

4-3-2013

UC Minutes 2013-04-03

Northern Illinois University

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

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Minutes 2013-04-03" (2013). *University Council Archives*. 46.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/46>

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, April 3, 2013, 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, Block, Bohn, Carpenter, Cho, Coles, Dawson, Downing, Entzminger, Fox (for Neal), Fredericks, Guerrero, Gupta, Haliczzer, Henning, Hofer, Holly, Houze, Kapitan, Koren (for Plonczynski), LeFlore, Lenczewski, Long, Lopez, McCord, Middleton, Mirman, Mohabbat, Munroe, Peters, Rosenbaum, Sagarin, Small, D. Smith (for Latham), M C. Smith, Sunderlin (for Bond), Theodore, Thu, Towell (for Schoenbachler), VandeCreek, Walker, Zahay-Blatz (for Lee), Zanayed

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bond, Duerkes, Farrell, Feurer, Gregolunas, Harris, Kolb, Kowalski, Latham, Lee, Lin, Naples, Neal, Plonczynski, Porter, Prock, Richard, Rollman, Rosato, Schoenbachler, Vohra, Von Ende, Ward

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Baker, Bryan, Cunningham, Freeman, Kaplan, Klaper, Wesener

OTHERS ABSENT: Blakemore, Freedman, Prawitz, Slotsve, Snow, Waas, Williams

I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Peters: Called the meeting to order at 3:12 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters: There are no walk-ins or corrections.

D. Haliczzer: made the motion. **R. Lopez:** was second.

The agenda was adopted as written without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 27, 2013 UC MEETING
(distributed electronically)

Z. Bohn: made the motion. **M. Theodore:** was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Peters: introduced and welcomed our new president, Dr. Doug Baker, and the new first lady, Dr. Dana Stover.

D. Baker: thanked President Peters for his excellent work over the past 13 years and introduced himself to the University Council. He noted the importance of shared governance and communication with the faculty and staff. He also commended and thanked the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. Finally he expressed his excitement about the position and that he can't wait to get started.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – [report](#) – Pages 3-4

S. Armstrong: called the council's attention to the second page of the report for a list of some current active bills that involve higher education that we probably all want to be aware of and be following.

J. Peters: Yesterday we had an IBHE meeting and we had an in-depth report on the legislative issues, including pension reform. The presidents of the universities and the chancellors have come together to support a set of principles and an approach to pension reform that we feel is appropriate. In terms of legislative update, there's one or two issues that are out there that are of concern. Of course, there is conceal-and-carry that is going forward and the university presidents unanimously supported an exemption for universities as sensitive places that would give us the prerogative to ban weapons. There's a bill once again to eliminate the dependency waiver for employees for dependants. Of course, we think this is a particularly inappropriate piece of legislation since it's a contractual thing and it's a great benefit to the state and to employees to attract good employees to university.

D. Cho: On the second page, I saw waivers of out-of-state tuition and I'd like to ask if you have further information or if there is any way that I can get more information.

S. Armstrong: I can certainly send you some information on that, but basically the context of that is establishing perhaps a reciprocity agreement wherein students from neighboring states would not have to pay out-of-state tuition and maybe even beyond just the neighboring states. Apparently this is going on in other states where some Illinois students are moving.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – [report](#) – Pages 5-9

- C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Pages 10-13
- D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee –Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – [report](#) – Page 14
- E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – [report](#) – Pages 15-16
- F. Academic Policy Committee – Sean Farrell, Chair – no report
- G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Paul Carpenter, Chair, no report
- H. Rules and Governance Committee – Melissa Lenczewski, Chair, no report
- I. University Affairs Committee – Kathleen Coles, Chair
 - 1. 2022-2023 academic [calendar](#) – Page 17

K. Coles: Yes, I move to that we adopt the calendar. **D. Cho:** was second.

The motion was passed without dissent or abstention.

- 2. Revision to [Guidelines](#) and Principles for Establishment of Academic Calendar – Pages 18-22

K. Coles: I also move that we adopt the revised guidelines. **Z. Bohn:** was second.

The motion was approved without dissent or abstention.

- 3. Proposed [revisions](#) to Article 19.4: Annual Evaluation of Ombudsperson – Pages 23-24 – **FIRST READING**

K. Coles: The ombudsperson serves three-year terms. The University Affairs Committee is charged in the first two years to conduct an annual evaluation. In the third year, there's a special committee appointed that reviews whether the contract should be approved and the University Affairs Committee does not conduct an evaluation.

