work is if we fundamentally change our documents. Because having 171 pages of bylaws and constitution really is not an effective way of dealing with things. Perhaps, you know, five years ago, I might not have said this, status quo, budget -- much concern. Right now we have a lot of turbulence going on, right? We don't know what's going to happen. I don't know what's going to happen. And if we want to have some power to make differences, we need to have our governance documents that work for us and not against us. So that's my little opening bit on the discussion of why I think this should be referred to committee. Certainly open to other questions and comments. Did want to take this opportunity.

B. Wood: I'm representing College of Education, my first time here, so hi. I just had a question about a few of the things you said. So my first question has to do with you talked about the bylaws being more like policies and procedures, but they were like placed in the bylaws and everything. So if we have the power to adjust the bylaws as a group, why haven't we done that? I mean, how long has this council existed?

G. Long: At the University Council we've existed for, gosh, I want to say it was in the '60s. The most current constitution was in 1985. And one of the reasons we haven't done this is this is a horrendously complex and pain-in-the-rear kind of a task. I mean I say this with all sincerity. I think it's absolutely necessary to do, but unless we had all these converging factors that we have right now on us, I don't think there would be any chance we could be even successful in bringing this up. So there's no criticism about any previous executive secretaries or anyone else in this position. Just given the context that we have right now, it seems like this is an opportunity for us to regain some control and have some say in shared governance.

D. Baker: Do you have a second question?

B. Wood: I just had follow-up questions. Like I said, I'm new to this whole thing. So I guess my questions would be, so we don't have anyone in charge of bylaws, like specifically delegated like a council or committee or anything?

G. Long: That's us.

B. Wood: Oh.

G. Long: We have a committee called the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. And they're the ones who would take this discussion we're having right now and then come back to us with ideas or ways of looking at this. And while they exist, I would also say that I'm sincerely committed to this. And so my term as executive secretary ends in July. I've got the possibility of another year. I'm certainly willing to serve that. And so I'm personally going to devote the next year and a half of my professional life to this endeavor in conjunction with the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee. I mean, I believe it's that sincerely necessary.

B. Wood: Thank you.

B. Jaffee: I thought I heard you say at least two things. One, that we have this issue of bylaws that really are policies and probably shouldn't be in a constitution. But you also said something about Faculty Senate having more authority in terms of voting. And it strikes me that these may not be two

things we want to take up simultaneously. I mean, might we want to prioritize one of those things over the other, i.e., giving Faculty Senate more authority, and then perhaps something like a major reconstruction of our bylaws might be seen differently?

G. Long: I appreciate the point. There's a lot of actual at this point even redundancy between the Faculty Senate bylaws and the, you know, University bylaws. For example, the one we looked at today in terms of election process, that page is exactly the same page that we voted on or we talked about in Faculty Senate because they're exactly the same, exactly, word for word. And so I think it would be very difficult to do them as separate activities because of the tie between the Faculty Senate Bylaws and the university's Bylaws, but I don't have the answer to this. I'm saying we have a problem, and I'm open to any suggestions of how we might deal with it. But as an issue, it's still there. Virginia?

V. Naples: I was here way back when, when there was an honest to goodness fear on this campus that we were going to be subsumed into a regency system. That, fortunately, did not happen. I don't know whether the changes in the structure of our governance documents made any difference. But I believe that the situation has changed significantly enough that we are not only safe, but I think well advised to try to find ways to reduce redundancy and to be more streamlined in what we're doing. I also endorse the idea of giving Faculty Senate a lot of additional authority to make appropriate academic decisions. I think that would go a long way toward people feeling as though they are part of an inclusive process of shared governance.

G. Long: And then

K. Thu: I agree with most, if not all, that you said, Greg. I have been on University Council, this is my seventh year, I guess. And we are hardly a nimble body. This is the broadest charge to a committee I think I have ever seen, review of NIU Constitution and Bylaws. And certainly before they embark on their work, we need to get the voting thresholds changed, as you know. Otherwise we're just barking up the wrong tree. But maybe as we put a little more structure on it, we could ask the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee to report back to us on the priority areas in the document that they want to go after first and sort of get our blessing of that so that they are not working in Never-Neverland and not having any feedback from us. And also lay out a timetable for when that could be done.

