

11-2-2011

## UC Minutes 2011-11-02

Northern Illinois University

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Minutes 2011-11-02" (2011). *University Council Archives*. 28.  
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/28>

This Minutes 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](mailto:jschumacher@niu.edu).

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, November 2, 2011, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**Disclaimer:** These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council Web site under Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Alden, Barth, Bender, Bozikis, Corwin, Dawson, Downing, Echols, Farrell, Foss, Greene, Gupta, Haliczzer, Hecht (for Neal), Heller, Holt, Houze, Johnston-Rodriguez, Kaplan (for Peters), Kreitzer, Latham, Lee, LeFlore, Lenczewski, Lin, Lopez, Middleton, Mirman, Mogren, Munroe, Poole (for Kowalski), Pritchard, Quick, Rollman, Rosato, Rossi, Sagarin, Schoenbachler, Shortridge, Small, Ridge (for K. Smith), Steadman, Sunderlin (for Bond), Theodore, Thu, VandeCreek, Venaas, Vohra, Walker, Willis

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bond, Brandt, Coles, Elish-Piper, Holly, Hurt, Kapitan, Kowalski (on sabbatical), Lindvall, Long, McCord, Mohabbat, Neal, Peters, K. Smith, VonEnde

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bryan, Finley, Freeman, Griffin, Hansen, Kaplan, Sunderlin, Williams

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Blakemore, Cunningham, Freedman, Hemphill, Prawitz, Slotsve, Snow, Waas

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Provost Raymond Alden, standing in for President Peters.

**II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**R. Lopez:** made the motion. There was an unidentified second.

The motion was approved.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2011 UC MEETING**

**P. Vohra:** made the motion. **T. Latham:** was second.

The minutes were approved as written.

**IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**R. Alden:** President Peters is on his way to Springfield. We're having a budget meeting with the

IBHE tomorrow; I'll be attending, as well. We meet with them every year before they start the budget process. This year will be particularly meaningful because we're starting to discuss with them performance-based funding. Some of the recent discussions with the steering committee that is making recommendations to the IBHE have suggested a major change in their model, and so we want to make sure we understand the implications and what the full workings of the model are.

I know a lot of you are also concerned about the pension debates that are going on during the veto session. There has been a sense that Senate Bill 512 will come forward. It is unknown whether they will have enough votes to pass it. What is known is, even under that particular bill, any pension funds earned up until the time it goes into effect will be grandfathered in, so it's not going to change everybody's pension system earnings that have already been earned. The other sense is that, even if it is approved, it is liable to be changed fairly radically once the regular session begins. Also, we have no idea where the governor stands on this. So, I don't think it's a done deal and even if it is voted and approved, it may not be the end of the story and I can't comment further because it would be pure speculation.

## V. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approve [maintenance updates](#) of various position titles referred to in the Committees of the University Book – Pages 3-9

**The UC voted using the automated clicker system and the consent agenda was passed by a vote of: 43-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain.**

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

- A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – [report](#) – Pages 10-12
- B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – no report
- C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – no report
- D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – no report
- E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report
- F. Academic Policy Committee – Karen Brandt, Chair – report
  1. Guests in the Classroom Policy [proposal](#) – Page 13

**R. Alden:** Rebecca Shortridge will be making the report and a motion associated with that.

**R. Shortridge:** The Academic Policy Committee met on October 11<sup>th</sup> to discuss the guests in the classroom policy presented by Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate initially proposed this policy

to provide faculty with some ability to control who is allowed in their classroom. In some cases, I guess, instructors have been frustrated with students who have, for example, brought children to class and then have disturbed the environment for other students in the classroom. The committee believed that supervisors, including chairs and deans and security, should be able to enter the classroom without the approval of faculty. So, the proposal from Faculty Senate was revised to reflect this fact. The proposal is printed on your page in the packet. It essentially states, "Guests in the classroom must have the permission of the instructor. When deciding whether a guest is appropriate, the instructor should take into consideration the effect that that guest will have on the learning environment. The individuals present in the classroom should be limited to the instructor of record, students registered in the class, individuals admitted by the permission of the instructor, and those present on behalf of departmental or university supervisory or security duties." I would like to make a proposal that we adopt this policy.

**C. Rollman:** was second.

**S. Willis:** Okay, this is a concern that I think we raised at the steering committee but, in any case, I think that it might be. I understand that instructors need to allow people who are present on behalf of supervisory or security duties, that these people cannot be excluded from the classroom, but I'm wondering if it might not make sense to put in some text to the effect that whenever possible, this should be discussed or arranged with the instructor in advance or at least the instructor should be notified.

