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I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2013 FS MEETING
    (distributed electronically)

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
    A. Faculty Fund – Michael Kolb

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES
    A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Pages 3-4
    B. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and James Zanayed, Speaker – report
    C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – report – Pages 5-9
    D. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – report – Pages 10-13
    E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – report – Page 14
    F. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – walk-in

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
    A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – report – Pages 15-20
    B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report
    C. Economic Status of the Profession – Debra Zahay-Blatz, Chair – no report
D. Rules and Governance – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – no report

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair

1. Election of FAC to IBHE representative – 4-year term
   See excerpt from NIU Bylaws, Article 16 – Page 21
   See letter from Sonya Armstrong – Page 22

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. 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, 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
R. Letter of acceptance of ES/P nomination – Alan Rosenbaum – Pages 23-24

XIII. ADJOURNMENT
Report on the FAC-IBHE Meeting, March 15, 2013

The Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) met on March 15, 2013, at Joliet Junior College. The meeting began with the introduction of Dr. Debra Daniels, the 8th president of Joliet Junior College, who welcomed the group and provided some information on the history of Joliet Junior College (the oldest junior college in the country), and also introduced the group to the new student services building.

FAC and IBHE Updates

FAC Chair Abbas Aminmansour (UIUC) noted that the next FAC meeting is Tuesday, April 2nd with the IBHE at Elgin Community College. IBHE Liaison Ocheng Jany announced that there is a vacancy for an assistant director position in Academic Affairs at IBHE with the deadline for applications of March 25th.

IBHE Deputy Director of Academic Affairs Dan Cullen reminded the group that faculty involvement is necessary for the Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) panels to be successful. The IBHE is currently updating the policy and procedures manual for IAI panels. The IBHE is currently seeking active volunteers to serve on IAI panels.

Public Four-Year Caucus Updates

The Public Caucus discussed how campuses handle faculty activity reporting; this group will gather the various reports from the universities that use them to discuss at the May meeting. The group continues its work on the value of higher education paper.

Visitors

Senator Daniel Biss, former faculty member at the University of Chicago, explained that the State is in severe financial trouble. The income tax increase has brought in additional revenue, but does not cover needs. He discussed the K-12 funding formula, which starts with a foundation level (a minimum per student amount of $6,119); it is universally agreed that this amount is too low (the actual appropriated amount is even less). Biss also discussed SB 1900, which directs Illinois institutions to use open access journals. Biss wants a working group on each campus to problem solve and study questions about different disciplines, taxpayer funding, academic freedom issues, and the issue of cost.

Tom Lockman, Institutional Sales Director for Cengage Learning, and Brian Campus, Assistant to the Manager of the JJC Bookstore joined the group to discuss the future of the textbook. Traditional textbook publishers are morphing into educational content providers. The accelerated shift to digital is underway. Trends were identified (including digital distribution, MOOCs, flipped teaching and hybrid classes, open education resources, analytics, portability of content, and partnership alliances [such as book rental programs].
Next was a discussion with Harry Berman, Interim Executive Director of IBHE, and Dan Cullen, Deputy Director for Academic Affairs for IBHE. Berman noted that the Public Agenda is our strategic plan and 60% by 2025 our goal. The Governor has proposed a 4.95% reduction in appropriation for higher education in his budget. Berman provided an update on the longitudinal data system (which currently provides a wealth of information on the 2006 student cohort) and college choice information legislation (which has been superseded by the College Scorecard at the federal level for undergraduate information). Berman also provided a legislative update. There are currently 57 active bills involving higher education, including the following:

- concealed carry and exempting community colleges and public universities
- MAP and eligibility of for-profit institutions
- requiring advising twice each semester for MAP students
- funding eligibility for MAP students who do not meet GPA requirements
- tuition waivers at public universities for dependents of employees
- post-9/11 veterans tuition benefits and registration priority
- STEM students and tuition differentials
- waivers of out-of-state tuition
- mandating unbundling of textbooks and supplements
- open access to publications (Biss’ SB 1900 bill)
- grants to IBHE to develop online textbooks
- The Smoke Free Campus Act, SB 2202, for state-supported institutions to go smoke free

The minutes from the February meeting were approved. Full meeting minutes are posted to the FAC-IBHE website (once approved) for public viewing. These can be accessed at http://www.ibhe-fac.org/Meetings.html

Respectfully submitted,

Sonya L. Armstrong
Assistant Professor in the Department of Literacy Education
NIU Representative to the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council
To: The NIU University Council and NIU Faculty Senate
Fr: Andy Small, Employee Advisory Rep. to the Board of Trustees
Re: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee

February 28th, 2013

The AASAPC Committee of the Board of Trustees met on February 28th, 2013.

