

12-6-2017

UC Transcript 2017-12-06

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Transcript 2017-12-06" (2017). *University Council Archives*. 22.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/22>

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 MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, December 6, 2017, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Andree, Arado, Azad (for Haji-Sheikh), Baker, Barnhart, Bishop, Block, Bond, Boughton, Briscoe, Carlson, G. Chen, J. Chen, Chitwood, Chmaissem, Chung, Cordes, Doederlein, Elish-Piper, Freeman, Graff, Hathaway, Hunt, Kassel, Ledgerwood, Lesnicki, Martin, McCord, Millhorn, Mogren, Naples, Newman, Nicholson, Patro, Penrod, Plum, Prabhaker (for Rajagopalan), Rheineck, Saborío, Scherer, Schmidt, Segura, Shi, Song, Staikidis, Tahernezehadi, Thu, Torres, Wang, Wilson, Woods

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Campbell, Click, Flores, Haji-Sheikh, Hernandez, Jacob, Krmeneč, Maddali, Milot, Peterson, Rajagopalan, Stephen, Stiggers, Zolotor

OTHERS PRESENT: Blazey, Bryan, Doyle, Falkoff, Gorman, Jensen, Klaper, Pinkelton, Smith, Stang (for Wesener Michael), Stoddard, Subramony

OTHERS ABSENT: Kortegast

I. CALL TO ORDER

L. Freeman: Everyone's been saying that it feels weird that this is the last week of classes and not finals week, that Thanksgiving threw us for a loop this year, but it's definitely December, it's definitely the holiday season, and I hope everybody notices the very festive cookies that are out in the area by the elevators. Please feel free at any time during the meeting to help yourself that has sprinkles and some festive red and green on it. That will serve as our call to order.

Acting President **L. Freeman** called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

L. Freeman: And I'm now going to ask for a motion to adopt the agenda.

W. Penrod: So moved.

L. Freeman: Thank you. A second?

C. Doederlein: Second.

L. Freeman: All right, all in favor?

Members: Aye.

L. Freeman: Opposed? All right.

III. APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES](#) OF THE NOVEMBER 8, 2017 MEETING

L. Freeman: I'm now going to ask for a motion to approve the minutes of the November 8, 2017 meeting that have been supplied electronically by Pat in the usual efficient fashion. Motion to approve the minutes?

T. Arado: So moved.

L. Freeman: All right, second?

T. Bishop: Second.

L. Freeman: Thank you. Any discussion? All right, hearing none, all those in favor?

Members: Aye.

L. Freeman: Opposed? Great.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

L. Freeman: So we are now at the point of President's Announcements, and I actually have four items to announce before I turn the floor over to Ritu Subramony, who will be talking about the Higher Learning Commission Assurance Review. And they're kind of not all announcements; they're sort of acknowledgements of dates and one announcement.

So I want to start out with an acknowledgement, and in particular, I want to congratulate Paul Stoddard, who is retiring from NIU after 29 years of service. He's going to be – I think we all know, we've read in the papers – pursuing the relaxing lifestyle associated with higher stakes politics in Illinois. And I want to take this moment to just highlight how his career here at NIU has prepared him for that challenge.

So maybe if you know, Paul served as the Faculty Senate president and University Council executive secretary for five years, from 2004 to 2009. More recently, he's represented NIU on the Faculty Advisory Council of the IBHE, and also served as the faculty/SPS personnel advisor. But if this were not enough, Paul has also honed his public communication skills through the STEM Outreach events. And he chose particularly at Acquaviva Winery in 2018 to comment about the possibility that the United States would be decimated by a large meteor. So I think that's wonderful training to go into Illinois state politics when you take all of those together. Please join me in recognizing Paul Stoddard on his last meeting. [applause]

My next item is an update on [time sensitive federal issues](#). And Pat's going to help me out by coordinating some slides here. I want to start out by just reminding everybody that faculty and staff are free to communicate with their legislators on views on any matter of public or private concern without notice or prior approval of the university, as long as they don't represent that they're speaking for or on behalf of the university. And there are two issues that are very time sensitive

calling for federal action. And the university does have official positions that have been articulated by the board and the president on these issues. And I just wanted to make you aware of their current status.

So the first is an update on DACA. Thirty-four Republicans in the House of Representatives sent a [letter to Speaker Paul Ryan](#) calling for a permanent legislative solution for DACA recipients before the end of the calendar year. And in fact, that this was promised to some of the legislators who signed on to tax reform to help get it passed. Illinois representatives Rodney Davis and Adam Kinzinger signed this letter. So thanks to them would be in order if you so choose to express your views in that way. And certainly if you are a supporter of this legislative relief our undocumented students, it's always good to remind people that this is an important issue to you, since they're looking for action before the end of the calendar year.

The second item with time sensitivity is tax reform. As you probably know, the House of Representatives and the Senate have each passed respective versions of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and there are some key differences. Higher education advocacy by individual institutions and by our large national organizations, American Council on Education, Association of Public & Land-Grant Universities, the Association of American Universities, and then also some of the 501(c)(3)s that represent not-for-profits. They're working together to influence the outcome of conference committee, where the bills will go to be resolved.

The Republican leadership is intent on passing the legislation before the end of the year, again, the end of the calendar year, so communications, if you're so moved, are time sensitive.

The Republicans have appointed conferees from the Ways and Means Committee to be on the conference committee that will help resolve these issues. Among them is Rep. Peter Roskam from Illinois, and so we do have an Illinois representative on the House membership. The Senate has not yet appointed their conferees to the House-Senate [conference] committee that will reconcile the difference between the bills and produce the legislation that will be voted on in both chambers.

I think the position and priorities of higher ed are very well summarized in the [letter that the APLU president, Peter McPherson sent](#) to the leadership of the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committees. There's a link to that, and Pat distributed it to the University Council list serve this morning. It details the tax provisions that are related to public research universities and their students that we think are the most important. And I would put at the top of the list getting out of the final bill any effort to tax graduate student tuition waivers or tuition benefits that are provided to university employees or their dependents. Other tax provisions that are unfavorable for higher education are taxation of employer tuition benefits, elimination of lifelong learning credit, and you can read the whole list. But again, it's time sensitive. This is our last meeting. We will be continuing to update the community as we learn things from the organizations that are advocating on behalf of higher ed.