G. Long: I think that would make sense. Having talked to them, their first order of business would be to deal with the bylaws requirement of two-thirds of the entire University Council membership. If that bylaw doesn't get changed, the rest of this is irrelevant because we will not have unanimity. We don't have unanimity on things that seem very clear-cut right now. The discussion of changing constitution and bylaw issues will give us plenty of opportunity for discussion and opposition. So yeah, unless we change the number one step is dealing with the bylaw regulation that two-thirds of the entire membership. Once we get that done, it's reasonable to go back to that committee and say, let's lay out a timeline. In talking with, I shot this idea around a little bit and talked to President Baker, Provost Freeman. There's support for that. I talked to Marc Strauss yesterday, who's the chair of the Governance Ad Hoc Committee on the Board of Trustees, and he felt that certainly the Board of Trustees would be supportive of a significant review and revision of the Constitution and Bylaws. So you know, as I am talking to people, I'm not finding anyone saying don't do this because what we has worked so well. And the other item we bring up is that there are differences in the

Constitution and Bylaws with regard to, for example, the Academic Policies and Procedure Manual, the APPM. There are legitimate differences that exist in part of the process, and this overall thing would be to get our governance documents aligned. This is a serious scholarly endeavor and I would suspect from a referral to a committee they may come back, and if they come back with a plan that says, we could use extra resources, or perhaps look at a task force, there are a number of ways with which this kind of effort could be expanded and be more inclusive, I think personally, as I do any type of teaching or research, inclusivity is very important. I don't want anyone to feel left out of this process. But in my role as the executive secretary of this body, I will just say again we won't be successful moving on in governance standpoint with the way it's currently structured.

P. Vohra: I think this is an important issue, which is important to lot of people. I suggest that you have a discussion in the Executive [Steering] Committee and then come up with a timeline with two or three important things that could change everything, and then we could have a plan because in this forum I think it can take forever for us to discuss and agree. I think you have a forum in terms of Executive [Steering] Committee, two or three things that are more critical to be changed immediately, timeline, and bring it to this committee.

G. Long: Thank you. I will say that we have within both Faculty Senate and University Council Steering committees talked about the voting issue repeatedly. That is something that, if you hang with me and we talk about governance, we're talking about. Holly?

H. Nicholson: When we're talking about power and authority, to take a look at staff representation and make sure that it's proportional and also about the Operating Staff Council's authority and power and how that's structured too.

G. Long: Absolutely. Yes, Dillon?

D. Domke: We as well support both initiatives in regards to undertaking the changing of the bylaws and giving more power to the faculty. Along with Holly, as the Student Association, we would like to see a more codified representation of our body as well within any new documents that come out of this process.

G. Long: Absolutely.

B. Jaffee: I just had an observation. In a completely nonscientific way, it seems to me that voting has become much more complicated since we went to clickers. Is there some kind of, you know, there's a lot less discussion and there's this sort of private, oh, I can hit this no and, I don't know. Why did we go to clickers?

G. Long: I mean, you heard me earlier voice my concern with clickers. As I understand, there was a concern raised by someone with regard to anonymity. So if you're, for example, evaluating the performance of the ombudsperson, or later on this year you will evaluate my performance as executive secretary. So if you are taking a vote on did the person do a good job or not, well, there is some level of peer pressure that might say, oh, I don't think he did, but if everyone else says yes, as it has been described to me, that was the rationale for it. So it was that someone raised a concern about anonymity, so we went to clickers. But again, you know, from my standpoint, I'm not a fan of clickers. I think that it can hurt us some. Other comments? Catherine?

C. Doederlein: When looking at the bylaws, it might make sense to look if we need to do anything to tighten up the attendance requirements. I know there's no way we can enforce that. But certainly we could get more people to consistently show up or have repercussions if they don't. The two thirds-vote might not be as much of an issue.

B. Jaffee: Is there a particular constituency that's consistently underrepresented? Have we done an analysis?

G. Long: We have. When I say we got the 46, 45 people across year, I have the data right here if you want to look at it. But in our group, all groups, faculty, staff, administrators, you know, our attendance figures are in the 70-80 percent. The student representation tends to be lower, 55 to 60 percent. But I have a caveat on that in that it's not necessarily the students from the Student Association. The Student Association is far more consistent than the student representatives from individual colleges. So we have 16 students on the overall body. So when you have 8 of them or 9 of them show up and the others not, that hurts us.

