

2-1-2012

UC Minutes 2012-02-01

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Minutes 2012-02-01" (2012). *University Council Archives*. 36.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/36>

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.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES
Wednesday, February 1, 2012, 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, Bender, Bozikis, Brandt, Coles, Corwin, Dawson, Downing, Elish-Piper (for Neal), Farrell, Gaebler (for Rosato, Greene, Haliczzer, Holly, Holt, Kapitan, Kowalski, Latham, Lee, Lin, Lindvall, Long, Lopez, McCord, Middleton, Mirman, Mogren, Mohabbat, Munroe, Peters, Pritchard, Quick, Rollman, Rosenbaum, Sagarin, Shortridge, Small, Smith, Steadman, Sunderlin (for Bond), Theodore, Towell (for Schoenbachler), Vandecreek, VonEnde, Walker, Willis

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Barth, Bond, Echols, Foss, Gupta, Heller, Houze, Hurt, Johnston-Rodriguez, Kreitzer, LeFlore, Lenczewski, Neal, Rosato, Rossi, Schoenbachler, Thu, Venaas, Vohra

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

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Holt moved to adopt the agenda. **T. Latham** was second.

The agenda was approved without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 30, 2011 UC MEETING
(distributed electronically)

A. Quick made the motion. **N. Bender** was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Peters: At 8:30 tomorrow there's a welcoming reception and a swearing-in ceremony for our newest trustee, Wheeler Coleman. He's an alum of the class of 1983 and then he got an M.B.A. at Notre Dame. He currently is vice president and chief technology officer of Health Care Service Corp. which, I think, is the fourth-largest health insurance company in the U.S. He is going to be sworn in by his spouse who is the Honorable Sharon Johnson Coleman, also an alum, and a federal district judge. Mr. Coleman is very much interested in technology; this is what he does for a living and he's extremely interested in the status of our IT systems and our technology and will be an advocate going forward for the adoption and use of technology by the university and he's just a genuinely very gracious and diplomatic person and we're glad to have him.

The agendas will cover such things as the sabbaticals, both receiving of reports and hearing a couple of faculty discuss their sabbatical leaves and what they accomplished, and then approval of the list for next year. There will be a discussion in Finance and Facilities on, among other things, the student fee structure including room and board rates, not tuition. The full board meeting is March 1. In addition, President Peters noted the following:

The rededication of Cole Hall on Feb 12. We're going to get a chance to show that off and see how it works and thank people.

February 14, we will have our wreath-laying ceremony and moment of silence at 3 p.m. at the memorial gardens to remember February 14.

In Governor Quinn's State of the State address he committed to the federal goal and the state IBHE goal of a 60 percent rate of young people in the state who could get a degree or a certificate by 2025. Right now we're at about 42 percent. The governor spent a bit of time in the speech asking for a significant increase in the monetary award program funding, the MAP funding. The presidents and chancellors of the public universities have been invited to have lunch with the governor next week and so I'll report back to you about what that's about.

We're still behind in our cash flow payments. We did receive some payments right after the break, but I don't think we've received any payments for a couple of weeks.

Vision 2020 update. We're working very, very hard on enrollment and recruitment and hopefully we'll have some good things to report. I've made two investments that I want you to know about with the money that we set aside. Over the next year or so, a first investment, in information technology and we're going to commit around \$4 million for two purposes. One is to spread wireless technology throughout the campus and we've got a goal to be 100 percent by 2020. The other infrastructure investment will be in cloud computing. Another investment that we're making, I made an initial disbursement to Lisa [Freeman] of a \$500,000 beginning this year to make strategic investments based on proposals she's already gathered to stimulate external funding. We've also made a substantial investment in recruitment. In a couple weeks or so we'll be making some disbursements to academic enhancement programs and we have many good proposals to choose from.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

S. Willis made the motion to approve the consent agenda. **A. Quick** was second.

The consent agenda was approved without dissent or abstention.

