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I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 3, 2013 UC MEETING
(distributed electronically)

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION
   A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/
      Executive Secretary of University Council
   B. Report from the UC-University Affairs Committee on the evaluation of
      The Ombudsperson

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. Recognition of University Council members whose terms are completed, who
      have been re-elected, and who are newly elected – Page 4

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES
   A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Pages 5-6
   B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry
      Freedman and Andy Small – no report
   C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg
      Waas – no report
   D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and
      Rosita Lopez – no report
   E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report
   F. Academic Policy Committee – Sean Farrell, Chair – no report
G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Paul Carpenter, Chair

1. Report on meeting with president and provost – Pages 7-10

2. Year End Summary – Page 11

3. Resolution concerning the shared governance role of Resources, Space and Budgets Committee in setting recommendations for budget priorities – Pages 12-13

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Melissa Lenczewski, Chair – no report

I. University Affairs Committee – Kathleen Coles, Chair

1. Student grievance policy status report – Pages 14-23

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

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – Pages 24-28

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – no report

M. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair

1. University Council election of 2013-2014 Executive Secretary of University Council

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Reconsideration of proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, Article 14.6.4, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum – ACTION ITEM – Page 29


C. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, Article 19.4: Annual Evaluation of Ombudsperson – SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM – Pages 36-37

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Comments from the Executive Secretary

X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR
XI. 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. Meeting Schedule – 2013-14 – Page 38

XII. ADJOURNMENT
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBER RECOGNITION
May 1, 2013

Faculty who have completed their service:
M Cecil Smith, Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology & Foundations
Cliff Mirman, Department of Engineering Technology
Kathleen Coles, College of Law
Artemus Ward, Department of Political Science
Carl Von Ende, Department of Biological Sciences
Chhiu-Tsu (C.T.) Lin, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
Rebecca Houze, School of Art

Students who have completed their terms:
DeLonte LeFlore, Student Association
Austin Quick, Student Association (served fall semester)
James Zanayed, Student Association (served spring semester)
Nick Bender, Student Association
Kyle Bak, Student Association (served fall semester)
Susie Richard, Student Association (served spring semester)
Daihe Cho, Student Association
Gina Gregolunas, Student Association
Chad Harris, Student Association
Michael Theodore, Student Association
Matthew Hofer, Student Advisory Committee, College of Business
Petia Guerrero, Student Advisory Committee, College of Engineering & Engineering Technology
Cara Prock, Student Advisory Committee, College of Health & Human Sciences
Wayne Duerkes, Student Advisory Committee, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Dan Porter, Student Advisory Committee, College of Law
Melissa Entzminger, Student Advisory Committee, Graduate School

Supportive Professional Staff and Operating Staff who have completed their terms:
Debbie Haliczer, Supportive Professional Staff Council
Andy Small, Operating Staff Council President
Zachary Bohn, Operating Staff Council

Faculty who have been re-elected:
Chih-Chen Lee, Department of Accountancy
Brad Sagarin, Department of Psychology
Virginia Naples, Department of Biological Sciences

Faculty who have been newly elected:
Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Department of Electrical Engineering
Eric Mogren, Department of History
Amy Newman, Department of English
Robin Moremen, Department of Sociology
Billie Giese, School of Art
Report on the FAC-IBHE Meeting, April 2, 2013

The Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) met on April 2, 2013, at Elgin Community College.

FAC and IBHE Updates
FAC Chair Abbas Aminmansour (UIUC) called the meeting to order and provided the following updates:

- A SB 1900 group is being formed.
- Caucus chairs will be meeting with IBHE Interim Executive Director Harry Berman and the IBHE staff in Springfield this month to move this forward.
- The Illinois Education Research Center’s presentation/discussion of their High School-to-College Success Report will take place at the May FAC meeting in Monmouth.
- Planning is on track for the September FAC meeting in Champaign. There will be a panel discussion about higher education in the future—how we’ll teach, what we’ll teach, and who will be teaching.

IBHE Liaison Ocheng Jany announced that the position search that opened upon Dan Cullen assuming the deputy directorship is now closed and review of applications are underway.