D. Baker: Greg mentioned that the board is interested in this issue. I know they have an Ad Hoc Governance Committee that's looking at their own bylaws and regulations. And I'm sure they will want to dovetail, assuming that this work is undertaken, dovetail that work so that the approval process is, and whatnot come together. So I think they'd want to, if this gets underway, have that dialogue upfront so that everything's lined up.

G. Long: As a point of view, if you actually start reading the Constitution and Bylaws and looking at the board regulations, as currently written, our Constitution and Bylaws are subordinate to the Board of Trustees' regulations. So it's just a perspective, that's not the way it is at every university, but can be a concern. So given that they could basically say no to anything we advise, it's best to have them on board from the beginning. So that was one of the reasons I talked to John Butler yesterday in his role on the ad hoc. If I said Strauss, I meant Butler. Excuse me.

H. Khoury: In fact, I have a question was related to the Board of Trustees. So if we change the bylaws, could that imply that also we may be changing the authority that's given to the Board of Trustees and making the final decisions regarding academic or faculty situations.

G. Long: Want to answer that? Let me defer.

D. Baker: My understanding from counsel is that the board gives you the power, that you don't give them the power. So as Greg said, your roles are subordinate to the board. And the board is granted by the state the authority to govern the institution, and then that's delegated down. So it would be good to have them aligned. And I think actually talking with Marc and John, they're on the same page. They want an efficient, effective, well-governed system that's well represented. It's just that we've got kind of gobbledygook set of rules. This can make things easier by streamlining activities and not having overlapping and duplicative kind of things going on.

K. Thu: I will move to refer to committee.

G. Slotsve: Second.

G. Long: Okay. So all in favor?

B. Jaffee: What are we referring?

G. Long: We're referring to the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee the general concept of looking at the Constitution and Bylaws.

B. Jaffee: I thought there was some discussion about asking for something more circumspect that's

G. Long: We will ask the committee to come back with a set of here's a timeline, here's a basic plan of how we might do this. But our motion right now is simply refer this concept to them and come back to us.

B. Jaffee: I'm sorry, I still didn't -- first we're making a general motion to refer, and then we're going to determine what their task is?

G. Long: No. That would be up to them. This would be referred to committee. We've discussed it in here to say, you know, a number of us see there as being issues with this. Give us your feedback, bring it back to University Council and -- Sorry. So my sense is having talked to them already, that they would like to bring this up, particularly like the 40-person vote thing, sooner than later in the spring semester. We're going to them to say, identify what the priorities are. As I've identified, I think the voting issue for bylaws is the most singularly important thing right now. But after that, how everything is structured out so on and so forth, still remains the question. That's where --

B. Jaffee: I guess that's what I'm trying to determine. Are you saying that we're asking the committee to look at the Constitution and Bylaws, or are we asking them to look at them in order to produce a timeline and the kind of outline of what are the most important prioritizing tasks? The latter? I hope it's the latter.

G. Long: It is the latter. I just don't know if we need to put that level of specificity into the referral. But that is certainly the plan.

B. Jaffee: Could we?

K. Thu: That's not my motion. I want to generally refer the overarching issue to the committee, and I believe the committee will come back to us with a timeline for an ongoing basis.

R. Moremen: Again, a clarifying question. The issue about the requirement for two-thirds voting. Is that a recommendation we're making to the committee, or are we hoping that the committee will just emerge with that recommendation?

G. Long: Having talked with the committee, I know they already support the concept.

R. Moremen: Do we want to include this in the motion, or is it just understood? My fear is that there's going to be other individuals addressing this at some future date when it comes back from this committee who will have no institutional memory for the fact that the voting issue was a paramount issue.

G. Long: And Chris, you had something to say.

C. McCord: So I'll simply suggest that Kendall's motion is perfectly fine. The people in the conversation know what the conversation is about. I don't think we actually add value to the process we want to move forward by filling in all the details for them. They will know the charge. And this is a referral anyway, this isn't binding. This is a recommendation that the committee ought to look at something. That recommendation comes with plenty of guidelines from you. I don't think us spending a lot of time fine tuning a referral is the best use of our effort. I think we know where we want to go, let's go.

G. Long: Thank you.

B. Wood: So I just had like a parliamentary question. So it was my understanding that the motion was already on the table from you. So we were in discussion talking about it. So there's another motion on the table.