Under University Reports, the faculty report on sabbatical leave was presented. During this portion, two presentations were given by faculty that discussed the importance of their sabbatical and what it meant to their own professional development. At the end of the two presentations, some facts and figures were presented that detailed the scope of the productivity of sabbaticals:

For the 2009-2010 academic year, a total of 58 faculty were awarded sabbatical leaves. Of these, 57 (98 percent) accepted their awards. Two faculty recipients chose to take their sabbaticals over two summers and will be included in next year's report. Four faculty retired, and one faculty left the university prior to completing the survey. An additional faculty member was seriously ill and unable to provide the requested information. Out of the remaining 49 faculty, 100 percent of them participated in a survey conducted in fall 2012 to ascertain the outcomes of their sabbaticals. Faculty from all seven colleges had sabbatical leaves in 2009-2010: 52.7 percent were from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 18.2 percent were from the College of Education, 14.6 percent were from the College of Visual and Performing Arts, 3.6 percent each from the Colleges of Business and Health and Human Sciences, and 1.8 percent each from the Colleges of Engineering and Engineering Technology and Law. In addition to the colleges, faculty from the University Libraries and the Center for Black Studies also had sabbaticals, representing 1.8 percent each of total sabbatical leaves.

The faculty were highly productive in advancing their scholarly work. They reported that as a result of their sabbatical leaves, they published 33 books and book chapters, 79 journal articles and made 21 contributions to conference proceedings. In addition, they made 11 contributions to public media. The results of sabbatical work were also presented at 142 international, national and regional meetings. They produced 38 works of art, including international exhibitions and performances, museum displays, and compositions, and earned distinctions such as the Asian Cultural Council Award and the Vermont Studio Fellowship Award. Faculty submitted 33 applications for external grants and projects that produced funding for 29 initiatives in excess of $2.1 million. Faculty also reported that they revised or created a total of 22 graduate and undergraduate courses as a result of their sabbatical leaves, benefitting more than 600 students annually.

At that point, the list of proposed sabbaticals for the upcoming year was presented and approved. The list is as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACULTY AND SUPPORTIVE PROFESSIONAL STAFF SABBATICAL LEAVES FOR THE 2013-2014 ACADEMIC YEAR
The following individuals are being recommended to the President for sabbatical leave. The President may also approve a request by an individual to change the period of the leave from one semester to another within the academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Department/School</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Churyk, Natalie Tatiana</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF BUSINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Sonya L.</td>
<td>Literacy Education</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, So-Yeun</td>
<td>Kinesiology &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonks, Stephen</td>
<td>Leadership, Educ. Psychology &amp; Foundations</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werderich, Donna E.</td>
<td>Literacy Education</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickman, Scott A.</td>
<td>Counseling, Adult &amp; Higher Education</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zittel, Lauriece</td>
<td>Kinesiology &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joung, Hyun-Mee</td>
<td>Family, Consumer, &amp; Nutrition Sciences</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Jinsook</td>
<td>Nursing &amp; Health Studies</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkoff, Marc D.</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider, Daniel M.</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF LAW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allori, Valia</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Fall 2013 &amp; Spr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentley, John R.</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Dennis E.</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Fall 2013 &amp; Spr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, Gary</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappell, Charles</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakraborty, Dhiman</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall, M. R.</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorman, David</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamayotsu, Kikue</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Fall 2013 &amp; Spr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartelius, Elin Johanna</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, Beatrix</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Fall 2013 &amp; Spr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Eric</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingham, Rama T.</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo, Wei</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merino, Eloy E.</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounts, Nina</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An informational item was presented on the fees associated with distributed learning:

FEES FOR COURSES ASSOCIATED WITH DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES OFFERED THROUGH DISTRIBUTED LEARNING (ONLINE)
Vision 2020 established goals for the implementation of distributed learning, particularly the use of online learning. The working group on academic programming sought to increase NIU’s overall instructional effort through the use of distributed/online learning instructional models. The working group saw this as a potential area of growth for NIU and one in which the university lags behind its competitors. A goal was set to increase the number of student credit hours (SCH) generated through distributed learning modes tenfold (from 17,500 SCH to 175,000 SCH).

In addition to recommending a significant increase in the number of students and credit hours offered through distributive/online learning, ambitious goals were set for the number of certificate and degree programs to be delivered online. The working group on regional impact reported that NIU lags behind its competitors and must grow the number of online certificate and degree programs to remain sustainable. Therefore, the working group recommended developing courses for up to 42 additional online degree programs and certificates that are prioritized to meet the highest levels of student demand. The group also recommended establishing a continuing, adequately funded infrastructure to create and support more market-driven, online programs.