Public Four-Year Caucus Updates
The Public Caucus discussed how faculty productivity is reported at each institution. Caucus members are asked to report back at the May meeting on what information is collected, how frequently, by whom, and who has access to these data.

FAC Meeting
The minutes from the March 15th meeting were approved. The nominations for FAC officers are Abbas Aminmansour (chair), Marie Donovan (vice-chair), and Steve Rock (secretary). Also, nine names for Illinois Articulation Initiative panels (four from Publics, four from Privates, one from Community Colleges) have been submitted; the FAC will consider submitting these (and any others that come forward) after the May meeting.

Next was a discussion of possible items to bring to the Board’s attention at the luncheon. From the Publics: the IBHE Faculty Fellowship, pensions and repercussions in hiring, unfunded mandates, students going out of state, IBHE’s spheres of influence within the legislature, collaboration between four-year institutions and community colleges, standards for IBHE approval of new programs, faculty/administrative balance in hiring, and paperwork expansion. From the Privates: IAI role and connections, possible smoking ban, and quality control for institutions wanting to do business in Illinois. From the Community Colleges: the “6% rule” and its limitations, healthcare implementation, and student readiness for alternate delivery. Additional ideas included recent mandates with teacher education assessments and the interaction of state boards.
FAC members moved to lunch with IBHE staff and members. During this lunch, FAC members raised concerns about pensions as well as a new teacher education assessment (edTPA).

**IBHE Meeting**

The IBHE meeting was called to order by Chair Carrie Hightman. Following several introductions and welcome remarks was an update by Hightman on the higher education budget proposed by the Governor. Next were updates on the Illinois Longitudinal Data System and MAP funding. A dual-degree program that is a partnership between Governor's State University and several Chicago-area community colleges was showcased. Following the action items and consent agenda, Robin Meade from the Illinois Adjunct Association, provided a brief explanation of the impact of healthcare changes on adjunct faculty. At that point, the Board went into executive session and all visitors were excused.

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](http://www.ibhe-fac.org/Meetings.html). In addition, the audio of the full IBHE meeting is available at [http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/Board/audio/130402.mp3](http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/Board/audio/130402.mp3)

Respectfully submitted,

Sonya L. Armstrong  
Assistant Professor in the Department of Literacy Education  
NIU Representative to the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council
President Peters was unable to attend. Provost Alden and Steve Cunningham were present to answer the questions the committee had submitted prior to the meeting.

1. **Vision2020 - in what ways is Vision2020 linked to budget? How is the plan being impacted by lower admission numbers and the adverse publicity the university has had of late? What is the current status of the plan in terms of meeting the milestones the plan identified?**
   a. Provost Alden explained that the funding for Vision 2020 was ‘one-time’ funding. In some cases this was spread over several years, but no base allocations have been made to initiatives identified in Vision 2020.
   b. Steve Cunningham confirmed that about $8M has been allocated and/or spent on initiatives from Vision 2020 and Provost Alden indicated that this included around $4M for technology and facilities improvements, $1M for recruitment initiatives, $1M for research, and $1.5M for academic improvements such as engaged learning, course transformation, and on-line course development.
   c. Some of the funding allocations have only recently been approved and while in some areas spending has moved ahead of schedule in other areas it has not been on schedule. A complicating factor has been the drop in enrollments. Had enrollments held at the 2008 level, it might have meant that this level of ‘one-time’ funding could have been sustained.
   d. Provost Alden was asked if he had any indication as to whether the new President will continue with Vision 2020. He noted, based on his limited interactions, that President Baker believed Vision 2020 had many worthwhile goals and that it was a good plan. He felt it was likely the new President would adopt some facets of Vision 2020 taking a strategic approach linked to base budget funding.
   e. Conversation followed about the need to revisit the milestones and benchmarks for Vision 2020 in light of the changing fiscal (e.g., performance metrics) and higher education landscape and lower enrollments. There is a need to clearly identifying priorities in the plan and develop concrete actions plans tied to budget, something the incoming President has expressed as a priority.