G. Long: There was potentially a friendly amendment to that. I don't know that we've gone with that yet.

Unidentified: The confusion comes, I think because Chris said Kendall's motion. And I don't think that's necessarily the case because the motion that you put on the table; correct?

B. Wood: Well, Kendall.

D. Baker: Is that correct, Chris?

C. McCord: It's not Kendall's motion that we're talking about.

G. Long: It's the executive secretary's motion. And we refer this to the Rules, Governance and Elections for further discussion.

K. Thu: I withdraw my motion since you already have a motion. And we can get in motion.

G. Long: All right. I love Roberts Rules of Order. Sorry. Bethany, did you have something else?

B. Wood: I think it's kind of a clear consensus that we agree that the bylaws need to be adjusted, so I think it's a good idea to kind of refer it out to that one specific group of people instead of such a large group of people, can kind of take a closer look at it and determine maybe like what are policies and what are bylaws.

G. Long: Thank you.

D. Baker: Do we have a second on the motion, Greg?

G. Slotsve: I'll second.

D. Baker: I call the vote.

G. Long: Let's not even use clickers this time because this is a simple majority, all right? So all in favor?

Members: Aye.

G. Long: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Cool. Excellent. Yea. All right. I'll turn it back to -- I would say I look forward to this process, I look forward to the outcome of this process; I think this is going to be something that we'll have to work on it.

B. Jaffee: Should we have reconsidered streamlining the committee, the vote that we just took prior to this? More people on the committee.

G. Long: Say again.

B. Jaffee: Didn't we just streamline that committee by combining Faculty Senate with University Council?

G. Long: Well, we merged, it's somewhat smaller, but you've got a better -- and again, as part of this too; we're coming -- they're going to come back to us with recommendations, with requests. I don't see that this committee by themselves is going to take on a complete revision of the Constitution and Bylaws. You know, that has to be something, if that's a recommendation, of the entire body, University Council agrees; that has to be a much more inclusive process. But there's certainly -- they're certainly the first level of review and recommendation for how we might want to proceed with this.

B. Jaffee: It was a little more facetious; I'm sorry.

G. Long: I'm sorry. Up here it's hard to tell.

D. Baker: All right. Let's move on. That was exciting. Thank you. And a big project in front of us.

C. [Temporary Appointment Waiver Request](#) per NIU Bylaws 19.5.2.2 – walk-in
Gerald Blazey, Interim Vice President for Research and Innovation Partnerships

D. Baker: Speaking of bylaws, our bylaws ask that this body approve the extension of an interim position if that comes up. So here's the situation. We've got four dean searches underway, no state budget, and Pat's announced he's taking another job too. And so we've got two people in temporary positions, vice president for research and innovation partnerships, Jerry Blazey, and vice president for marketing communications, Harlan Teller. My sense is we've got, with program prioritization, no budget from the state, four dean searches going on, we're taxing the system pretty heavily, and it would be relatively difficult to hire two vice presidents, particularly a vice president for research and innovation partnerships if they don't know who the deans are going to be.

I'll start with Jerry. Jerry's been doing a good job. And so I'm hoping to get this group's approval based on the bylaw requirement and I guess we need a motion to that effect and then we can discuss

it further. Reed and Janet? Thank you. So with that I'll open it up to any discussion about this. So that was the preamble. Reed?

R. Scherer: Yeah, I agree, there's a lot on the plate, and Jerry, I think, is doing an exemplary job.

D. Baker: Other comments? Todd?

T. Gilson: Question for President Baker: Are you asking to extend the interim tag or remove the interim tag?

D. Baker: Extend the interim tag for a year, another cycle, and that we would do a search at that point.

T. Gilson: Thank you.

G. Long: Promod?

D. Macdonald: Hi. I'm just going to make a personal comment here. And it's not about these two individuals, but I just wanted to say that – again, I'm speaking from myself here – it's a little disheartening to be asked to waive a search when we have had long-time inability to hire; when I'm unable to staff courses with experienced instructors; and we're working with VAPs. And that's just a personal opinion. I just wanted to put that on the table.

D. Baker: Thanks, Doris. It's not waiving the search, it's delaying the search for a year. So that we don't have to go through the time and expense now and we don't know how successful we would be given the context. But I understand concern. Others? Reed, did you have another comment?

R. Scherer: No.

D. Baker: Are we ready for a vote? All in favor, aye?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: All opposed? Abstentions? Thank you.