Northern Illinois University is undertaking a major distributed learning (online) initiative that will require new academic, operational and financial models. In order to remain competitive and effectively address the market for distributed learning (online) degrees and certificates, the university needs to establish a process to charge appropriate fees that allow the programs to remain competitive and recover costs for delivery. The university therefore recommends that the Board authorize a fee for courses associated with degree and certificate programs delivered through distributed learning (online). To produce flexibility in pricing (needed to be competitive with existing market price points), the fee should not exceed 50% of the existing on-campus tuition at any point in time or the 2013 delivery fees for the program, whichever is greater. To be eligible to charge this fee, an entire program (certificate or degree) must be available online or in a blended format (i.e. utilizing a combination of online and face-to-face delivery) using one or more off-campus sites. Programs and certificate programs eligible for the application of this fee will be approved by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Other than tuition, on-line fee, and the technology fee (amortized to the credit hours taken by students), no other fees will be charged. Furthermore, to accommodate veterans and students who have employers who will pay for tuition but not fees, all charges (tuition, on-line fee, technology fee) will be bundled into a single charge or “on-line tuition.” The university will provide an annual report to the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee (FFOC) of the Board listing the fees associated with the approved distributed learning degrees and certificates.

A request for New Minors was proposed and approved for:

**Minor in Community Leadership and Civic Engagement**

**Minor in Social Entrepreneurship**

A request for a new emphasis was approved for:

**Emphasis in Justice and Democracy: The American Experiment**

A request to delete an emphasis and a general program of study was proposed and approved for:

**Emphasis in Environmental Science Teaching (within the B.S. in Chemistry)**
General program of study (within the M.S.Ed. in Kinesiology and Physical Education)

The report on: Oral English Proficiency Annual Report 2011-2012 was given and it was noted that “No students complaints were reported by the 48 departments that were requested to provide information on ESL”.

The meeting ended with a short update on the Higher Learning Commission Accreditation.

Respectfully submitted

Andy Small
The Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee of the NIU Board of Trustees met on Thursday, February 28, 2013 at approximately 10:45 a.m. and adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m. The Committee was chaired by Trustee Robert Boey. There were 24 action items and 3 informational items on the agenda. All of the items listed below, with the exception of item (r), were approved.

1. Action Items: The following action items were reviewed and unanimously approved by the Committee:

   a) **FY2014 Student Fee Recommendations**: new student fee levels for activity, athletics, bond revenue, bus, health insurance, health service and grants-in-aid. The average aggregate increase is 6.88%, which includes a 12.30% increase in the Student Health Insurance contract based on negotiations with the insurance carrier. Excluding this health insurance fee increase, the increases recommended represent an average of 2.77% for students who pay for health insurance coverage and 4.16% for students who opt out of health insurance coverage.

   b) **FY2014 Room and Board Rate**: an overall average 3.08% increase in standard room and board rates, which assumes the purchase of the minimum board plan buy-in.

   c) **Fees for Courses Associated with Degrees and Certificates Offered Through Distributed Learning (Online)**: establish distributed learning fees that are either up to 50% of on-campus tuition or equal to the amount of the 2013 delivery fees for on-line or hybrid off-campus programs. Tuition, distributed learning fees, and technology fees will be bundled into a single charge (i.e., “on-line tuition”) for billing purposes.

   d) **College of Law Academic Excellence Fee Renewal**: increase the College of Law Academic Excellence Fee to $120 per credit hour (2012-13 rate: $70/credit hour).

   e) **Housing and Dining Services Cable Television Programming Package**: expenditure authority to provide satellite cable television programming services for FY2014 for (1) General Housing provided by the university (i.e., residence halls, summer conference rooms, HSC hotel guest rooms); (2) Northern View Community; and (3) New Residence Hall Complex. ($238,000)

   f) **FY2014 International Programs Division Expenditures**: authorization for expenditures for foreign study programs. (not to exceed $3,000,000)

   g) **FY2014 NIU Foundation Professional Services Contract**: a renewal order for a contract with the NIU Foundation to support fundraising services and activities provided by the Foundation on behalf of the university. ($630,052)
h) Six university contract renewals:
- Outreach Centers Catering Services ($1,009,000)
- Document Services Copier and Controller System ($1,000,000)
- ITS Document Services and Materials Management Copy Paper ($730,000)
- Materials Management Central Stores Commodities ($490,000)
- NIU Outreach Radiation Oncology Physician Services ($330,000)
- Student Accident and Sickness Insurance ($7,700,000)

i) FY2014 Transportation Services, Physical Plant and Capital Architecture Planning and Safety Motor Fuels: expenditure authority to purchase 10% ethanol blended regular non-lead gasoline, 11% soy ultra-low sulfur bio-diesel, and B2 off-road dyed diesel for use by these departments and the Grounds Department. (not to exceed $963,250)

j) Zike Giorgi Law Clinic Lease Renewal: expenditure authority for FY14 – FY16 to exercise the first of two, three-year renewal options. ($313,200)

k) Electrical Infrastructure Campus Wide Replacement – Phase II: second phase of four phases to be completed during the next decade designed to provide a new, reliable electrical distribution system. Phase II is to ensure that all systems identified as critical to operating the university will be updated. (not to exceed $2,580,000)

l) Campus Alert System – Upgrade Campus Buildings Capital Project Approval: Phase III of this project will complete the new alert system to more than 90% of the floor area on the main DeKalb campus. This system is designed to allow transmission of live verbal announcements or warnings given directly from a microphone in Public Safety or by converting pre-developed text warnings to verbal announcements. (not to exceed $1,250,000)