- A. 2021-2022 academic [calendar](#) – refer to University Affairs Committee – Page 3
- B. Review and update [Guidelines](#) and Principles for Establishment of Academic Calendar – refer to University Affairs Committee – Page 4

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen
 - 1. December 9, 2011 – [report](#) – Sonya Armstrong – Page 5
 - 2. January 20, 2012 – [report](#) – Earl Hanson – Pages 6-7

J. Peters: You could add that the next IBHE meeting is coming up next Tuesday and performance-based funding will be on the agenda and they will adopt pretty much the metrics that appear in your material. We don't know whether that will appear in the governor's budget or not. I think the next meeting will have a lot more to report to you on that.

- 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 – [report](#) – Page 8
- F. Academic Policy Committee – Karen Brandt, Chair – no report
- 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 9-10

A. Quick: The Student Association Senate has passed a number of resolutions these past two meetings in regards to some issues that we've seen on campus and I will list a couple of them. We passed a resolution for the university to track down and start implementing fines on university vehicles that are parking on university sidewalks and or grass areas that are in violation of current university policy. Second, we passed a resolution supporting DeKalb's proposed police station. That was a heated topic, but it ended up passing almost unanimously. There were a few dissenting votes, but it passed and we sent that along to the City Council and to the mayor for their information. We're currently working with Faculty Senate Supportive Professional Staff Council and Operating Staff Council regarding the faculty/staff code of

conduct and student grievance policy. Two more things, we are currently starting the process for review and audit of the top 15 funded S.A. organizations. Both student organizations – and there are a number of university departments that are currently funded through the S.A. – and just seeing if there are ways we can save money in the future and cut back on costs there. Last December, before we left, we held a vigil for our former staff member, Steven Agee, and I would like to publically thank the NIU community for coming out that that evening, and showing their support for both Steve and his family but more importantly for us as students and our staff. It's been definitely a difficult time but it's another example of when we go through difficult things here at NIU we definitely rally as a community.

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – [report](#) – Pages 11-13

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – [report](#) – Page 14

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

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed changes to NIU Bylaws, Article 8, Sabbatical Leave [Policy](#) – **FIRST READING** – Pages 15-20

J. Peters: We do have two items of new business. The first is the first reading of proposed changes in the NIU Bylaws with regard to sabbatical policy and I believe Provost Alden is going to make a presentation.

R. Alden: This change arose as a result of the Board of Trustees wanting to have a summary of all sabbatical productivity of people who have come back and have had a few years to actually produce publications and so forth. They really enjoyed the individual presentations of the one or two faculty who gave their presentations and went into depth on the value of those sabbaticals. But they wanted a summary report and we have, for the last several years, produced a summary report. This year the report is over 60 pages long and, just so you know, our faculty are very productive. Out of the 43 faculty that took sabbatical as of two years ago, there were 389 significant works spread between publications, presentations, major curricular revisions. I think our faculty show that they are very productive. The challenge we have every year is getting people to complete the survey. We started off with a Survey Monkey type of thing on electronics and people decided they didn't like that. We have gone to an Excel spreadsheet questionnaire and we're hoping that, as we get more and more of the departments working with digital measures, that it will be just a simple thing that could be completed very easily after service reports are produced, identifying which of the service activities are associated with sabbatical and hopefully in the future it will be even easier. The problem is we always have a few laggards if I can use that word – people who simply do not want to produce their information. We have to go to their supervisor and sometimes their supervisor's supervisor to encourage them that this is something that, when we produce the letter of award, it says right in the letter of award that this is part of what's expected – a report after they come back from their sabbatical and then the data on their productivity two years later. Every year it's the last two or three individuals who take probably

half the time of the staff support trying to get this report together. One of the things we often hear is, “it’s not in the bylaws therefore I don’t have to do it.”

So, we took this issue to UCPC and both they and the Deans Council agreed that we should change the bylaws so it’s no longer just the sabbatical report, but this two year summary of productivity, that we would like the faculty to report on so that we can produce a holistic look at our faculty productivity for the board. And, as everybody knows, sabbatical is a very fragile entity in this country. Many states are doing away with it entirely and I think the more we can show its true significance in terms of allowing faculty to increase their productivity and serve the students, I think the better we are in standing with the board. The changes that have been requested, one is on the bylaws and the other is on the UCPC working rules which are in the APPM.