D. [Temporary Appointment Waiver Request](#) per NIU Bylaws 19.5.2.2 – walk-in Harlan Teller, Interim Vice President for Marketing and Communications

D. Baker: Second is Harlan, and I will ask for a motion.

H. Nicholson: So moved.

D. Domke: Second.

D. Baker: Harlan was on a two-year appointment, and his appointment is up next summer. Again, same kind of concern I've got. He has made a number of changes that are positive in our marketing and communications group, and has a number of things underway including a branding survey

study, so we better understand our brand position. And with all that underway and the need for us to kind of continue the momentum that we've got in marketing and communications, again I'd like to not waive a search, but this would be the end of his contract; he would not be interested in going beyond one more year. That would be to extend his contract one more year. Questions or comments?

H. Khoury: Can we have some examples of some of the positive impacts of this particular vice president, please?

D. Baker: Sure, thank you. So I'll go down a list that I've pulled together here. One, he's made a number of personnel shifts; he's identified high potential individuals and moved them around within the division, and provided strong leadership and mentoring, developing the individuals there. So I think part is developing the talent within the group, giving them additional responsibility. And enhancing their impact. He's reengineered and reorganized the division to create greater alignment of resources. He's done that within the division, and he's done it out across the institution. With Marketing and Communications Council. Marketing and communications at the university has been very disparate so that units all over campus are doing their marketing and communications without the integration so we haven't been rolling together to get the collective impact. I think he's professionalized the approach to communication programming planning strategy so we're thinking much more strategically how we're spending our resources. And you can see that from earned media to purchased media to our Web access, etc. where he's really kind of professionalized that with the staff. He's focussed a good deal on our external media and outreach placements resulting in bigger shares of our voice in the regional and national media. We've had a couple stories, one of them was Reed's research. I think we got a billion hits, over a billion hits on that research globally so our name is getting out further. He's been good advice to other vice presidents about marketing and communications issues within their areas. He's helped lead internal communication groups. I think he's created a new narrative instead of themes for us internally that give us more brand consistency so our voice is more common. Those are some of the examples. Holly probably has better examples since she lives it everyday.

H. Khoury: Thank you. I know that's a lot of work that's been done already. But did it impact our recruiting of students? Did it increase the number of NIU students? Or do we see more parents being involved, student parents being involved? What maybe could we see in the future?

D. Baker: That's an excellent question. So our normal enrollment was down this year. So what part of that is due to external marketing or internal communications is an interesting question. We have the funnel of prospects coming into the institution, then we get to the admissions area, into the colleges and departments and whatnot. So there's that whole funnel of activities and the things that influence it. We're moving lots of different parts. We're changing what admissions is doing, how they're communicating with people. We're changing orientation, financial aid, et cetera. So there are a lot of moving parts in here. At the same time enrollment in the state is on a decline for all of higher education. Community colleges were down six, seven percent last year in the state. Universities were down. With the exception of U of I and ISU, all the other universities were down. Publics were down. It's hard to answer that question. How much is marketing and communications slowing the decline or helping us turn around? My sense is it's a much more focussed and professional group that's dovetailing nicely with the admissions group. So you see the process in place. But we haven't seen the turnaround in enrollment yet. Promod?

P. Vohra: Just wanted to share with you we had a meeting with Harlan and his team at the Council of Deans, and one of the important things he discussed was how he's trying to take NIU in the Chicago market, which we were missing for a long time. He gave us examples of 20 stories that he has taken in the last six months to the Chicago market. Even though right now we cannot assess the outcomes of these marketing efforts to get the enrollment up, but necessarily he's taking NIU's name to Chicago, which was never done before. He's using the media to get us to the national and local and regional level. The deans were pretty happy with what he had to say.