m) Huskie Stadium Sound System and LED Ribbon Board Project: replacement of the existing sound system that is becoming unserviceable due to the unavailability of replacement parts and an opportunity to install on the east and west sides of the stadium digital LED fascia boards to be used for promotional advertisements. (not to exceed $650,000)

n) Revision of Maximum Vacation Accrual Limitation for Nonexempt (Hourly) Civil Service Employees: The university Administrative Professional Advisory Council (APAC) recommended that the maximum vacation accrual for hourly Civil Service employees be consistent with salaried Civil Service personnel. The following language will be added in Board Regulations: “Nonexempt Employees as defined in III.C.1(c), meeting the criteria set forth in III.C.1(c).5, will be permitted to accrue up to a maximum 56 vacation days.”

o) Technical Update – Faculty and Staff Educational Benefit Limitations: current language in II.D.9 and III.C.7 of the Board Regulation establishes tuition waiver benefits for status employees and provides a maximum number of hours and courses for the fall and spring semesters (i.e., “2 course not to exceed 8 hours”), but not the summer. Consistent with university practices, the following technical changes were made in order to standardize applicable language:
- Retirees and full-time employees – 2 courses not to exceed 8 hours
- 3/4-time employees- 2 courses not to exceed 6 hours
- 1/2 – time employees- 1 course not to exceed 4 hours
p) **Revision of Vacation Accrual Limitations for Temporary Administrative Professional (SPS) Employees:** Board Regulation II.D.1 establishes vacation accrual policies for Faculty and Administrative Employees. Existing language in section II.D.1 provides that vacation balances for temporary appointments are for the duration of the contract only and are adjusted to “zero” at the end of the contract. Employees on temporary contracts are not eligible to receive payments for accumulated vacation upon termination of employment. Based on a recommendation from the SPS Council, the policy will allow for a carryover across consecutive re-appointments limited to no more than the amount of vacation earned during two years of consecutive reappointment with no expectation of payment for accumulated vacation.

q) **Illinois Shared Learning Environment Development Services RFPs:** NIU is one of four recipients of State of Illinois grant funds for the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE) project, a new state technology platform initiative that will support many of the State’s education and workforce development reforms and programs. Phase 1 of the ISLE grant, which started on July 1, 2012, was made to the University of Illinois (UI), with NIU as a subgrantee to UI. For Phase 2 of the ISLE grant, which will commence in the next month, NIU will be the direct grant recipient, with subgrants made to UI, SIU, and IlliniCloud. The amount of funding for Phase 2 of the grant is $9,000,000. Of these funds, three RFP procurements will be issued: (1) development of a portal interface for school district teachers and principals (not to exceed $1,000,000); (2) development of an assessment authoring and delivery application for school districts; (3) development of a “learning map” application that will utilize data maintained within ISLE (RFPs for 2 & 3 not to exceed $1,500,00).

r) **Naming Rights Authorization:** current BOT naming rights procedure provides that the President, after consultation with members of the university community, may propose a name for a specific facility. The BOT guidelines do not address the Board’s authority in this area. This proposal establishes that the Board maintains the authority to name facilities on its own initiative and delegates to the President the authority to develop naming policies for university property not within the exclusive purview of the Board. This proposal was tabled following the absence of a motion second.

s) **Renewal of Academic Program Enhancement and Instructional Technology Surcharge:** In May 2003, the BOT approved for a period of five years the university’s request for an Academic Program Enhancement and Instructional Technology Surcharge. In 2007, the BOT renewed the technology surcharge for an additional five year period. This proposal authorizes the continuation of the technology surcharge at the existing rate of $250 per semester. Any future changes to the fee rate will necessitate a return to the BOT for approval.
2. Information Items

a) Projects Related to Campus Noninstructional Modernization and Capacity Improvement – update on Infrastructure Projects: At its October 2010 meeting, the BOT authorized the sale of Build America Bonds to support modernization and capacity improvement projects. While this bond issue includes the renovations of Grant Towers, Gilbert Hall, Holmes Student Center, intramural fields, campus parking and roadways, and campus infrastructure, other projects recently completed, about to begin, or are currently in the planning stage include: storm sewer replacement on the West Campus; campus lighting replacement near residence halls; installation of lighting at the NIU Track and Field / Soccer Complex; replacement of sections of sanitary sewers servicing Neptune Central and Neptune North; replacement of campus electrical distribution system in association with the Gilbert Hall renovation.

b) Sixteen transactions exceeding $100,000, for the period of October 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012, were reported to the Committee for informational purposes. Five capital projects exceeding $100,000 were also reviewed: renovation of 3,700 square feet of existing, unoccupied ground floor office space at the NIU Naperville facility ($248,000); replacement of the emergency generator for ITS NIUTEL, Health Services, and Public Safety ($206,080); restoration of the north addition roof of the Recreation Center ($127,000); repair of Stair Tower 2 of the Parking Structure ($136,500); replacement of the revolving doors at the entrance of Founders Library ($150,000).

c) Reports of investment holdings and earnings for the period of July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 were provided. The average annualized rate of return was .37%.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Waas, Ph.D.
University Advisory Committee
Legislation, Audit, External Affairs and Compliance Committee
February 28, 2013

The meeting was called to order by Chair Anthony Iosco in the Board of Trustees Room, 315 Altgeld Hall. Recording Secretary Sharon Banks-Wilkins conducted a roll call of Trustees. Members present were Trustees Robert Boey, John Butler, Robert Marshall, Marc Strauss, Student Trustee Elliot Echols and Chair Iosco. Also present were President John Peters, Committee Liaison Kathryn Buettner, and General Counsel Jerry Blakemore.