Any questions about that? All right.

My next announcement relates to modifications to how meetings of University Council and standing committees will be conducted going forward. And it requires a bit of explanation for the

group.

For decades, University Council has served as the primary university body for consultation at the institutional level regarding the establishment of educational and academic policies at the university. It's operated in a manner that promotes shared governance between and amongst university faculty, administrative staff, supportive and professional staff, civil service employees and students. The University Council has historically conducted its business and activities in meetings that are open to the university community where members of the community can attend and observe the workings of the University Council. Yet throughout its long history at NIU, the University Council has operated in the spirit of the Open Meetings Act, posting agendas and minutes, but the body has not followed the strict, technical requirements of the Illinois Open Meetings Act.

Recently, there was a formal challenge lodged with the public access counselor in the Office of the Illinois Attorney General by a member of the university community who believes that the Resources, Space and Budget Committee should be required to abide by the requirements of the Illinois Open Meetings Act. The Resource, Space and Budget Committee is listed as a standing committee of the University Council, along with six other standing committees. And for those of you who don't know them off the top of your head, those are the Steering Committee, the Faculty Senate/University Council Rules, Governance and Elections Committee, the University Council Personnel Committee, the Academic Policy Committee, the University Affairs Committee, the Financial Exigency Advisory Committee and, as I stated, the Resources, Space and Budget Committee.

Unlike most of the other standing committees, the Resource, Space and Budget Committee is also listed as a standing committee of Faculty Senate, which as I think everyone here knows, is a related council that represents its primary constituency, the university faculty, in the shared governance process.

The formal challenge before the public access counselor provided us with an opportunity to reexamine the inner working of the University Council and its standing committees. Whether an entity is subject to the Open Meetings Act in Illinois depends on a number of factors that courts have identified over the years, and they have to be looked at, weighed and assessed on a case-by-case basis. These include but aren't limited to: how members of the entity are appointed and the formality of those appointments, the duties of the entity, whether the entity is purely advisory or has other deliberative or investigative functions, the entity's place in the larger organizational structure, whether the entity is subject to or accountable to a public body of the state.

I've had individual discussions with the university's Office of General Counsel and the executive vice president and provost about this issue. In consideration of their expressed opinions, as well as feedback from other members of the university community, I'm announcing today that the University Council and its seven standing committees will seek to comply with the Illinois Open Meetings Act and all of its requirements.

This operational decision is a good step for further transparency in our shared governance process; however, I want it to be understood that this change can't happen overnight. The Illinois Open

Meetings Act establishes a number of technical requirements so that moving toward compliance will take some training time, effort and additional resources. And I'm asking that everyone be patient during this change. We will start to move quickly, but we won't get there immediately. There will be a learning curve, but it's my expectation that the university will act in good faith, strive toward compliance with the Open Meetings Act and act with the principles of shared governance in mind.

The spring 2018 semester provides us with a good opportunity to put things in place for compliance with the act on a test-run basis with the intent that the University Council and its seven standing committees will reach compliance by the time the 2018-19 academic year begins next fall.

There will be other issues for us to consider in examining NIU's alignment with the Open Meetings Act, and we'll address those in the appropriate times and places. As I said, these considerations are on a case-by-case basis, and they're complex. I believe the actions I've outlined here are an important step and reflect our proactive commitment to transparency.

And I'll stop there and take any questions you might have about that announcement. Obviously, there'll be more to come.

K. Thu: Does this have any implications for other types of meetings, more discreet units; for example, department meetings, faculty meetings, subcommittee meetings of our faculty? Are we headed that way? Or can you comment on that?

L. Freeman: I can comment on the fact, to some extent. And I'll tell you what I can tell you right now. As I said, there are a number of factors that are considered in the Open Meetings Act and the associated case law. And they really do need to be applied on a case-by-case basis. One extreme on the spectrum is every time any group of employees or students at this university got together, we would call it something subject to the Open Meetings Act, and I do not believe we are headed there, nor will there be pressure for us to head there. The other extreme is to use every tool possible to defend what we've always done just because it's what we've always done, and I also don't think that's appropriate. I think careful consideration of these on a case-by-case basis with a line towards what's consistent with the Open Meetings Act and what's most appropriate for university operations and reputation is the way that we'll go forward. But I suspect that there will be questions raised, and we'll address those to the best of our ability. And when necessary, we'll consult with the public access counselor and the attorney general.

E. Mogren: Just to follow up from that, as you're scoring on a case-by-case basis, what's the [inaudible], is it also possible to draw up a set of guidelines that unit administrators and folks like that might need to be aware of moving forward so that, two things: One is to make folks aware so that we comply, but also to perhaps begin the process of operationalizing? [inaudible] Is it possible for us to develop a – checklist might be too rigid, but at least it would sort of help us get into a frame of thinking. Is that something

L. Freeman: Those are, in fact, under development. The General Counsel's Office has already started. The last time I saw it, the guidance document that most resembles the format you requested, it was two sides of one page and it was being refined. Obviously, that will be incorporated into

some other types of training materials, but it's meant to be sort of check-off bullets that people can use and, again, we'll set up an FAQs page and, as more decisions are reached about applicability, we will go forward.

E. Mogren: And the decisions [inaudible] applicability, getting back to Kendall's comments, the decisions about applicability, that's indefinite. So is it possible for [inaudible] that you predict might be affected by this to have a little bit of guidance [inaudible]. Is that possible?

L. Freeman: Absolutely. And the units that we're starting with are the units that are clearly derived from a public body directly with the delegated authority from the Board of Trustees, which is our ultimate body, so we're sort of doing that, but we'll make sure you get as much information as we can in the most useable and helpful format, because that's our job.