D. Baker: Any others? Are you ready for a vote? All in favor please say aye.

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Abstain. Thank you. And I will take this to the Board of Trustees. They too have to approve it. And we'll do that next week. So it's a multi-step process.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – [report](#) – Page 10

D. Baker: Here we go. Let's move on to the reports of council. First is Sonya. Hers is written only.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees
Greg Long, Dan Gebo, Rebecca Shortridge, Leanne VandeCreek
Deborah Haliczler, Holly Nicholson – no report

C. Academic Policy Committee, Chris McCord, Chair – no report

D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Mark Riley, Chair – no report

E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Therese Arado, Chair – no report

F. University Affairs Committee – Linda Saborio, Chair – no report

G. Student Association – Nathan Lupstein, President – report

D. Baker: Where are we? Student Association is next. Nathan?

N. Lupstein: Tonight the Student Association is hosting an event in the Heritage Room doing a dialogue about diversity. In light of the recent events that happened in Columbia at the zoo, students have been coming to us expressing their opinions about certain things, campus climate. And they wanted a forum to discuss in a more structured forum. I know members of the administration are very gratefully joining us together. We're grateful for that. If you are encouraged or motivated to see this kind of discussion, see how our students are understanding their student experience here as far as diversity is concerned, I encourage you to come by seven o'clock tonight in the Heritage Room in this building.

D. Baker: Dillon, your side of the student government?

D. Domke: As I said, we've had a bunch of things go on as far as the state budget. I already talked about the letter-writing campaign. I mentioned to you last meeting how there was a Facebook group set up for all of the student leaders across the state. We're actually taking that a step further now and looking to actually codify something and getting an actual organization together of leaders, student leaders across the state. There's a few of us that are going to be potentially meeting over the break in Chicago to discuss these opportunities. Some of these opportunities are going to be different leadership conferences where we're going to involve state legislature, the governor, things like that. Right now I don't know if we've got one planned for this year. But we would do this in the springtime right around when the appropriations are taking place, or would typically take place for the state budget. And we would have it in Springfield, and we'd get as many of the student leaders from different student governments from universities across the state down to Springfield for a weekend event that will focus on -- first off on leadership development for the students within these organizations, but then also act as almost a lobbying organization on behalf of students throughout the State of Illinois. So we've been making progress over the past few weeks about this; and once all of us go on break, we do intend to meet to kind of discuss some more of the details. So we are quickly organizing something that this state has never seen before. So that would be something that would be awesome if we could eventually have that. I don't think there's ever been any student-run lobbying groups as far as higher education goes. So it would be something new and creative that would hopefully eventually become a powerful entity within state government.

D. Baker: All right. Thanks, Dillon.

D. Domke: Any questions for me or Nate?

D. Baker: Nate, thanks to the SA for putting together the dialogues tonight. They are important pieces. We'll have more in the coming semester as well. Of course during MLK work, and I have asked Denise and Joe Walton to work together on that. This is an important ongoing discussion for us across the university, and it can't be a one-and-done kind of activity. Thank you for taking this on. We'll see you there tonight.

H. Operating Staff Council – Holly Nicholson, President – report

D. Baker: Holly, I think you're up next.

H. Nicholson: I just want to remind everybody the call for nominations for the 2016 Outstanding Service Award is out, the deadline is January 29. I would encourage you to nominate an operating staff member who has had an impact on you. Several winners every year, and they receive monetary compensation. Thank you.

I. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczzer, President – report

D. Baker: Anybody else? Deborah?

D. Haliczzer: Of course. Hi. SPS Council also has our awards nomination process out. Deadline is Friday afternoon. But I want to alert you to the January announcement we will be sending out. The

December nominations are for the presidential award, the four people who get that one. We also request nominations for five other awards including things like excellence in supervision, institutional advancement, and other categories. So don't think when you see that notice that you already saw it. It's a different one. We've separated the two cycles. We just finished our leadership series today. It was very well regarded, successful. We had faculty as well as SPS and operating Staff and some grad students. And we plan to go forward next semester with additional topics. Be watching for that. SPS Council is working on reapportionment in preparation for our spring election. So many SPS have moved from place to place in the university that we had to look at how we are going to conduct elections. SPS Council will be electing a new president, and we'll know probably next week whether that will be the vice president, or whether we're going to solicit nominations for a new president. This is my last meeting. And I want to applaud all of you for the excellent work you all do on behalf of the university, and to emphasize my belief in the importance of shared governance, and the important voices that we all bring, different perspective, whether it's faculty or SPS, operating staff, and certainly from our students. We all play a really critical role in communication and assuring honest, civil dialogue on different opinions. And in my last item in the SPS newsletter – sorry if I'm horse – I concluded my letter to all SPS by saying that our governor and chief leaders in state government really should be referred for good family therapy. Because of their impacts. And I thought my dear, goodness gracious, I may have violated the ethics act; and I thought, no, I did not, because I was an equal opportunity commentator on all parties. Keep up the work advocating for all of us as we go forward. And I applaud the work you do. So thank you. Thank you.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

D. Baker: Any comments or questions from the floor tonight?

G. Chen: My name is Gary Chen, College of Engineering. I have just heard President Baker state that there are two public universities in Illinois; they are the exception of having enrollment down. One is U of Illinois, another is ISU. Is there anything that we can learn from them, or have they been doing much a better job in marketing and communication? Is that so? Is that the only way to keep them from being getting the enrollment down? Or is there anything that we really can learn from these two Illinois schools?