2. **Workload - a combination of retirements, inability to fill all vacated positions, and individuals on suspension/leave has seen workloads increase for many employees. Do we have sufficient employees to cover operations?**
   a. The Provost stated that on the faculty side, the number of faculty was back to where NIU was a decade when we had an enrollment high. With the projected budget cuts and lower enrollment numbers, this is going to make the next round of cuts very challenging. In some areas there are over capacity issues and other
areas under capacity. The need for a more strategic approach to implementing budget cuts was discussed.

b. Deb Halizcer commented that retirements were trending up again and with comments from both the Provost and Steve Cunningham, an issue previously reported that mid-career leavers was the bulk of the 30% turnover over the past 3 years (60% of people leaving), staffing concerns exist. Typically expect an attrition rate of 3% per year and the current annual rate is 3X the normal rate. The attrition is resulting in impacting diversity in the mid-level ranks. The concern over mid-career leavers was expounded with reference to the budget and pension uncertainty in Illinois and the challenges NIU has in being competitive with salary and benefits. Steve Cunningham noted that that NIU is at a disadvantage in the higher education market. This is further compounded as many other states are reporting a comeback in revenues.

c. The attrition has impacted workloads as it has led to job expansion. This looks like it will be a challenge for a while. It was noted we are living off the “work ethic” of the current employees. Having sufficient staff is a qualified yes – we need to do more with less and in part this is because we have to move forward given all the issues facing the institution.

d. The conversation on workload also addressed the cost of the increasing number of unfunded mandates and compliance requirements being applied by at the Federal and State levels as well as external accreditation agencies. These costs are in terms of increased workload as well as the real cost fiscally in the additional reporting requirements, although the exact fiscal cost is unknown at this time. It is also the case that because of some of these mandates and fewer staff in some areas other work isn’t getting done. With budgets constrained, there is a limited ability to compensate employees for the extra work they take on. Some of the compliance mandates also limit NIU’s ability to be responsive to the changing higher education climate, for example, it has taken 5 months to get approval to move forward on the RFP for the development of entities to work with NIU on on-line initiatives.

e. There were additional comments about the current budget uncertainties as to whether the cut will be at the level proposed by the governor (5%) or whether, as happened last year, the legislature imposes a different % cut. Current planning for the academic units is to prepare for a 2.5% or 4% cut. Steve Cunningham reported that current planning allows for up to a 10% cut from the legislature although clearly this adversely impacts NIU.

f. The university is actively involved in conversations to shape the outcome on pensions and health benefits. These include dialog on cost shifting. The university (and other state universities) believe some cost shifting is needed and they are prepared to take on some of the benefit costs but in return we need to see stability in general revenue and not see that cut in addition to having to take on the cost shifting as that in effect would have a double hit on the budget.

g. Issue of performance metrics being implemented by the state. Focus is on degree completion rather than enrollment numbers although enrollments and
retention are precursors to graduation so are critical elements (improving yield was also stressed by the Provost as key to increasing enrollments). Other metrics also focus on nuances to who completes degrees with greater weight placed on certain completers (e.g., Pell recipients, STEM degrees). There are also metrics related to research productivity. It was noted that the metrics are not based on benchmarking against an institution’s own improvement but on absolute numbers. You can improve but still not get performance based funding. System does not advantage NIU but institutions like U of I as they can open up wait lists which NIU doesn’t have. Right now as performance based funding represents 0.5% of appropriations the impact is limited. It is further limited by the decreasing nature of more cuts which means less to lose. In examining rates, do not count transfer students or students who leave but then return.