**R. Shortridge:** From our discussions in the committee, I think it was clear that, chair people and supervisors who do come into the classroom, usually do request the permission of the instructor and say, "We're going to come in your class today to observe your class." I don't think that there's a problem with maybe specifically putting that in the policy. Security, I'm not so sure about because it may be that they have to be there unannounced for some particular safety issue.

**S. Willis:** I understand that. I know there was a concern a while ago right after the February 14<sup>th</sup> incident that there might be undercover university security personnel in classes and I'm just wondering about whether the instructor should know that or not, depending on the sensitivity of topics that might be discussed in class, for example. I'm just raising the issue.

**A. Rosenbaum:** There were a number of people in the senate discussion on this who felt that there was not a good reason to put in that department chairs or deans or people doing evaluations should have to be allowed in by a faculty member but that a faculty member who excluded those people would do so at their own peril. If a department was saying, "We need to observe you teaching in order for you to be evaluated for tenure," a faculty member would be foolish not to allow that to happen because that would affect their tenure decision. The idea was that faculty members would, more than likely, allow supervisors or administrators into the classroom, but it shouldn't be in the policy that they could just walk in. I'm not saying that the senate as a whole felt that way, but that was certainly one of the discussion points that was raised in the senate. As for security, likewise, if there is an emergency, nobody is going to stop the security agent from coming in but that if security agents are not there because there is an ongoing emergency, that it should still be up to the professor to decide whether or not to admit that person to the classroom. This is why the senate did not include those exceptions in the policy as it was sent forward.

**P. Vohra:** In 99.9 percent of the cases, there would not be a problem in the instructor giving the

consent, but there could be a point where in some cases you need to have an external viewer or a peer mentor attend the class to make suggestions for improvement and the instructor may not agree. In that situation, what do you do? So, I think putting something in writing as was suggested would be a good idea. Second, there are many people who may need service dogs in the classroom because of their requirement, so I think that aspect should also be included in the policy.

**A. Quick:** Correct me if I'm wrong, but during steering committee, didn't we discuss the point of service dogs and being that that was actually a federal law that we had to abide by, there wasn't a need to put this in here?

**A. Rosenbaum:** I believe that that's what we thought was the case and I haven't heard otherwise.

**J. Holt:** And, likewise, for signing or an interpreter. There might be other instances, but maybe that also falls under federal law, so it doesn't need to be explicitly stated.

**R. Alden:** I believe ADA accommodation is covered by federal law and sign interpreters are covered by that. Obviously the CAAR office would be able to help a student to make sure that that person is placed in the classroom. I don't think it would be determined by the instructor as to whether the student needs that interpretive services, it's up to the CAAR office to determine that's an appropriate accommodation.

**S. Willis:** I just want to follow up a little bit on my earlier comment about, particularly about security personnel. I would imagine that there are situations where in a classroom, that you are having discussions that are taking place with an expectation of privacy where you say, "Well, we're going to talk about this topic here, but nothing in this classroom leaves the room," and I would imagine that if such a situation was to pertain, that the instructor might want to know ahead of time if an observer was planning to attend so that they could adjust the discussion accordingly so that the students' privacy wouldn't be violated. Like I say, it's just things that I've sort of heard floating around.

**There was considerable discussion regarding whether a friendly amendment should be included, however, this discussion became moot owing to a point raised by several people but best expressed by E.Mogren.**

**E. Mogren:** In the proposed policy there really is only one operative sentence, and that is the first one which says, "Guests in the classroom must have permission of the instructor." The rest of the sentences are merely recommendations. There is no operative force to those. So, I guess my first question is, "why have those?" The second question is, "How can somebody give permission unless they are notified in advance of the fact that somebody wants to come to their class?" In other words, the amendment seems immaterial given the operative language of the policy.

**K. Thu:** I agree with Eric's statement, and I think the language following the first sentence is simply clarifying for the instructor what kinds of criteria they might take into account when deciding whether to allow someone in the classroom.

**R. Shortridge:** I believe that the intention was to allow supervisory people and security

personnel to be admitted into the classroom without permission because, in certain situations, that was necessary.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So it sounds like that's what you intended but as we're reading this now, the word, "should" would suggest that it's not required. And so, if that's what was intended, I agree with the people that have suggested that this is not what this statement does. The current statement would be more in line with what the senate was suggesting, i.e., that the instructor should have complete control over who is in the classroom. So, if you want it the way the committee intended, it would seem to need a rewording.