V. Naples: First of all, I would like to say thank you for being responsive to working with this kind of an issue. I have been on Resources, Space and Budget and many of the other committees for a long period of time and, while I recognize there are some kinds of information, such as personnel decisions and things like that that need to remain, and should remain, confidential, I certainly would appreciate the ability to discuss more openly some of the other issues that are of general interest to every person who is at NIU, whether a staff or faculty member or student or anything else. A lot of the issues about budgets and budget priorities and the explanations behind why money can or cannot be put into certain places, as well as how policies are developed and furthered, would be a tremendous amount of sunshine and fresh air coming into the way the university works, go very far toward demystifying the process. So, thank you.

L. Freeman: Other questions or comments? Okay, well my final – I said I had four – and my final announcement is a reminder about the president's appreciation gathering or holiday celebration, depending on what you prefer to call it, which will be from 2 to 4:30 on Monday in Altgeld. It will involve the auditorium where there will be desserts, hot chocolate, coffee, punch, a photo booth and both live and video-streaming entertainment involving NIU administrators. There'll be an appearance by Victor E. Huskie as well. Rooms 203 and 225, so the large meeting rooms on the second floor across from the auditorium, one will allow you to have the opportunity to give food to the Huskie Food Pantry or sign up to volunteer for a shift there or to drop off warm outer clothes – and they can be new or gently used – for international students and graduate students. There'll also be an opportunity to either write to pledge a good deed or to write a letter of encouragement to students that can be shared with them, either during finals or mid-semester of next semester. And we will be sending out an employee release notice for the party this Friday. Any questions about the celebration? I've seen some of the entertainment in its preliminary form, and it's pretty entertaining, let me just put it that way. Please do try to come out, again 2 to 4:30. We'll be recycling some of the videos, so if you don't see it the first time, you'll get to see it the second time.

A. [Higher Learning Commission 2018 Assurance Review NIU HLC web page](#)
Carolinda Douglass, Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness

L. Freeman: All right, so with that, I'm going to ask Ritu Subramony, who is standing in for Carolinda Douglass, to talk about Higher Learning Commission 2018 Assurance Review.

R. Subramony: Good afternoon. I'm standing in for Carolinda Douglass, who had to be out for a family reason. We wanted to tell you a little bit more about the Higher Learning Commission and the assurance review process that is in place. So I'll just elaborate on that.

What I'm intending to do is give you a quick overview of why this is important, the HLC timeline, which is our regional accreditor. The [inaudible] how we organized the whole process, how it's moved forward, as well as give you a status update with the project, and then probably beg for your requests and request your help for helping us with the process in terms of what you can do.

So with that, let me just give you a quick, brief overview of why this is important. I am definitely preaching to the choir. You have all been a part of the HLC effort one way or the other. If you recall, we had them on site in 2014. The good news is that for 2018, they are not on site. We like it like that. We do have to produce some documentation nevertheless. So the whole effort is we are maintained as an institution, our regional accreditation is through the Higher Learning Commission, and through our activities to our procedures as we follow the compliance guidelines they have, we continually try to show our quality assurance and our [inaudible] improvement efforts so that we have the accreditor give us their external validation of our programs, [inaudible] quality of our operations being in the right direction and such.

Not to say that compliance efforts definitely improve and impact the flow of budgets, the Title IV, transfer agreements and IBHE requirements. So with every sense, as you well know, the reason the accreditation touches all aspects of our operations and functioning of the university. So it would behoove us to present this in the best possible way, all the hard work we do on a daily basis.

NIU's ten-year open pathway cycle, which is what we are in right now, started in 2014 when we finished the previous cycle. So a quick review of what that means. You will see that in 2014 we the site visit, we completed the cycle, we started the next ten-year launch. The ten-year cycle, they made us choose one of the pathways. We had three options, and we chose the open pathway, which is the least restrictive. Now the joke is that it is least restrictive, but we still have to assure its argument complete in the ten-year span, and several other quality initiators that we need to do. So this is an example of least restrictive, but it gives us the choice to showcase our story the way we want to.

In June 2018, we have what is called the assurance argument, which is [inaudible] review. The best way to look at that is, it's a self-study. It's a focused self-study, which is not as [inaudible] out as the 2014 was; however, it will still speak to the same main five criteria that the Higher Learning Commission has for us or any other institution. We will also be talking about an interim report on budgeting and planning, which is embedded within criteria V.

So our oversight group that is facilitating the process is Acting President Freeman, EVPP Chris McCord, Carolinda Douglass, myself, Susan Smith, who is our projects coordinator, and Crystal Doyle, who is the administrative assistant. So this is the core group, but the core group is really just pushing various groups and facilitating the combined group of faculty and staff at NIU.

Back in June, we were given the charge by Acting Provost McCord to develop the assurance

argument on behalf of NIU and then submit it to the HLC. What the teams, the various teams, and I'll stand upon with who these people are and what they're doing, but the idea is to collect and review all the evidence that leads to the five criteria and core components – there's about 21 of those on number V. – to analyze this evidence and to prepare a written narrative that will best showcase what NIU does and continues to do.

So the five criteria of the assurance review – and these continue to be the same as they were the last time – relate to the mission of the university; integrity: ethical and responsible conduct; teaching and learning: the quality, resources and support we have for our programs, academic and curricular and otherwise; teaching and learning: evaluation and improvement; and then resources, planning and institutional effectiveness. So these are the big categories or big buckets so-to-speak, where the core components then follow.

When we write our assurance argument or our narrative, we really speak to each of the core components under these big categories. We are also evaluated on each of the core components. I'm looking at several people around the room, who are part of the assurance system right now, so thank you.