3. It has been stated many times that investing in NIU’s employees is critical to the university’s success and future. There is concern that with fewer employees doing more work and with no raises in sight and the prospect of increased costs for benefits and reduced benefits on retirement this is having and adverse impact on morale and isn’t consistent with the messaging regarding investing in NIU’s employees. Are there plans in place/under discussion to address these concerns?
   a. Steve Cunningham stated no problems with meeting payroll despite fiscal challenges.
   b. As part of this conversation the issue of enrollments came up again. The shortfall in enrollments has created challenges and even if enrollments start to rebound it will take time to compensate for the lower numbers recently. This is also compounded by the inability to raise tuition as we are at the price point.
   c. The enrollment issues are also being compounded as more students leaving due to their inability to cover the costs of their education.
   d. Discussion ensued about the need to visit operational procedures and governance processes to make them more efficient and responsive. It was stated the university is working on greater use of electronic records and tracking systems and ways to reduce the number of steps to complete actions. It was suggested that through university council we look at reducing the number of committees and meetings and the number of people involved, but preserving governance. This will require looking at constitution and bylaws that, as Provost Alden noted, can in places be complex, contradictory, and vague.
   e. Compensation is a priority for the President. Salary increases are one of the priority items presented every year to the IBHE. Steve Cunningham stated this year was the first time in several years there had been no increment. The increments the past few years have been through reallocation of funds rather than new monies. Steve stated the university will be looking to see if there is a possibility to have an increment for 2014.
   f. Conversations with the state over pensions and benefits is also seeking to mitigate impact on pay by raising losses due to increased costs for health and pensions and inflation. Until the pension and benefits is resolved it is difficult to see how we will see increments. The current state deficit means that even with
an increase of state revenues the deficit isn’t going to be resolved anytime soon which means budgets aren’t likely to rebound. Politically it looks like the picture will get worse.

g. Despite the budget challenges, NIU is one of the few that have avoided furloughs and layoffs and this is a core institutional value to uphold. So while there have been challenges with salary, no one has lost their position.

h. With all the changes and challenges it is implicit that we need a new funding model for the allocation of funds across the university. Need to find new revenue streams.

i. At what point will level of state funding and what we need to do to get it reach the point where it costs more to secure those funds than the funds we get?

4. Place-holders - a number of key positions are occupied by individuals who are 'place-holders' with replacement hires being placed on hold until the appointment of the new President. What impact is this having on operations and making key decisions in those areas? With the challenges facing the university can we afford to use 'stop-gap' solutions? What plans are in place to ensure continuity of operations.
   a. It was stated that there are no placeholders since the negative implications of doing that are profound. The unique and unprecedented confluence of budget concerns, the changing nature of higher education, lower enrollments, pensions, benefits, and attrition mean NIU cannot put anything on hold. It was stated that the university is committed to moving forward.
   b. The legal issues are being resolved and a number of new compliance procedures are being out in place.
   c. Looking to create efficiencies through data warehouses, increased data transparency, and examining trends over time.
   d. If the new application trend holds, the enrollment pipeline will start to refill and the revenue was help alleviate some of the budget concerns.

5. Budget Statement - the committee requests a formal written response to its statement on budget priorities. How has/is the statement being used? Has it/will it be sent to the BOT?
   a. The list of priorities to IBHE is constrained – it is limited to about 5 items. This list includes the recurring priorities of addressing employee compensation and deferred maintenance. As such, this does include some of the recommendations identified by the committee, but as the list is limited it is unlikely all the items will be included. The list is then acted on by the legislature who may or may not take into consideration the priorities identified by the university to the IBHE.
   b. Provost Alden and Steve Cunningham were not in a position to address whether the committee’s recommendations had been passed on to the BOT. They did note that the new President may take the committee’s recommendations into consideration as he works with the BOT on the budget for the next fiscal year.
   c. Provost Alden and Steve Cunningham noted in their parting comments that despite the challenges they were optimistic about the future and NIU’s ability to meet the challenges.
The Committee appreciated the updates it received on matters related to resources, space and budget and the opportunity to share this information with the wider university community. The information helped inform the committee on the resource, space and budget issues facing the university and on how the university was meeting the challenges it faces. The committee acknowledges and appreciated actions that led to some changes based on its recommendations.

The Committee wishes to make several observations related to how the committee operates, its remit, and on the information it was provided over the year. Members expressed frustration over not being presented with opportunities to provide timely and informed input on resource, space, and budget issues.

1. Much of the information provided to the committee is as a matter of report. The committee is not provided with information up front and as such isn’t in a position to provide any substantive or real time input into decisions related to resources, space, and budget. The committee needs to receive information that it can use to help shape the budget as opposed to merely reporting on the current fiscal status.