**R. Shortridge:** So, what would the recommendation be, that it goes back to the committee?

**P. Vohra:** Someone can withdraw the motion. We can withdraw the motion and then send it back to the committee.

**F. Bryan** informed the UC that the motion could be withdrawn by the maker without a vote.

**R. Shortridge:** Based on the discussion here today, it seems like it still needs to be polished and so, I will withdraw the motion.

**R. Alden:** Okay, do we need the seconder to agree to that?

**C. Rollman:** I agree.

**R. Alden:** So it will go back to the Academic Policy Committee for some wordsmithing and, hopefully, we will see it at a future meeting.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Laurie Elish-Piper, Chair – no report

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Suzanne Willis, Chair – no report

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Greene, Chair – no report

J. Student Association – Austin Quick, Speaker – [report](#) – Pages 14-15

**A. Quick:** Last week, the Student Association took 65 students down to Springfield to lobby on behalf of both MAP grant and higher education funding. It was a very successful event in that we had 65 students for the most part who had never even been to Springfield and had never been involved in any form of lobbying before. We met with many different members of the house and the senate, both in the area and across the state. At one point, Representative Pritchard on the floor of the house recognized NIU, and they gave a standing ovation to the students from NIU, which was actually quite impressive.

The big thing is, we are going to continue to fight. We are going to work on this. We created a thing that is actually being replicated across the other state schools called, "Faces of MAP Grant." We've taken surveys from various students from different backgrounds and different home towns to point out the different people that are affected by MAP grants. Instead of sending

a letter that people don't pay attention to, we're actually sending these profiles with a photo, their hometown, their major, whether or not they're first generation college in their family and what their background is. The first one we did was Nora Lindvall who is our Lincoln Laureate and pointed out that she is considered our top senior and receives a MAP grant to go to school. It has been very successful thus far so it's not the same mundane letter they get from everybody asking for something, but it puts a face and a name to things. The other schools across the state, I've been told by Lori Clark, are replicating that. So, I guess they say the best form of flattery is plagiarism, so we're happy with that.

A few weeks ago, Elliot Echols, Jeremy Sanchez, Jill Zambito and I went out to the SGA Conference in Washington, D.C. to see where our school ranks compared to other schools in our involvement as a student body and we're very excited to continue with that. We actually had the great opportunity to attend the retirement ceremony of Admiral Mike Mullen, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs and got to spend time with the president and the vice president and all them, so it was a very successful event for our part.

We're working on how to make homecoming better and working with the various police departments to fix some of the problems we had this past year.

**R. Alden:** Okay, thank you, it sounds like exciting and meaningful activities. Great.

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – [report](#) – Pages 16-17

In addition to the report, **A.Small** announced that one representative from each of the 12 state universities gets together and advises the merit board on state statutes around the state for operating staff employees and that he was elected to be a representative of the Employee Advisory Committee (EAC).

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – [report](#) – Page 18

M. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report

## **VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

A. [Proposed amendment](#) to Article 9.2 of the University Constitution – SECOND READING – **ACTION ITEM** – Page 19

**R. Alden:** The next item is a second reading of an item for consideration for change to the University Constitution.

There was extensive discussion of the proposed amendment in which there was clarification of misunderstandings regarding whether the proposed amendment does enough, as well as whether the statement that had been approved by the BOT, which provided the impetus for this wording change, could also be edited by the UC. Once these points were clarified, efforts to amend both the proposed amendment and the BOT language were dropped, the vote was called and the proposed amendment was approved by a vote of 44-Yes, 0-No, 3-Abstain.

**R. Alden:** Since this passed by a greater than the required two-thirds of those voting, it goes

from here to the faculty for their vote which requires only a simple majority of the faculty voting in order to be approved.

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Committees of the University Book – [Maintenance Updates](#) – Pages 20-26

**R. Alden:** You are being asked to approve the updates to the Committees of the University Book. I believe the purpose of doing this by having a webpage provides us the ability to make changes as federal regulations change with respect to Institutional Safety Committee and the Institutional Review Board. You can see that the suggestion is to strike the language from the document that it is stated in, is it the Committees book and then to reference these web pages that can be updated in real time as regulations change so that we're not always trying to keep up with changes in the regulation by bringing additional changes to the University Council, because these are changed by federal law.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I'll make the motion that we combine all of those and we vote them as a block unless somebody has an objection.

**S. Willis:** was second.

The motion was approved by a vote of 44-Yes, 0-No, 3-Abstain.

## IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

## X. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

## XI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.