With that, what I wanted to do is, I did want to have several slides, because we have at least 40 people who are most directly in the criteria groups, who are helping out. And then we have about 65 to 70 people who are involved in the effort directly, and several others who are one degree separated. So with that, I just wanted to show you who these people are. And if you can help me also thank them. We can go into the [website](#), Pat. This is our page for the HLC. It rests on the accreditation page under institutional effectiveness. And if you want to go into the [NIU criteria groups](#), right there it tells us – Pat I'm going to have you scroll really slowly – the first group and all the people who are involved in it. You can see the names, perhaps your own name. The second group and the people involved in it; it's a mix of faculty and staff. Likewise, third, fourth and fifth groups. And the asterisk is next to the people who are chairing that particular criteria group. The groups chose to go with a co-chair model, and each of the five groups have two chairs, two co-chairs. We have ten co-chairs. So these are all these wonderful people who are helping, and at this point, they have been able to collect a lot of the evidence to speak to the criteria and have started to craft the narrative as well. You can exit, thank you. So this is a good website anyway in case you want to know what's going on with the initiative and who these people are. Thank you.

So in all of what I want to say is, as you've been probably gathering where is this story going, our outcome is going to be to present a very authentic depiction of NIU by developing a persuasive argument, is what we call it, that addresses the five criteria and core components, while we highlight our strengths and areas for improvement. It's best to be candid, we have understood that with accreditation. And also as we address the interim report within criteria V on budgeting and [inaudible].

I want to tell you a little bit about the project, how we organized this, and the status of it. Before that, are there any questions or do we wait until the end?

So these are the five main groups, and then they also feed into the Steering Committee. This is how the project and the teams are organized right now. There is a Steering Committee so it touches all

these five groups, or will touch if the group is not activated. But the more we talk about the criteria groups, I think it's probably best to make you know that those really the troopers on the ground. They are the ones who are crafting and developing the narrative right now. I just showed you a page with all those names. They have the explicit job of collecting the evidence, analyzing the evidence and representing the narrative.

The Resource Group, yellow circle, is a pretty important group too. This group consists of, I want to say about 35 or 40 individuals, again, who are people in different units across functions [inaudible]. So, for example, we have Jennice O'Brien; we have Rachel Xidis from EMMC; we've got Nick Choban from IT; we have Stephanie Richter from Blackboard. All these people who can help us in different ways. So these are those Resource Group people.

The Validation Group is an important group that is stemming out of institutional effectiveness. It has some staff. It also has some GAs that help out with data that is appropriate for them to maneuver and move around. The Validation Group's purpose is to make sure that all evidence that's collected can be verified, that it is, indeed, coming from the source [inaudible] if it's data in terms of qualitative, making sure that tables are making sense and is not in conflict with [inaudible] calculation and such. So they are already in the process of doing this.

The Review Group will be a group that gets activated in February, where the first draft of that narrative is then looked at through those eyes. At this point, we have three people who we invited, five from the Review Group that's [inaudible] from the College of Business, Carolinda Douglass from IE, and Brad Bond from Graduate School. All of these people, what they have in common is that they're experienced agency reviewers. So they can use their red pens or red inks in however fashion and, hopefully, really go through this critically. At that time, the criteria groups will also be reading each other's arguments. So we are hoping that we can be organized in our efforts so that we can produce our report in a timely fashion and have a buffer so that it goes through various drafts and various eyes so we don't really leave out anything from the story that we wanted to include.

Our project milestones are, very briefly, you don't have to read all of them. The circle is just to simply tell you that this is where we are at. We are gathering evidence. We are drafting the argument. We are expecting to co-chair validation in January, and this is the phase we are in right now.

Overall we are about slightly above, upwards of 40 percent complete in our process. And we hope to – our project manager keeps us doing this – and this is helpful, it's not been with too many glitches up until now, any. People are working hard, and our first reality check will come in January to see, you know, where we will be.

So with that, I want to come to a close and how you can help. We recently conducted a survey, a very quick informal survey with our recruits and co-chairs. And we really wanted to ask them things like: Are you being helped? Do you have – What do you need as you look for sources and such? Are people able to respond to your questions? What's going on? Is there anything else that can be done?

We do have a data request, we've streamlined that so people are not being sort of – so their doors

are not being knocked on willy-nilly from every place. We try to make sure that we triage it so you hear the data request for interviews or data coming from one source. The survey was just to see how things are. We found out that there was initially a concern that the websites were not updated, the org charts were not in line. There's been a big change in that. We've seen a lot of success in the fact that there's a lot of websites that are now the way they need to do with the new templates. The org charts are getting to be updated, but we're still not at 100 percent. So I put the bullet point in here to say, wherever possible, please review that with your website and your org charts to make sure that we can help in updating those. We have the resource through the EMMC, and we can certainly work on those.

The second point being that, as and when we have need to reach out to different people, maybe the colleges as well as divisions, we hope you will continue to respond as you have to provide agency data or interviews that might be substantial pieces of evidence if you can provide the narrative for that.

And the third one going backwards up again is just the awareness of the assurance review process. I do know that the either directly or indirectly you are aware, because we've talked about this in various other committees, the APC, the UAP, and such as well. But you might be directly related or one degree separated, and maybe more than one degree separated. But our point was to make sure that you are aware that this is an institutional project, and it's best for us to be able to capture what we do on a daily basis with pride and, where we have room for improvement, we have to be candid and state that that's what we will do next.

And thank you. If you have any questions, I'm right here.

S. Torres: Thank you for the presentation. Just one question. Looking at your criteria groups, I was just curious if there were any students on them and, if not, is it [inaudible] to have students representing that sector on the HLC team?

R. Subramony: At this point, we don't have students directly on the criteria groups, partly because of how involved these groups are. The Steering Committee meets on a monthly basis, but the criteria groups meet almost every other week. However, we do have student involvement in the Data Verification Group, in the Resource Group, and then also in the various committees that will be reviewing these documents. That's how we plan to capture.

G. Chen: I don't have a question, but just your website, what's the title, HLC Criteria Groups or the line material groups that webpage. I guess there is a typo either criteria numbers III, or the criteria number IV, because the title of criterias number III and number IV, they were listed identical.

R. Subramony: Right. So that may well be, but just so I can point it out, III and IV are, indeed, the same, but they are two sides of that. One is the teaching, learning and resources – that speaks to that – that's number III. And the fourth speaks to the evaluation component. So if that's what you're seeing, then they are accurate. If you're seeing identical, then we need to change that.