2. Information is not only post-hoc, it tends to be at a level that is too general to offer any real insights or understanding to how the budget is allocated or spent. More detail is needed on how monies are allocated and then used if the committee is to be able to offer substantive and timely recommendations. The committee believes more transparency is needed on what is actually spent and the return (outcomes) of that spending and how that is linked to the university’s mission and its strategic priorities.

3. There is a tendency to present information in a manner that fails to acknowledge, in a tangible way, many of the concerns facing employees related to workload and salaries. The committee appreciates the statement that salaries are a priority, but feels there needs to be a more concrete strategy to address this than each year identifying salaries as a priority to the IBHE.

4. The committee feels there is no effective feedback loop that allows it to determine whether the recommendations it does make are taken into consideration and that it’s work isn’t wasted. The committee needs to be better informed on how its work shapes resource, space, and budget decisions.
Resource Space and Budget Committee 2012-2013

Resolution Concerning the Shared Governance Role of the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee in Setting Recommendations for Budget Priorities

Preamble: Bylaw article 2.8 describes an active role for the Resources, Space, and Budget Committee that includes, among other duties, participating with the president and provost to develop long-range plans regarding the allocation and re-allocation of resources; advising the president and provost regarding goals and priorities for the utilization of resources; and offering advice on budgets and space issues. Over the past few years progress has been made in that the president and provost now meet regularly with the Resource, Space & Budget Committee, as required by the Bylaws, however, those meetings primarily involve the administration informing the committee as to what is being done, rather than being the dialogue described by the Bylaws. More progress is needed in order for the committee to perform its functions as described in Article 2.8.

Whereas the University Council is a partner in shared governance; and

Whereas the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee represents the voice of the constituent groups of NIU in the budgeting process and is responsible for offering recommendations for budget priorities; and

Whereas the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee requires timely and detailed fiscal information instead of post-hoc summary reports; and

Whereas the absence of such detailed and timely information adversely impacts the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee’s ability to meet its charge and to be an effective and an active partner in shared governance;

Therefore be it resolved:

That the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee be given budget relevant information early enough in the budgeting process to allow it to help shape budget recommendations and priorities.

That the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee be given detailed information on how monies are allocated that is transparent with respect to funding formulas, actual expenditures and the return on that spending; and how such expenditures are linked to the university’s mission, strategic priorities, and future funding.

That the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee be included in the process of shaping action plans that address resource, space and budget issues as they align with identified budget priorities.

That the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee is provided with feedback that allows it to evaluate how its work shapes resource, space, and budget decisions.
That the Resource, Space and Budget Committee be an active partner in shaping the dialog on budget recommendations.

Respectfully Proposed,

Resource, Space, and Budget Committee
April 2013
Memorandum

To: University Council
From: Kathleen Coles, Chair
University Affairs Committee
Re: Status Report Concerning Proposed Student Grievance Procedures

Date: April 29, 2013

This report summarizes the current status of efforts to develop new student grievance procedures to address perceived gaps in existing NIU procedures, a task that was assigned to the University Affairs Committee (UAC) by the University Council in November 2011. In the winter of 2011, the UAC began work on the grievance project, and this year’s committee has continued with the task. These ongoing efforts have resulted in the preparation of an outline of proposed new procedures, a copy of which is contained in Attachment A.

It must be stressed that the attached proposal is simply a discussion draft, and much work remains to be done to refine the procedures, vet them through university counsel and Human Resources, and complete a write-up of the underlying research and consultations. Nevertheless, substantial progress has been made in (i) identifying the relevant concerns and needs of the students, faculty and staff involved, (ii) researching procedures at other universities, (iii) developing the key features of proposed procedures for NIU that attempt to balance the needs and concerns of the affected constituencies, and (iv) obtaining preliminary comments on the draft from a number of interested parties.

At its last meeting on April 24, 2013, the UAC discussed the comments received to date on the proposal and approved a few changes in response. Because the semester is coming to an end, the committee decided to defer action on more comprehensive revisions and recommended that a volunteer working group be established to continue developing the proposal over the summer, in consultation with university counsel and others. By keeping the process going, the committee’s goal is to assist next year’s UAC in preparing a proposed amendment to the university bylaws that will set forth fully developed new student grievance procedures for submission to University Council during the fall of 2013. No action is being requested of the Council at this time.