D. Baker: Great question. I think we can learn a number of things from ISU. I think the University of Illinois holds maybe a different place as a land grant university than we do. I think ISU may have more parallels to us. And I think they do a number of things very well. They really have a very streamlined recruitment, retention process. They've been very good at getting their message out through marketing, communications. Their processing has been very fast. They're on-campus orientations have been very smooth. We've studied them, and our enrollment folks are studying them and other schools for best practices. I would say there is a good deal to learn from them, and we are trying to adopt some of those practices. Great question. Not that Illinois doesn't, but I think they have kind of a different market position.

V. Naples: Well one of the things that I would like to say is I congratulate President Baker on his little blurb along with the contest for student achievement in the Rockford area. I get a lot of Rockford television channels, and I think that gives us really good publicity and I like to watch those whenever I get a chance. But one of the things that concerns me is that, in addition, I haven't

so much seen it on television, but a lot on the radio, I get a lot of advertisements in this area for going to SIU and some of the other campuses. And I think we might benefit by having some of the NIU messages that might capitalize on the college bowl-style competition for getting students interested in coming to NIU.

D. Baker: Good. We can have Harlan come in and talk about the media buys and what we're buying and not buying, and whether radio is the right avenue or Web based. I think we've been more Web-based in our communications, which you probably aren't going to see but the students may be seeing. But we can certainly have him come in at some point if it's of interest to the University Council and talk about our communications plan, marketing plans. We can follow up on that. If it's of interest.

E. Mogren: This is an issue I raised last time, about removing our honorary degree from Dennis Hastert. I wonder if you can give us an update on progress we've made on that so far.

D. Baker: There's an Honorary Doctorate Committee, and I met with Brad Bond about that recently – he chairs the committee – and asked him to look in it. And he said that the work for the semester is done; he'll take it up in the spring semester. That's kind of the latest update on that.

E. Mogren: Do we have a timing on when in spring semester that might happen?

D. Baker: I don't have that. I assume at their first meeting in spring.

E. Mogren: And the meetings of who

D. Baker: Honorary Doctorate Committee.

E. Mogren: Thanks.

G. Long: There is no policy for, you know, rescinding it. So that's part of the discussion that's going to have to happen.

E. Mogren: Right. Seems to me, I don't know the rules, but it does seem to me that it ought to be very similar to the kind of policies and procedures that are in place to award it, that it can be done. And I would also suggest that, you know, even the United States House of Representatives has removed his portrait. I would hate for us to be seen as being less decisive than the House of Representatives on this matter.

G. Long: Ouch!

Unidentified: If I could piggyback on that, I believe Wheaton College rescinded the degree.

E. Mogren: Yes, it has, as far as I know.

D. Baker: After your comments, I did go out and Google other places where things have happened with honorary doctorates and see what other schools. And there appears to be a debate out there. Some schools have said, we're not rescinding it, because at the time it was appropriate and at the

time they represented the values and we don't need to rescind it, we don't need to pander, I think was one of the words, or something like that. We don't need to tell the world what everybody else knows. And others have said exactly what you said: We need to show our values and support those. And so it was interesting to go out and kind of look at the different debates. There were some back and forth debates about whether you should do these or not across various schools. So...it was interesting to go read. And a little different than what I thought might happen. Who else had a comment or question?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- I. [Minutes](#), Faculty Sena
- J. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- M. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- N. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- O. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- P. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- Q. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- R. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- S. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- T. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

XI. ADJOURNMENT

D. Baker: Okay, I think we're done. If there's nothing else, I would entertain a motion to adjourn. Better say something or we have to stay. Stuart.

D. Haliczzer: Second.

D. Baker: We're leaving. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

D. Baker: Opposed? Thank you.

The meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.