G. Chen: I see them identical.

R. Subramony: Then we need to change that. Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you very much. [applause]

L. Freeman: Thank you, Ritu. Please convey our thanks to the entire team for doing this important work on behalf of the university.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS

L. Freeman: At this point, I am going to turn the meeting over to the University Council executive secretary and Faculty Senate president, Linda Saborío.

- A. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws [Article 15.5](#) Baccalaureate Council –
Pages 3-4
FIRST READING

L. Saborío: Okay, good afternoon, everyone. So we're going to move along with our agenda here. Item VII, New Business, we have A., proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws Article 15.5 Baccalaureate Council on pages 3 and 4 of your agenda packet. You can find details regarding this bylaw change. This is a first reading, and then we'll have the second reading at the January meeting, and we'll be voting at the second meeting then. So today we have Becqui Hunt, I believe, is here to introduce this bylaw change and answer any questions.

R. Hunt: Basically, the amendment is to add a nonvoting representative from the University Committee on the Initial Educator Licensure to the Baccalaureate Council. When the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and the Undergraduate Coordinating Council merged into the Baccalaureate Council, this representative was inadvertently dropped. And so we're just adding this representative back on to the Baccalaureate Council. Are there any questions?

L. Saborío: I don't see any questions, thank you. Great, should we move on then, no questions?

- B. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws [Article 15.3](#) Academic Planning Council – Pages 5-7
FIRST READING

L. Saborío: Let's move on then to B., proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws Article 15.3 the Academic Planning Council, which is on pages 5 through 7 of your agenda packets. And again, this is the first reading for this bylaw change, this amendment. And I think we are going to be asking Ritu to speak for this. And you're also doing C., right? So we'll go ahead with that one too – the proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws Article 15.8 University Assessment Panel, which is on pages 8 through 11. So go ahead, Ritu.

R. Subramony: Okay, thanks. So talking about the APC, the Academic Planning Council, as you can see the rationale, the changes here are reflecting the title changes of individuals who serve ex

officio on the Council and then there is an elimination of one position that no longer exists. So in that sense, those are the only changes, and you see them on page 6. Are there any questions?

C. Proposed amendment to NIU Bylaws [Article 15.8](#) University Assessment Panel – Page 8-11
FIRST READING

R. Subramony: Okay, then we'll move on. So the UAP or the University Assessment Panel, we are proposing recommended changes to the composition of the panel membership that would retain the number in the staff membership as is, but it would create greater representation from across academic colleges on the panel. And I'll just explain that briefly in a second. Also the recommendations are aligned with the composition of the faculty representation on the Academic Planning Council, and the idea is to better represent the integration of the UAP and the APC. There are some changes here that also reflect title changes as in the case of the previous called APC, and there is an elimination of one position that no longer exists. We want to correct title changes for other committee and agency members.

So what I do want to say about this in brief is that the idea was with this proposal to implant greater college representation from all the colleges such that we would have one member from Law, two from the other colleges, Business, Engineering, Health and Human Sciences, Education, VPA; and then three from LAS – one each from humanities, the social sciences and the other sciences. The idea was also to have a stronger linkage in terms of program review and assessment processes for the APC. So to not be undue burden on the members who sit on more than one university committee, but instead have actual representation from all the colleges, which is what is proposed here.

And there are several members who have been called guests, so those people, especially the educator licensure associate director, she's demoted into an ex officio, nonvoting member, as well as the elimination of what used to be the associate vice provost position. That is also [inaudible].

[inaudible] the duties for the UAP, the duties have been reworded so there is some fresh language there. There isn't a whole lot of new duties, but what I do want to bring your attention to are things like, we wanted to clean up the language in terms of adding the accreditation and discipline reaccreditation. The UAP does look at the assessment plans, but they also provide advisory support for programs that have come up for reaccreditation, [inaudible] is presented to them.

As well as we cleaned up the language for performance measures and benchmarks that we use externally for state approval and then also internally for program review, so there is a dash for program review processes, there's approval [inaudible]. The idea is to have greater linkage by even having some overlap with members of APC and the UAP so we can talk about assessment as well as program review in the same meeting.

So that would be the summary of the proposal. Thank you.

L. Saborío: Any questions for Ritu?

K. Thu: Does it specify somewhere elsewhere in the bylaws that, when we refer to faculty, it's

means tenure-track faculty?

R. Subramony: I would not know the answer to that, but I can find the answer.

K. Thu: Because if not, then this kind of a body, I think we want tenure-track faculty when we're talking about 14 faculty representatives.

L. Saborío: It doesn't. It would have to specify in this bylaw if you want tenure-track faculty on this committee.

K. Thu: I think that's the way it should be.

L. Saborío: It would have to state it. Ritu, do you want to take that into consideration?

R. Subramony: Yes.

P. Stoddard: Article XI of the Constitution defines university faculty as consisting of full-time staff members holding the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor and instructor. So yes, if we want to, if it's desirable to only have tenured and tenure-track faculty, then that would have to be explicitly stated in the bylaw.

L. Saborío: Particularly if you want tenured faculty.

H. Nicholson: Can you please break down the staff representation versus faculty. I know you said staff would stay the same, faculty you added, I believe?

R. Subramony: No, the representation is the same, but the way they are selected and elected, that process is being changed, or proposed.

H. Nicholson: Oh, I see. So what is the break-down for staff and faculty.

R. Subramony: So it's primarily faculty, like the APC, but as we go down, the one change if you see in 15.8.1 c if we have two people or two members who could be included by the vice provost. We have now made that into one staff member from Student Affairs units appointed by the chief Student Affairs officer. And that can be broken down to say one specific member again for the assessment purpose of focus on Student Affairs programs. And then the second staff member is from the academic support units, appointed by the vice provost for undergraduate academic affairs. So these are the two staff in terms of the appointed.

I'll skip over the student. And then the ex officio, now there is one staff or faculty member from the University Libraries, that is being added for the proposal. We already have the University Libraries rep, but they wanted us to make sure that we put [inaudible].