The remainder of this report consists of attachments that describe the primary concerns and needs of the constituencies affected by the proposed procedures, set forth a brief chronology of key developments surrounding the student grievance project, and summarize the suggestions and comments received to date with respect to the proposal outlined in Attachment A.

Over the next few weeks, additional comments and suggestions may be submitted to the UAC by e-mail to kcoles@niu.edu. After June 30, any correspondence should be addressed to the newly constituted University Affairs Committee for 2013-2014.
(1) Conduct giving rise to actionable grievance

(2) Required attempt at informal resolution, including right to request mediation

(3) If no informal resolution is reached by 30th day after conduct giving rise to actionable grievance, a written complaint must be filed with 15-person Student Grievance Committee within next 30-day period

(4) Three-person panel of Student Grievance Committee reviews written grievance, conducts appropriate investigation and issues findings, based on which the committee may act as follows:

- Deny the grievance
- (5) Refer the grievance to mediation or to Affirmative Action
- (6) Order an informal hearing by a five-person committee panel; based on panel’s findings, committee may act as follows
- (7) Impose moderate sanctions for cause
- Deny the grievance
- (7) Impose moderate sanctions for cause
- (8) Refer matter to supervising authority for sanctions

*Above numbers refer to the following comments*
(1) Actionable Grievances. Actionable student grievances would be defined as “capricious, arbitrary, unreasonable, false, malicious or professionally inappropriate acts or decisions by a member of the faculty or staff of the university.” Complaints of discrimination or harassment, appeals of disciplinary decisions, complaints about grades, and other complaints for which written procedures are provided by separate university policy or regulation would be excluded from this Student Grievance Procedure. The new grievance procedures would only be available to an undergraduate or graduate student who was enrolled at the university at the time the conduct giving rise to an actionable grievance took place and who filed a written grievance in accordance with the time limits established in (2) and (3). All proceedings with respect to a student who files a written grievance, including all hearings, must be completed by no later than six months following the date on which the student either graduates or otherwise departs from the university.

(2) Attempt at Informal Resolution Required. As a condition to filing a written grievance under (3), a student would have to provide written evidence that he or she attempted to obtain an informal resolution of the disputed conduct by making a good faith effort to meet (with or without the participation of a supervisor) with the party against whom the grievance is raised. Whether further informal up-the-ladder meetings would be required as part of the informal resolution process would be determined by the written procedures of each department or college. Either party would have the right to request mediation at any time. All attempts at informal resolution, including mediation and additional departmental or college procedures, would be required to be completed within 30 calendar days after the last act in the conduct giving rise to an alleged actionable grievance, except that the parties could agree to shorten or extend the 30-day period for an additional 30 calendar days by written agreement.

(3) Grievance Committee. After the expiration of the 30-day period for informal proceedings (as shortened or extended), students would have another 30 calendar days within which to file a written grievance with the Student Grievance Committee. This committee would be composed of fifteen members chosen from among the following constituencies:

- faculty
- SPS
- operating staff
- students
- Human Resources
- the Council of Deans

Determinations by the committee as a whole would require a quorum of eight committee members and a vote of at least a majority of those present at the meeting where such determinations are made.

Subject to review by university legal counsel and development of more detailed procedures. The numbered paragraphs in these comments correspond and relate to the procedures summarized in the numbered boxes in the preceding flow chart.
(4) Investigation and Screening. Upon receiving a written grievance, the committee would appoint a panel of at least three committee members from three different constituencies to review the student’s written grievance form. The panel would also be empowered to conduct an informal investigation to obtain facts relevant to the grievance. After making written findings of fact concerning a student grievance pending before it, the investigating panel of the Student Grievance Committee would report to the committee as a whole, which would be empowered to make the following determinations: (i) deny the grievance; (ii) refer the grievance to mediation or Affirmative Action, if appropriate; (iii) order an informal hearing; or (iv) impose moderate sanctions on a faculty or staff member for cause without further proceedings.