The LAEAC Committee received a presentation by Christian Spears, Deputy Director of Athletics, on the NIU NCAA Athletic Compliance System. This system was designed internally and has been commended on its depth, security, and accuracy. The system reports on areas of compliance such as eligibility, violations, and waivers. This system provides Athletic personnel access to NCAA Academic Progress Rate worksheets. It also contains a lauded self-reporting process for NIU violations and waivers. The system permits direct access to NIU internal audit personnel.

Committee members entertained a reading of proposed changes to the Board of Trustees Travel and Expense Reimbursement Policy. This proposal was tabled pending additional information requested by committee members of types of reimbursement submissions for past years. Members agreed on the need to be transparent including an annual report.

Update of Board of Trustees Bylaws as They Relate to Functions of the Executive Committee received first reading. This update specifically addresses the composition, powers, duties, responsibilities and limitations of the Executive Committee.

The FY 2012 Financial Audit was presented to LAEAC Committee members. A 98th General Assembly Report and Substantive Budget was provided to committee members for review.

Respectfully submitted,
Rosita Lopez and Todd Latham
Report of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (FRR)
Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate on the Issue of Joint Appointments and Proposed APPM Changes

March 27th, 2013

This report details the recommendations from the FRR subcommittee on an issue raised by Dean Chris McCord (CLAS) over joint appointments of faculty, usually between departments and centers, as it relates to the granting of tenure. The committee’s work has been guided by the extensive work of the 2011-2012 joint FRR-Rules and Governance joint committee of the Faculty Senate; consultation, discussion and recommendations proposed by Dean McCord; an examination of the joint appointment policies of the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign, the University of Illinois-Chicago and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale; and consultation among the subcommittee faculty.

As understood by the FRR subcommittee, the issue under consideration is summarized below:

The decision to grant tenure is first considered at the department level. For faculty with joint appointments with a university department and a university center, the decision to grant tenure has historically been made by the department with non-binding input from the university center. For faculty with joint appointments between university departments, the decision to grant tenure can result in disagreements between departments and/or colleges. This can cause uncertainty for the faculty member, especially when one department may vote to grant tenure while another may vote to deny.

Joint appointments are made using specific memoranda of understanding (MOU), a guide to both the faculty member and the university, that help illustrate the process that will be used to decide issues of tenure for that faculty member. While MOUs can provide clarity as to the tenure process, it is important that MOUs contain procedures documenting the tenure decision process and a process to resolve disputes between different university constituencies. The following changes to the university by-laws (article 5.4) and to Section 2, Item 30 (Joint Appointment Policy) of the Academic Policy and Procedures Manual (APPM) are proposed to guide the university in the creation of MOUs so that procedures for the recommendation of tenure and for the disposition of disagreement between the various university constituencies are properly documented.

---

1 An example of a joint appointment might include a tenure-track faculty member who has a 50% FTE appointment in the Department of History and a 50% FTE appointment in the Department of Sociology.
2 The FRR subcommittee thanks the Joint Committee and its chairs, Rosemary Feurer and Gretchen Bisplinghoff, for their work on this issue and their report at the April 21st, 2012 meeting of the Faculty Senate.
Northern Illinois University By-Laws

ARTICLE 5: THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL PROCESS

5.4 University Criteria for Tenure

The decision to recommend a faculty member for a tenure appointment is the most critical decision made by an academic department, a college, and the university. Each department has the responsibility of building the most capable faculty possible within its means. The process of building a strong faculty involves not only the recruitment of the most promising candidates available, but also the critical evaluation of their teaching or librarianship, scholarship and service to the university community and to their profession during their probationary period.

Decisions on tenure substantially determine the quality of teaching, librarianship, scholarship, academic counseling, and creative planning available to the department, college, and university. Accordingly, a recommendation for tenure is justified only for those faculty members who have demonstrated to the satisfaction of appropriate faculty bodies and administrative officers that they are fully qualified to discharge their responsibilities in advancing the mission of the department, college, and university on a long-term basis as a teacher-scholar.

Ordinarily, the criteria for tenure are similar to those for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Only in unusual circumstances should tenure be recommended for assistant professors without the concurrent recommendation for promotion to associate professor.