In terms of the long-term guests, we have – I have to look for that section – it was the educator licensure preparation who was a guest for a long term, and that will be added as an ex officio.

So these are the staff members we are talking about. [inaudible] it as again as ex officio, nonvoting member as assistant chair, Carolinda Douglass, staff, as the chair [inaudible].

H. Nicholson: Thank you. As a University Assessment Panel versus an academic, do you think that it would add value to have more equitable representation between staff and faculty.

R. Subramony: My understanding is at this point that we do have an assessment committee for the student affairs programs, a separate committee, and focus of the UAP primary being to the academic degree programs, as well as academic [inaudible].

L. Saborío: Any other questions? All right, thank you.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report

L. Saborío: So let's move on to Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. And first up is our – I was going to say hero of the day – Paul Stoddard.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. First off, I'd like to thank President Freeman for her remarks at the beginning. That was very nice. With regards to those remarks, while it may be that I did, indeed, contemplate the devastation that would befall the United States should a large meteor strike the country, I never contemplated the disaster that actually befell us this last year. I'll leave you to figure out which one that was. [laughter]

Anyway I'm here to report on the FAC rather than past disasters. We met on November 17 at Illinois Valley Community College. We had a hastily scheduled, informal discussion regarding sexual harassment on campus, brought about by some of the current revelations crossing the news these days. A couple of questions or issues that were brought up, it was noticed that the frequency of harassment seems to be increasing. That always raises the questions of are the actual incidents more common or are they just being reported more frequently.

There was some discussion mostly focusing on student-on-student harassment issues and how to best inform students of what is, and is not, acceptable behavior to alert people to the fact that sensitivities vary greatly, especially in an area like this; and what might be a harmless joke to one person is deeply offensive to somebody else. There was some discussion about how faculty should deal with potentially touchy subjects in class when they come up. And the recommendation was that there should always be some sort of trigger warning at the beginning of a class that's going to touch on those issues, let people know that this is coming, and let them prepare in whatever way they need to. And I think those were the topics covered in that.

We got a report from the chair, Marie Donovan, of the FAC. First off, Al Bowman has been appointed the new IBHE executive director. And the FAC will be meeting with the IBHE next Friday. I will not be at that meeting as it turns out. And they plan on pointing out to Mr. Bowman that we do not have any faculty representation on the IBHE at the moment, and that SB 440 which is a senate bill to formalize and improve, in our opinion, faculty representation on the IBHE is still

working its way through the system.

We then broke into our caucuses, and the four-year publics caucus really was discussing two issues. One, there's with the FAC and with the IBHE, that there's still a lot of work being done on dual credit offerings, a lot of schools, especially out of state schools are offering dual credit, high school and college. And with the Illinois Articulation Initiative, schools like Northern or others can be forced to accept credit even from out of state colleges for certain courses. And this is something that the IBHE and the FAC are concerned about. And so they're working on that.

We're also, in terms of the Illinois Articulation Initiative, looking into how that relates to the general education programs of various schools. For those of you not familiar, the IAI is a compact of the community colleges and four-year publics, which says, basically, if you fulfill your general education requirements at any school, the rest of the schools will honor those as having fulfilled general education. That came about when I was new to the university, so it's been around for at least 20-25 years. And we were wondering if, indeed, general education programs at the four-years are adequately represented by what the IAI considers a full gen ed program. So there's a sub-group looking at what all the various four-years are asking for in terms of gen ed, and then looking at how well that matches up or doesn't match up with the IAI.

And those were really most of the more interesting things that we talked about.

L. Saborío: Any questions for Paul? This is your last time to heckle him. All right, Paul, thank you.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – report
Barbara Andree, Catherine Doederlein, Alex Gelman,
Mark Riley, Linda Saborío, Kendall Thu

L. Saborío: Okay, next item is the UAC to the BOT. It's a clerical error, really there's no report, but I would like to take this moment to remind folks that [President Freeman's Fiscal Year 2018 goals](#) were approved by the Board of Trustees at their last meeting, and they are available to review through a link on the president's home page. So if you're interested in viewing her goals for 2018, they are available on her website.

C. Academic Policy Committee – Terry Bishop, Chair – no report

D. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Jim Wilson, Chair – report

L. Saborío: Next up, we have Resources, Space and Budget Committee, and Jim Wilson is here, and he has a report.

J. Wilson: Faculty Senate met last week and on this past Friday, RSB Committee met. I was not present at either of those meetings and so I am basically a messenger of what transpired last week. So there are some of us here present that were attending those meetings so, if there is any comment or clarification needed, we can get to that.

So the main question that we had for the acting president and acting provost was dealing with

chargebacks, regarding elimination of chargebacks; that is one department charging another for certain services rendered. The basic legitimate reason for this is that it forces departments to think more consciously about their use of resources. There are some resources that are considered a public good, while there are others that may or may not be needed. And various campus entities may need to pay.

Chargebacks are being enforced in such places as labs, but there are also other work-arounds, other ways around, such as grants. Now the chargebacks will be looked at a little more closely when the new CFO comes on board this January. And one thing that she will do is examine the system. So basically, the chargeback makes more sense in some places while others maybe less so. I guess the basic idea – and I didn't actually write this – but it was to prevent chargebacks being used for [inaudible].

Another question was raised concerning centralized admissions, a question regarding how the college is moving toward centralized admissions, and the question was why is it taking so long. And the answer was that there is a long queue of projects at DoIT that accounted for that.

There was a question having to do with engineering by Professor Haji-Sheikh, and that was referred to – it's about repairs – and that was referred to Vice President Heckmann. He was to contact Vice President Heckmann personally.

We did have some liaison reports. A student fee subcommittee – we are going to form a subcommittee, but that is not actually formed. Cathy Doederlein will be benchmarking other institutions to see how student fees are allocated among various institutions.

There was a report, although no details are provided, on Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee.