(5) Mediation or Referral. A referral to mediation may be appropriate at this stage if there have been no earlier attempts at mediation or if facts emerge during the committee’s informal investigation that indicate it would be appropriate to refer the matter to mediation again. A referral of some grievances to Affirmative Action may also be appropriate if it becomes apparent during the committee’s informal investigation that discrimination or harassment may have occurred or there are other issues of compliance within the purview of that office.

(6) Informal Hearing. If the committee determines that it would be appropriate to elicit more facts, assess credibility or develop a record for potential serious disciplinary action, it may order an informal hearing by a panel of not less than five committee members. Each panel must include at least one student member and one faculty member, but may not include any members of the investigating panel or more than two members of any single constituency. All parties would have the right to have a representative present at the hearing for support, but not to speak for them. Following the hearing, the hearing panel of the committee would prepare and submit written findings of fact to the committee as a whole, which would be empowered to either (i) deny the grievance, (ii) impose moderate sanctions for cause, or (iii) refer the matter to the appropriate supervising authority with recommendations for more serious sanctions.

(7) Committee Actions. Based on a written finding that an actionable grievance has occurred, the Student Grievance Committee would be empowered on its own behalf, after investigation but with or without an informal hearing, to impose moderate sanctions, including requiring a letter of apology to the aggrieved student, requiring training in the applicable codes of ethics or other standards of conduct, and sending a committee letter of reprimand or written warning to the faculty or staff member involved, with a copy to the dean or vice president of the member’s college or unit. Decisions of the Student Grievance Committee would be final and no appeals within the university would be available except as provided in (8).

(8) Referral to Supervising Authority. After a hearing and a determination that an actionable grievance has occurred, the Student Grievance Committee would be empowered, as one option, to refer the matter to the appropriate supervising authority for more serious sanctions. In the latter event, any procedures, rights of appeal and sanctions would be determined by the applicable written rules, policies and procedures of the supervising authority, taking into account the findings of fact and any recommendations of the Student Grievance Committee.
Policies Underlying Proposed Student Grievance Procedures
April 25, 2013 Draft

I. Student Needs and Concerns:

- A concern that students, a key constituency in the university, do not have the same degree of procedural protections that faculty and staff enjoy because of the lack of a formal means to address student complaints against faculty and staff for some types of unprofessional conduct.

- A need to give students a greater voice in the grievance process.

- A concern that meaningful sanctions are not being imposed on faculty and staff for unprofessional conduct in dealing with students.

- A concern about long delays in the current informal complaint process and uncertainty about who has the power to make decisions.

II. Faculty and Staff Needs and Concerns:

- A need to protect the rights of faculty and staff when serious sanctions are proposed.

- A need to encourage informal resolution of student complaints at the departmental or unit level and to encourage mediation at all levels.

- A concern that new procedures might interfere with existing complaint procedures or be unnecessarily duplicative.

- A need to provide a method for screening frivolous or vindictive student complaints.
Student Grievance Procedures
Chronology of Key Developments
April 29, 2013

2000 to 2003 University Bylaw Article 11, Grievance Procedures for Faculty and Staff, was developed and adopted by University Council; inclusion of student grievances in these procedures was specifically discussed and rejected (reportedly based on advice of university counsel)

April 2003 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee of the Faculty Senate recommended that the Faculty Senate support creation of a student grievance process for allegations of faculty misconduct against students. Issue was returned to the committee for further study and recommendations.

October 2003 A Faculty Senate report noted that “incidences of egregious unprofessional and/or unethical conduct by faculty” had been reported and that a “very real” problem existed that had to be addressed. Report recommended that the standards set forth in the ethics statement be applied and a methodology for review of violations be instituted. University Council referred student grievance procedure issue to Faculty Senate for further study.