A faculty member on joint appointment will have teaching, scholarship, and service expectations specified in the Memorandum of Understanding provided at the time of the initial appointment. These expectations must not exceed the overall requirements for faculty members not on joint appointment. The procedures must specify how recommendations at the unit and college levels will be made and how "agreement at the department and college level" (in the sense of Article 6.3.4.1) is to be defined.

Faculty members on non-tenure appointment must recognize that their appointments are probationary. During this probationary period, it is their obligation to establish that they are qualified for a tenure appointment.

Each faculty personnel committee and chair shall have procedures for the annual evaluation of the cumulative progress toward tenure of all probationary faculty members and for communicating the results of such evaluations to them. The criteria to be used for the evaluation shall be those guidelines for tenure most recently published by the academic unit in which the applicant holds a tenure-track appointment. The results of the annual evaluation shall be shared with the faculty member in writing as well as in personal consultation with the academic unit's chief administrative officer. The written evaluation may be composed by either the personnel committee or the chief administrative officer or both working together. If the personnel committee and the chief administrative officer agree on the report, both shall sign it. If they disagree, two written reports shall be shared with the faculty member and placed in the faculty member's file. This procedure shall be followed in all required evaluation reports: ordinary
annual reviews done at the time of recruitment of faculty for whom tenure may be awarded in fewer than five years, and the formal and particularly thorough evaluation done once for each faculty member on a five-, six-, or seven-year tenure track.

In the case of a faculty member on a seven-year tenure track, the evaluation in the third year shall be a formal and particularly thorough cumulative review which shall be conducted in the spring of that year by the personnel committee and chief academic officer of the academic unit in which the person being evaluated holds an academic appointment. A statement shall be appended to this evaluation which specifies the academic unit's anticipated long-term need for the position held by the probationary faculty member. This evaluation shall be shared with the concerned probationary faculty member and, where the academic unit involved is an academic department, with the appropriate college dean.

For faculty members on a four-year tenure track, it is expected that, at the time of recruitment, their previous professional performance shall be subject to an evaluation by the faculty personnel committee and the chair using the same criteria and expected level of performance as applied to those in the third year of a seven-year tenure track.

For faculty members on a five- or six-year tenure track, it is expected that at least one year before their evaluation for tenure, at a time agreed upon at the time of recruitment, a particularly thorough and formal cumulative evaluation of the progress toward tenure shall be conducted. It is further expected that, at the time of recruitment, their previous professional performance shall be subject to an evaluation by the faculty personnel committee and the chair using the same criteria and expected level of performance as applied to those in the third year of a seven-year tenure track.

If there is a disagreement among appointing units on recommending for tenure a faculty member on joint appointment, the unit(s) recommending tenure may petition the relevant college(s) to fund fully the position as either a tenured position within the recommending department(s) or as an appointment within a recommending center.

A probationary faculty member who feels that an annual evaluation is unfair, inadequate, or otherwise inconsistent with the relevant published guidelines for achieving tenure may place a written response to the evaluation in the personnel files maintained on that faculty member by appropriate university offices. However, the annual evaluation of progress toward tenure of a probationary faculty member shall not itself be subject to the personnel appeal process.
Northern Illinois University By-Laws
ARTICLE 6: GENERAL PERSONNEL PROCEDURES

6.3 Personnel Procedures at the College Level

6.3.4.1 Decisions not to recommend tenure, promotion in rank, or sabbatical leave shall be forwarded by the executive vice president and provost to the University Council Personnel Committee for review and action on the university level only if there has not been agreement on the decision at the department and college levels. Agreement at the department and college level shall be considered to exist when the college personnel committee, the college dean, and either the department personnel committee or the department chair are in agreement. When there has been such agreement, those decisions shall be forwarded by the executive vice president and provost to the University Council Personnel Committee only for information purposes. For recommendations to grant early tenure or early promotion in rank, the executive vice president and provost may seek the advice, but not formal action, of the University Council Personnel Committee concerning the required justification of extraordinary circumstances or an extraordinary record of achievement.

Joint Appointment Policy

Section II. Item 30.

Under certain circumstances, it may be both educationally and economically desirable for faculty members, both present faculty and future appointments, to have joint appointments with departments in the same college, with departments in different colleges, or with department and interdisciplinary or research centers in the same or different colleges. Specific conditions for each individual joint appointment must be detailed at the time of initial appointment in a written memorandum of understanding between the appointing units and the candidate.

While the faculty member and the appointing units should have the freedom and flexibility to negotiate individual agreements, certain fundamental guidelines need to be observed in all such appointment statements. Specifically, a memorandum of understanding must be prepared by the appointing units, and endorsed by the dean(s) to whom they report, at the time at which the position is offered. This document must specify the division of the faculty member's time and salary among each of the units, the weighing of factors (teaching, scholarship, and service to the university community and profession) in the faculty member's merit evaluations, all expectations for tenure and/or promotion, and the process by which all evaluations for salary increment, tenure, and promotion will be conducted. The memorandum of understanding will also specify the resources (space, research funds, teaching support, etc.) that each unit will be responsible for providing the appointee. A copy of the memorandum of understanding will be filed in the appointee's personnel file in the provost's office.