And lastly, we're coming up to this period of time in the beginning of the year where we'll be writing up the annual budget priorities statement. And so all are invited to offer up suggestions of priorities. It has been indicated to me that this last several years, we've heard nothing but negative things about the budget, circling the wagons, retrenchment, and so on, to keep ourselves afloat. But how can we move forward in a more positive direction, things like getting equipment, repairs, things needed so that we can do our jobs, the hiring of new faculty so we can pursue our missions. And so thinking of all those, what can be in a more positive direction moving forward as priorities. And I mean some priorities that we thought were priorities may not be very high priorities now.

So with that, I end the report. Any clarifications or comments?

L. Saborío: Any questions for Jim?

J. Wilson: I would refer them to Sarah [McHone-Chase] who will be the chair, acting chair, for the spring semester.

L. Saborío: No questions? Okay.

- E. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Therese Arado, Chair – no report
- F. University Affairs Committee – Reed Scherer, Chair – no report
- G. Student Association – Rachel Jacob, President; Christine Wang, Speaker of the Senate – report

L. Saborío: Do you want to get some more cookies; everybody seems like their energy level just dropped, need to get some more sugar, there's coffee back there.

So let's move on to Student Association, and I understand that Rachel Jacob is in Indonesia again presenting her research, is that what she's doing? So Emily Schmidt is here to give us a report. Thank you, Emily.

E. Schmidt: Hi. I am Rachel's chief of staff, Emily Schmidt, and she actually didn't send me a report, but she's in Indonesia at the Conference for Democracy representing the United States as the only student representative, so that's pretty neat for her. She actually just woke – it's about 5 a.m. over there. So Christine will be giving the Student Association report.

C. Wang: This isn't quite as exciting as Indonesia, but I'm happy to be here. So we have been working on a few things and it's been – it's always busy – but it got very busy this week and we weren't expecting it to be quite as hectic at the end of the semester. But I do want to talk about the things that we've been working on since our last University Council meeting.

So the first one was the Statewide Leadership Summit that we've been talking about with Dr. Edghill-Walden. It's basically a collaboration with Rev. Jesse Jackson after he came and visited and also with Rainbow PUSH, so there will be two events. The first one will be NIU Day, I believe at the end of February, we go to Chicago. Rainbow PUSH, for those of you who don't know by the way, it's a radio show. So we'll be going there. It's going to be an all-day event on a Saturday. They'll be showcasing notable people from NIU. I believe Acting President Freeman will also be there as part of that. Student Association members will also be there. A lot of our alumni will be there. And then also a showcase will be the Black Choir as well.

Additionally, there was a proposal to actually have a leadership summit – statewide leadership summit for student leaders, so gathering all of the student body presidents or senate presidents or whatever student body governing, excuse me, student governing body, that they might have. And having it like either as a telecommunications thing where they can actually Skype in or just have it live streamed, or they can actually come to NIU. So we are actually working on that with Dr. Edghill-Walden for next semester.

Additionally, on November 16, a couple members of the Student Association, as well as a few members from just in general the community at NIU, went to NPR to talk about the issues they have faced with being a minority. So the director of cultural affairs from the Student Association was there, as well as I was. We talked about the struggles we face as members of the NIU community and also any sort of discrimination we might have experienced as well. From my experience as a minority and as a woman, that was one of the perspectives I presented. And from the others, they

also presented their own point of view. That was awesome. It was about a two-hour conversation, and we could have probably talked for all night. But it's now out on NPR if you wanted to look. I'm very proud of our students who actually came out there and had a really nice conversation about that.

We have a full cabinet again, actually. So we are losing one of our directors – I'm talking on behalf of Rachel right now, by the way. We are losing one of our directors in December to graduation, but we actually just filled that position again this Sunday, so we again will have a full cabinet. I guess technically it never was empty – not empty, but not completely filled in that case. But in any case, we will still have a functioning board for the next semester.

On Monday there was the No Shame in My Game, which was an event that we hosted in the HSC Den where we had free bowling and free food, free games as well. We had people come out and learn a lot about the No Shame Campaign and then also kind of a little bit of a final project for our director of student life who is leaving in December, which was nice. So Director Anthony Williams has been around at the S.A. for a long time and we will be really sad to see him go, but we have our new director [inaudible]. So that was awesome, we had a great success. From what I hear we had about 50 signatures there and a lot of people showed up and we had a lot of fun as well.

And then while I'm still on the No Shame Campaign program right now, we actually installed the pledges in the HSC Glass Gallery downstairs. So if you have a chance when we leave today to go and take a look and sign a pledge, your name will be up there. There were a few of them that we weren't able to put up yet because we ran out of painters tape, so we will be going back, however, later this week to put those back up. So if you haven't signed one yet, you can go to CLB 180 and sign one of those. They should be up for the rest of the semester. We have it tentatively set up for February for now, but we are in talks to have that on for the rest of the semester, next year.

And additionally, we have a lot of goals for next semester. So the first one is that we are working on sexual assault prevention awareness in conjunction with mental health. As Paul Stoddard talked about, there are these issues across campus with sexual harassment. We don't know if it's people are coming forward because they are now emboldened, or the incidents are higher, we don't know about that so we want to kind of raise awareness of sexual assault, sexual harassment as well as how to cope with that. We're actually also going to be working with Prairie State Legal Services who approached us. They're a pro bono legal aid organization that provides aid with issues such as protective orders, domestic violence issues. So that will be a great way for us to tie that in to the No Shame Campaign.

We are also working with military and post-traditional student services to set up an event for veterans and more information about the PSD. We're also going to be doing something with LGBTQ and mental health and especially with minorities in the LGBTQ community and how mental health affects them as well. Of course, we'll be working with all of the resource centers on campus to set that up.

And finally, our coping mechanisms workshops – we want to work together with Counseling and Consultation Services. They are setting up a program with a grant called Kognito with a K. And it's essentially just kind of recognize behaviors that may not be healthy or behaviors that may be

dangerous to students or around us or people around us. I think that's going to be a really great program for us to have.

And then we are also going to be launching a blog next semester. Every week there will be someone new with a different issue to talk about. It can be students or people who have a certain condition and want to talk about their experience with it and how they cope with it and how they got help. So I'm really excited for all of these events. I'm really hoping that we see a great turnout.