We haven't had a new ombudsperson for a long time so this year we were faced with conducting an evaluation of Sarah Klaper who barely had time to get started in her office and has not yet prepared her annual report because it's not due until the end of the semester. That hopefully won't be an occurrence very frequently but, in the course of looking at prior proposals by the 2010-11 University Affairs Committee, and discussing it among ourselves this year, we agreed that there's also been a problem with the types and volume of information that's available to make these evaluations. There was a proposal from the 2010-11 committee to have a required self-evaluation which has been done informally since then and to try to institute a survey process of users of the ombudsperson's office.

This year, though, we also considered whether it was really necessary to have an annual review. It seems to make more sense to us, for a variety of reasons, to have a mid-term evaluation by the University Affairs Committee in the fall of the second year of each three-year term and that would be followed in the third year by the other review process for renewing the contract. It's hoped that that would sort of reduce some of the evaluation fatigue of those who respond to our requests for comments. That has been proposed in the revisions to Article 19.4 of the university bylaws for which this would be the first reading. I think the changes are self explanatory so I'm going to stop there and see if anybody has any questions.

K. Coles: made the motion. **D. LeFlore:** was second.

A. Rosenbaum: I think that when you think about this in terms of a specific person, like Sarah who is by all accounts doing a very good job, the idea of doing these evaluations seems tedious. But, where is our protection in this if we, for example, get a new ombudsperson and that person is doing a terrible job and we want to give feedback on that in the first year? And the second consideration I think is that everybody else seems to get evaluated on an annual basis. We evaluate our faculty and SPS personnel advisor on an annual basis. We evaluate faculty on an annual basis. That's pretty standard. So why would we want to exclude the ombudsperson from what everyone experiences.

K. Coles: I agree that the first point is a downside of this change. I don't understand part of the process myself. I guess I assumed that if there were complaints about the ombudsperson that the president would have the ability to take action even without the evaluation.

A. Rosenbaum: How would those comments get to the president, though, if no one was soliciting them for purposes of an evaluation?

K. Coles: Well, I guess I should also say that we're hoping to have an ongoing survey process where users of the office are asked to fill out a survey. And we'd like to set up the ability to have those surveys turned in to an administrative official. They need to be anonymous. We have to think about confidentiality issues but that person would keep records and could alert the committee, or whoever, if there starts to seem to be problems that need to be dealt with. We haven't worked out the details of that, but that is in the works to try to deal with the issue.

A. Rosenbaum: So, would that be part of the motion?

K. Coles: No. There is just a general reference to the surveys. I think this would be imposed by the University Affairs Committee, itself, in doing the reviews.

J. Peters: A fix might be a provision for an extraordinary review outside the cycle based upon some input.

S. Klaper: Just wanted to comment that Tim Griffin used to do those surveys, but he had them returned to the ombudsperson's office and then included that material in his annual review. And so what university affairs is discussing, is to have the surveys returned to an external body,

university affairs or somebody and then that would be the alerting mechanism, possibly.

K. Coles: Is there a request that we have an amendment for an extraordinary review process?

J. Peters: Are there any directives back to the committee for second reading? What about if you take this under consideration and perhaps come back with some language?

A. Rosenbaum: suggested a straw vote to assess the feelings of the body regarding the need for revision and following a split vote suggested that we send it back to the committee with the suggestion that they reconsider those comments that have been made and decide whether or not they want to make any adjustments or whether they want to bring it back to the body as is?

J. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and James Zanayed, Speaker – report

D. LeFlore: First of all, I want to start off on behalf of the student body to congratulate Dr. Baker on his appointment to be the 12th president of Northern Illinois University. We are excited for the new leadership. We are excited for the new opportunities and continuing to move NIU in a forward direction. With that being said, I am also excited to turn over my hat as well as being a student body president. Just last week we elected the 45th student body president, Jack Berry. He will take office I believe the third of May. The team is eagerly trying to assemble their cabinet and they will continue to look forward to working with administrative staff and faculty to continue to enhance the quality of life for students here.

My next thing that I wanted to talk about in dealing with our elections is, we had a referendum on the ballot that talked about the importance of campus recreation. And, out of the 1400 or so votes, we had 937 students who said that campus recreation should be a priority.

The next thing that we wanted to talk about is the amnesty policy that we've been working on with different constituents among the university as well as DeKalb community. We just received a five-page letter from DeKalb's attorney gently saying that they are not interested in pursuing an amnesty policy. And so what we're doing now is taking that answer and bringing it back to the table to figure out where do we go from here and how can we continue to try to get some of these initiatives taken care of. We are continuing to address that. We will be meeting this Friday.

Last, but not least, we had a student representative, our director of government affairs, Nick Bender, who met with Senator Dick Durbin today to talk about military student service and I am going to yield to him to talk about that for a second.