In the last paragraph on page 17 that says that it is the responsibility of the faculty to submit their data so that we can produce this very nice report. The second item is on page 20 which is the working rules of the UCPC which basically says that if they do not participate in this summary report, then the UCPC can choose to deny sabbatical if someone comes up in the future. Again, both the UCPC and the Deans Council agreed unanimously with these changes.

D. Munroe: I just had one other observation and I’m not sure if it’s too minute as long as we’re dealing with this. There is a sentence in that paragraph on page 17 that talks about a copy of the review, meaning the personnel committee review of the sabbatical leave report, will be sent to the dean and executive vice president or provost’s office. We’ve had some confusion in our college in terms of when that report should be submitted, meaning the PC committee review and wondered if that needed to be clarified here to.

R. Alden: Well, as I understand, because I obviously chaired the UCPC when they asked to have that put in, the assumption was when the report was presented to my office since my office is the repository for those reports, that we have a cover sheet that substantiates that some group at the department at the college certify that they have reviewed the report and said that it was equivalent work that was done to what was proposed. So it’s when the reports come forward we expect that cover sheet. And then when I receive that cover sheet then I can put that in with the report and that’s what the UCPC would have available when the names come up again maybe six years hence.

D. Munroe: What we found is it produces sort of a timeline issue because of the wording in the bylaws say it needs to be submitted in 30 days, meaning the faculty member’s report. It doesn’t then give time for the PC committee to do that, I mean when do we do it? And so that’s where the concern has come in terms of when to do that review if it’s likely we won’t even see that faculty member’s report until the 30-day deadline.

R. Alden: I don’t remember specifically if it was discussed at the time, but it seems to me that it may have been discussed that we didn’t want to prescribe to PC committees when they have to meet, but obviously it would have to be in that same semester. But I have no problem with an amendment of that sort if we are going to change these bylaws anyway.

D. Munroe: And I guess that might be our recommendation is maybe could it say within that

semester that then the report comes to your office.

There was a discussion of whether a further amendment of the wording was possible between the two readings or whether that would necessitate making the next reading the first reading. The opinion of the parliamentarian was that this would not necessitate reverting to the first reading. The Provost will work on the rewording to change the deadline for submission of the report, for the next reading.

R. Alden: Okay, we'll work on working that concept in for the next reading. Then we can consider that as a second reading that as well because that's the concept we'll try and put in there.

S. Willis: I just note that the last sentence of the existing Section 8.4.4 says that an individual granted a leave assumes a professional obligation to return to NIU for at least a year, but then you're asking for a report two years later. As I said, I presume since it says that it's at your request, that you would then, therefore, not request reports from people who are no longer around, but I just wanted to point that out.

R. Alden: I would assume so.

A. Rosenbaum: I just want to add that the University Council Personnel Committee can change their policy and that's just reported to the UC. Those changes would become policy unless the UC acts to veto. These are really two separate items. This is a first reading of the Bylaw change. The change to the UCPC policy will take effect unless the UC acts to veto it. If people on the UC have issues with the changes to the working rules of the UCPC, then we have to raise that as a separate issue. If we don't then that becomes policy without any further action required..

B. Proposed changes to NIU Bylaws, Article 3, [Operating Procedures](#) of University Council – **FIRST READING** – Pages 21-22

A. Rosenbaum: This will be a very brief item. This is really a housekeeping item. The agenda for the University Council is articulated in the bylaws. The way it is written doesn't reflect current practice. If you look at the headings in our current agenda, those are not the same as the ones that are specified in the bylaws. This will simply update the bylaw consistent with current practice.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

J. Peters: Okay, you will see we have information items for your perusal.

- 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
- Q. 2011-2012 [Meeting Schedule](#) – Page 23

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.