1. TENURE AND PROMOTION
   General expectations for tenure and promotion must be agreed upon by the appointing
units and communicated to the faculty member in the memorandum of understanding at the time of appointment. The ways in which tenure and promotion reviews will be conducted and the role appointing units will play in the evaluation process must also be specified in the memorandum of understanding. In addition, the memorandum of understanding must specify how "agreement at the department and college level" (in the sense of Article 6.3.4.1) is to be defined and what dispositions will be made in the event of disagreement between the units. The department chair(s) and/or center administrator(s) shall maintain regular communication with each other regarding the faculty member's performance in their units. Each unit will provide a written annual evaluation of the progress toward tenure, with special attention given to the written three year review of candidates on a seven-year track. (See Article 5 of the Bylaws.) In these cases, the emphasis must be upon the extent of the faculty member's excellence in meeting the expectations for tenure and promotion specified in university and college personnel documents. These expectations must not exceed the overall requirements for faculty members not on joint appointment.

If there is disagreement among appointing units on recommending tenure for a faculty member on joint appointment, the unit(s) recommending tenure may petition the relevant college(s) to fund fully the position as either a tenured position within the recommending department(s) or as an appointment within a recommending center. Resources permitting tenure may be awarded in the recommending department. In the event the joint appointment is between an interdisciplinary or research center and a department (or departments), and there is no departmental recommendation for tenure, the interdisciplinary or research center may offer the individual an alternative form of appointment without tenure.

Normally, a faculty member's rank is the same in all departments and titles for appointments in centers should be commensurate with the appropriate academic rank.

2. ANNUAL EVALUATION
The memorandum of understanding accompanying the offering letter shall clearly specify how each unit is to provide the other(s) with an evaluation that will be incorporated into the overall yearly evaluation. There should be a clear and mutually agreeable determination of how and by whom the units' individual evaluations will be combined and how and by whom yearly increment ratings will be determined. In all joint appointments there must be a clear and mutually agreeable prior statement of how a faculty member's professional work will be evaluated, by whom that work will be evaluated, and the extent to which the faculty member's productivity will be evaluated differently from that of others in the department because of the specific nature of the joint appointment. Specifically, two kinds of considerations need to be addressed in this determination: (1) the definition and weighing of professional performance factors (teaching, scholarship, and service to the university community and profession) that will apply to the individual on joint appointment; (2) the manner in which the evaluation of professional achievements will be divided among the appointing units performing the evaluation.

3. RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL OF PERSONNEL DECISIONS
The faculty member may obtain a reconsideration of a personnel decision by the department or center making that decision according to the reconsideration provisions in the university Bylaws. In conformity with the university Bylaws, an appeal of a personnel decision may be taken to the level above the level at which the decision was made.
4. FACULTY GOVERNANCE
   The memorandum of understanding shall specify the agreement reached by the appointing units and the faculty member with reference to the location of the faculty member's involvement in the faculty governance structure of the units, the college and the university. A person on joint appointment shall in no way be disenfranchised from the governance system because of the nature of his or her appointment.

5. RECRUITMENT
   During the process of recruitment, all units to be involved in the joint appointment shall be represented on the search committee. If the locus of tenure is known at the start of a search by a research or interdisciplinary center, the initial screening committee shall have representation from the departments where the tenure-track appointment would reside. If that is not known, the committee shall have representation of faculty from departments related to the center's areas of activity. As soon as a short list of candidates has been determined, representatives of potential appointing units will be invited to join the screening committee. Only a candidate who is acceptable to all appointing units shall be offered a joint appointment.

6. CHANGES IN APPOINTMENT STATUS BEFORE AND AFTER TENURE
   Provided all of the concerned parties agree, the initial statement of agreement on a joint appointment may be amended at any time after the appointment has been made. If any of the parties wishes to change any of the provisions in the agreement, this must be accomplished through the mutual consent of all parties involved.
Bylaws of Northern Illinois University

ARTICLE 16:
OTHER STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY

16.5 Faculty Representative to the Illinois Board of Higher Education

16.5.1 The Faculty Senate shall elect a tenured faculty member to serve on the Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. The person so elected shall serve a four-year, renewable term beginning at the start of the fall semester. The person shall receive annual compensation equal to one month of the median salary of all tenured faculty. If not otherwise a member, the person shall serve as an ex officio nonvoting member of the Faculty Senate and the University Council.
Date: March 14, 2013

To: Alan Rosenbaum
President, Faculty Senate
Executive Secretary of the University Council

From: Sonya L. Armstrong
Assistant Professor of Literacy Education

Please accept this memo as my self-nomination to serve as NIU’s representative on the Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (FAC-IBHE). I served as NIU’s alternate representative from spring 2011 until May of 2012, when I became NIU’s primary representative. In the time I have served as the primary representative, I have tried to become an active member of the FAC-IBHE. For instance, last May I volunteered to be one of the FAC-IBHE members of the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Working Group, a sub-committee of the State's P-20 Council; I have served in this role since that time and have attended monthly meetings in Chicago or Normal. In addition, I have been an active member of the Public University Caucus of the FAC-IBHE.