And then our final thing that we're working on that has raised a lot of concern this week is the city ordinance that would be proposing to place, basically, a parking ban on some areas of the city of DeKalb. They're charging \$25 for parking on the city streets. And so there was a lot of concerns with that. December 3, which was this Sunday, Chief Lowery came to talk about the Safe Streets Initiative, which is what the proposal is called, and I think the presentation raised a lot more questions than it answered, especially among students. From what I understand, it was open to the public and published in the Daily Chronicle on November 13, and it was also presented in front of City Council as well. November 27 it was the first reading, and then next week on December 11 is going to be the second reading where they may potentially be passing the first phase of this proposal.

So I think the main concern that a lot of senators and a lot of people in the S.A. and a lot of actual students have about this is that: What are the implications of this? I think people just don't quite have a good understanding of what's going on and they want to know more. The fact that there was a total of seven business days between the presentation and the public comment period and the first reading was a total seven days, I think, with Thanksgiving break in between, is just simply not enough time for students to totally understand what's going on.

The parking ban is going to be affecting Greek Row, which is a heavily populated area with students, as well as Echo Park, that area as well, which again is also very populated with students. And the purpose of this is to increase safety in these areas. We understand that there's been a lot of issues there with safety and shootings that have been happening this semester especially. And while I don't think anyone is going to say that the chief of police that they understand how safety [inaudible], it's still very important for us to understand the implications of [inaudible]. So we are meeting with the chief Friday to further discuss these issues and to further discuss these questions as well as coming to City Council on Monday to discuss the, just kind of ask for more time to understand what this proposal is. And we really want to make sure that we're safe, but we also want to understand what the implications of this proposal are.

So with that, I'm going to open it to questions.

L. Saborío: Thank you very much, Christine.

H. Operating Staff Council – Barbara Andree, President – report

L. Saborío: Next we have our Operating Staff Council representative, which is Barb Andree.

B. Andree: Just a couple of quick announcements. Tomorrow's meeting of the Operating Staff

Council will host Anna Quider, who is our representative in Washington, D.C. And she will be giving us some updates via Skype on what's happening in Washington regarding tax reform and how it's going to impact staff especially [inaudible] university community certainly, but we wanted to get updated on how it would affect our constituency as well.

And one of the committees of the Operating Staff Council – the PR and Activities Committee – has been sponsoring for a few years a gathering called the Giving Project where many of us get together on the lunch hour twice a month during the school year and knit or crochet or now we're making tied felt hats – I mean we're really branching out here – items to be distributed to students who need them through the Huskie Food Pantry. And we had a very nice write-up and pictures in the Northern Star on line, so if you're interested in looking at what we're doing and how it's affecting our student population who need some of these items, especially since it's going to get very cold very soon, you can look at the Northern Star online.

L. Saborío: Any questions? Thank you.

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

L. Saborío: And last we have our next report from our SPS Council president, Cathy Doederlein.

C. Doederlein: Thank you. Just really quick, thank you for those who have participated in nominating folks for our presidential awards within SPS. We'll be reviewing those and in the spring let folks know who are the selected recipients.

We do have our holiday party or end-of-the-year gathering I guess we would say, December 19, from 3 to 5 in Cole Hall, right outside of the Pick Museum, which will be open for extended hours for people to be able to go through that area as well. So feel free to join us and also certainly encourage our SPS colleagues to join us.

Just another reminder for the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women, that they have their Outstanding Women Student Awards and nominations are closing December 16.

And then really live, brand new fresh update is that the HLC Criteria typo has been fixed by our amazing web team [laughter].

L. Saborío: During the meeting? [laughter]

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

L. Saborío: Okay, Comments and Questions from the Floor, anyone? Okay, go ahead, Kendall.

K. Thu: Cathy, did I hear you say that the Pick Museum is charging \$10 to get in?

C. Doederlein: No.

K. Thu: Oh, okay.

L. Saborío: Anybody else? Go ahead.

V. Naples: I would just like to ask people if they would be willing to come to the Board of Trustees meeting tomorrow. We have had a lot of discussion about the presidential transition agreement, which was declared invalid the day before Thanksgiving, and that was reaffirmed this previous Friday. It's very important that we come and let our Board of Trustees know what we would like to have them do. And if they get the input from us, they may be willing to listen to what we have to say. Anyone can speak. You need to show up a little bit early and just sign a form and request opportunity to have your few minutes in the public comment section. And there is a lot of feeling that people are dissatisfied with President Baker's receiving a very large severance. And the Board of Trustees will be voting on what will happen with regard to that tomorrow. This is the last and only time that we will have the opportunity to provide our input, so I would urge everyone to come, or to come and speak. My feeling is that, if any of us participate in eating sausage or enjoying sausage, that we really ought to be present to watch it made at some point along the way.

So we have outside support asking that NIU not honor that or reiterate that additional severance from State Senator Tom Cullerton. If you are interested, that is an article in the Chicago Tribune today, and there is also information on his Web site as well as the Edgar County Watchdog. And I have also put together a very simple page asking for people to put their signatures on if they would urge the Board of Trustees to not honor the \$617,500 severance that President Baker got. Those monies could certainly address many of the other problems that the universities have. So if you're willing to sign this, I have a page here signed. I have several others. Please do this at the end of the meeting, or I can pass it around now. Thank you. Pass it around?

L. Saborío: Are there any other questions or comments from the floor?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

L. Saborío: Can I just quickly remind everybody that minutes are available for you to review from several committees across campus, and we do attach this to your agenda at every UC and Faculty Senate meeting.

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- C. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel

- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

XI. ADJOURNMENT

L. Freeman: Additional comments and questions from the floor before we get a motion to adjourn?
Hearing none, do I have a motion to adjourn?

B. Andree: So moved.

L. Freeman: Second?

C. Doederlein: Second.

L. Freeman: All right, we'll see you on Monday at the Appreciation Event/Holiday Party.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.