N. Bender: Senator Durbin was on campus today to talk to military student services and several veteran students who are on campus about some of the challenges we have as veterans coming into the civilian world or college. We talked a little bit about the MSS, the military student service system that we have on campus right now and how it works. We are 28th in the nation, so we're pretty darn good in my opinion as far as how we treat our veterans.

J. Peters: It was really a thrill to have the majority leader on campus today. He has been a good friend to NIU over the years and what a pleasure it was for me to be able to introduce Senator

Durbin to our new president. And we had a wonderful talk about issues that are of concern to us, basically on campus about military students. He praised what we do for our over 800 veterans on campus. And we had, for your interest, another talk about a subject that's dear to his heart and my heart, and that's gun control and the status of conceal-and-carry in the state and federal legislation. Then we had a very good discussion about federal student aid. One of the things that Senator Durbin is very concerned about is the role of for-profit universities that have a track record of abusing federal aid and then not graduating their students. He said to us, you only need to know three numbers. It's 12, 25 and 47. Twelve percent is the number of students that take up federal aid who are from a for-profit institution. Twenty-five percent is the amount. So 12 percent, eat up 25 percent; and 47 percent is the percentage of students that default on loans. Forty-seven percent of all students who default on loans come from proprietary, for-profit institutions. He was pretty hot about it and I am too because it seems to me that money should go to non-profit institutions like ours rather, than for-profit institutions.

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – [report](#) – Page 25

A. Small: Pat Siebrasse, a 50-year employee at NIU is going to retire. Her farewell party is Thursday, April 11, from 3 to 6 p.m. I believe it's in the Chandelier Room over in Adams Hall and there are remarks at 4 p.m.

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – [report](#) – Page 26

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

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposed [revisions](#) to NIU Bylaws, Article 14.6.4 Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum –**ACTION ITEM** – Pages 27-28

J. Peters: All right, then let's move into unfinished business. We have proposed revisions on NIU bylaws. It's on page 27-28. We've had two readings. We need a motion, a second and a vote.

D. Smith: I'd like to make the motion. **M. Lenczewski:** was second.

The number of voting members present was counted to make sure we had enough to get the 2/3 required. Forty-one voting members were present. The vote failed by a count of:

1 – YES – 38

2 – NO – 2

1 – ABSTAIN - 1

The motion failed.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed [revisions](#) to NIU Bylaws, Article 5: The Academic Personnel Process and to the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, Section II, Item 30: Joint Appointment Policy – **FIRST READING** – Pages 29-34

J. Peters: Okay, we have an item of new business which is a proposed revision to our bylaws This is a first reading and it's a revision to the academic personnel process and to the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. It's a first reading. It's on pages 29 through 31. Can anyone frame this for us?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, Chris McCord.

J. Peters: Do you want to comment on it? Where did this come from?

A. Rosenbaum: It came from the Faculty Senate.

C. McCord: This addresses faculty joint appointments. This is a type of appointment that is becoming increasingly important to the university as we try harder and harder to diversify our offerings and fully leverage our faculty strengths. We have a number of people who hold joint appointments of various types. What this particularly speaks to are people who hold joint appointments between two units within the university, whether it might be somebody who holds an appointment between two departments or between a department and an inter-disciplinary center. This is an issue about faculty rights and responsibilities with regard to tenure. Regarding the question of how the tenure decision operates for faculty holding joint appointments, some of the language has struck me as problematic, specifically that for an individual holding a joint appointment, if one of the units decides that they do not wish to tenure that person, the other unit can petition to take them on fully or the faculty member can be told that, for budgetary reasons, their position can no longer be funded and they can, therefore, be eliminated.

And I've requested that the Faculty Senate consider striking that language in order to remove that added risk that people coming in on joint appointments might face. It simply strikes that language. It does not seek to replace it with anything else. Within our college and within the Faculty Senate, there's been close reading of these policies and the sense is that it's not that we need to say something else instead of this; we simply need to stop saying this. So the proposal is to strike language that allows a unit to opt out of the joint appointment and then leave the other unit with the obligation to either fully fund the joint appointment or let the person go, not because they don't want to tenure them, but because they simply can't afford them.

A. Rosenbaum: And, again, Dean McCord brought this to our attention really to protect faculty. The Faculty Senate concurred and passed this and is sending it along for University Council approval.

A. Rosenbaum: I'll make the motion on behalf of the Faculty Senate. **R. Lopez:** was second.

Being a first reading, no vote was necessary and there was no discussion of the motion.

J. Peters: All right so this will come back at our last meeting. Okay thank you.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

J. Peters: I remind you that after our last meeting we have our annual reception which will be somewhere in this building.

- 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](#), Graduate Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- M. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- O. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- P. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- Q. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.