Because I have been involved with the FAC-IBHE for nearly two years now, I am fully aware of the commitment that this role requires in terms of time, travel, communication, and knowledge of issues relevant to NIU faculty and state-level policy and legislation. My teaching schedule allows for the necessary travel as well as attendance at Faculty Senate and University Council meetings.

My interest in serving as NIU's representative has much to do with my professional and scholarly foci. Specifically, the issues I am concerned with in my faculty role as Director of the College Learning Enhancement Program (the literacy arm of the CHANCE program), are inextricably tied to the types of conversations the FAC-IBHE is having on a regular basis (i.e., college readiness, retention, and completion; P-20 and the Public Agenda; performance-based funding and other conversations surrounding quality and standards; MAP and other student funding; and community college-university transfer). Similarly, because my scholarly emphases are also related to many of these conversations, I am well-versed on the relevant policy and scholarship needed to engage in these critical discussions.

Please know that, if selected, I am committed to representing the NIU faculty by serving in this role as liaison to the FAC-IBHE. I will do my best to stay informed on the important issues facing faculty in higher education in Illinois, and to keep NIU faculty up to date on these issues as well.

Thank you for your consideration of my self-nomination.
March 5, 2013

Letter of acceptance of nomination as
University Council Executive Secretary/
Faculty Senate President

Fellow Senators,

Once again, I am pleased to accept your nomination for a fifth and final term as Executive Secretary. Although asserting the faculty’s role in the shared governance process represents an ongoing job, I am pleased with the progress we have made. Regular meetings of both the Joint Committee on Resources, Space, and Budgets, and the University Advisory Committees with the President and his cabinet have not only been maintained, but, I think, valued by all parties as well. We continue to provide input from the constituent employee groups to the administration and our annual letter of budget priorities has become an established routine. True dialogue has begun to replace informational briefings and, while that remains a work in progress, the key word is progress. I think we have learned that the way to be heard is to speak up rather than wait to be asked.

Last Spring saw the completion of the report of the president’s committee on equity in compensation, or what we have dubbed the “Raise Equity Committee” for which the Senate had actively lobbied. The report did highlight a few issues which have now been called to the attention of the administration. As a result, the president approved a graduate assistant for the University Council. That person will begin working for us in August and will be available to help committee chairs from both the Senate and Council with research, data collection, and other appropriate tasks. This will, hopefully, make life a bit easier for committee chairs and members and facilitate the work of the Senate and Council.

The revised grading system, which expands grading options to include plusses and minuses took effect for graduate classes in the Fall, and has now been approved for undergraduates, as well. The new system should be in place for Fall, 2013 semester grading. Early reports on the graduate version of the grading system seem to be positive and the transition was apparently seamless. During the past year we resurrected the old Faculty Bulletin and replaced it with an updated e-version titled Faculty Matters. This was designed to enable communication to the faculty of the issues being dealt with at Faculty Senate and University Council, as well as new policies and policy changes of interest to the faculty. Thus far, four issues have been published with the goal of two issues per semester. We have also continued and expanded the use of the Faculty Senate Blackboard Community to facilitate communication with and between Faculty Senators. This has become a repository for documents and links to relevant websites that are of interest to the faculty.
The major ongoing task of the Spring has been the presidential search and making sure that faculty interests are well represented in the process. We have an excellent search advisory committee, more than half of which is comprised of faculty members. While it has been important for me to be involved in the search process, I feel the upcoming role of helping to acclimate the new president to our culture of shared governance is equally important. I think having four years of experience as Executive Secretary will be a valuable asset during this momentous transition to a new administration.

Going forward, there are two remaining projects that I hope to complete. The first is the partly finished Faculty Manual. We have been without a faculty manual for more than a decade and, although I identify this as a goal every year, I have not been able to complete it. I am hoping, once again, to be able to do so this year, before leaving office. Secondly, I have had many conversations with our General Counsel, Jerry Blakemore, regarding the need to revise, correct, and update the Constitution and Bylaws. This document has been in disrepair for a very long time, and although we have made piecemeal revisions to specific articles over the past four years, a more general reconsideration is long overdue. Hopefully, we can, at least, begin this arduous process.

Lastly, this year, we will have to prepare for the transition to a new Executive Secretary and I will do my best to help recruit my successor and prepare us for the transition.

As I itemize some of the accomplishments of the past year, know that I realize that this is not my work alone, but rather the work of so many good people on the Senate and Council, members and committee chairs alike and, of course, Pat, without whom I wouldn’t have run for a third term, let alone a fifth. I consider it an honor and privilege to serve as Executive Secretary of the University Council and especially as President of the Faculty Senate. I appreciate your support.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alan Rosenbaum, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Psychology
Executive Secretary of the University Council
President of the Faculty Senate