2004-2005 Faculty Senate formed an ad hoc committee to study student grievance issue; 16-member committee reportedly met a few times but took no action

January 2011 Minutes of 1/19 meeting of Faculty Senate: Alan Rosenbaum raised the issue of a student grievance procedure; Ombudsman Tim Griffin explained that there are grievances that are not covered by existing procedures, particularly as to faculty; Human Resource Services does have a grievance process for complaints against staff; Tim estimated that the Ombudsman’s office receives approximately 6 to 10 complaints a year that fall in gap

November 2011 Student Association President raised issue of student grievance procedure at 11/16 meeting of Faculty Senate; consensus reached to have University Council conduct review; Student Association President raised issue of student grievance procedure at 11/30 meeting of University Council and moved to send issue to the University Affairs Committee; motion approved 31-6-3

January 2012 Report of 1/25 meeting of UAC: committee focused on substance and remedies; agreed to use codes of ethics as basis for defining grievances,
but operating staff representative was to review language of staff ethics code re discrimination, exploitation or harassment of students; committee to review faculty grievance procedure, student grade appeal process and procedures at two other universities

**March 2012**

Minutes of 3/21 University Council meeting: Greg Long submitted a proposal regarding disability disclosure, including creation of a grievance board “to adjudicate complaints of disability disclosure, failure to accommodate and related discriminatory acts”; UC decided by a voice vote to refer the proposals to the UAC

**April 2012**

Report of 4/9 meeting of UAC: committee reviewed and discussed a proposed “Guide to University Resources for Students Wishing to Resolve Various Complaints” (the “Guide”) to be placed on the Student Association Website; students also submitted for review a proposed mark-up of University Bylaw Article 11 that would include student grievances in the Article 11 procedures

Minutes from 4/18 Steering Committee meeting: Draft of Guide contained a link to Bylaw Article 11 for complaints based on alleged violations of faculty and staff codes of ethics, which was deemed not acceptable; committee members also questioned whether Article 11 was the appropriate vehicle for student grievances; suggested looking at procedures at other universities and possibility of amending student affirmative action grievance procedures; subsequent e-mail correspondence indicates that, for logistical reasons, a decision was made not to include the Guide as an information item for the last UC meeting, and the Guide was passed on to the next UAC for consideration

**October 2012**

10/11 UAC Meeting: After reviewing the history of the grievance project and discussing various issues that would need to be addressed if the university were to adopt a more formal procedure, the committee agreed that the committee’s tasks should be addressed in phases and that the first two priorities were (1) to obtain more detailed information about the need for new procedures and the types of student complaints that may not be adequately covered by existing procedures; and (2) to obtain information about grievance procedures at other universities.

After the 10/11 meeting, various UAC members met with representatives of the student association and the Ombudsperson to discuss the need for new grievance procedures and the types of complaints not adequately addressed by existing procedures. The Chair also met with a representative of Human Resources to discuss the draft Guide to university resources for resolving various complaints which was prepared by last year’s UAC (see April 2012), with the goal of completing that project as an interim measure.
November 2012 11/7 UAC meeting: committee discussed concerns and needs of students, faculty and staff that were identified during October meetings and tentatively approved release of the Guide; with the help of HR, the completed Guide, which contains links to information about existing complaint procedures at NIU was released. Work continued on research of grievance procedures at other schools.

January 2013 1/30 UAC meeting: committee reviewed a spreadsheet with information summarizing the complaint procedures at various Illinois state universities

February 2013 2/6 UAC meeting: Committee discussed flow chart describing issues and questions that would need to be resolved in setting up a new student grievance procedure; committee decided to begin drafting an outline of new university-wide procedures for discussion at March meeting

March 2013 3/6 UAC meeting: Committee reviewed drafts of proposed student grievance procedures, including flow chart, and findings of needs and concerns of various university constituencies; committee approved various revisions to procedures and agreed that next steps should be to complete survey of MAC universities, circulate a revised grievance proposal and invite representatives of various university offices to participate in next meeting

University representatives were invited to attend April 10 UAC meeting; many of those unable to attend submitted comments on the draft procedures by e-mail

April 2013 4/10 UAC meeting: Representatives of HR and other constituencies and offices attended meeting and, among other topics, gave comments on proposed procedures, explained experiences with university affirmative action procedures and the student conduct board, and answered questions of committee members

4/24 UAC meeting: Changes to draft procedures relating to time periods were approved; other revisions were deferred pending receipt of further comments from HR and university counsel; committee agreed to recommend formation of volunteer working group to continue preparing draft in order to avoid losing momentum over the summer
Summary of Suggestions and Comments Received Regarding Early Drafts of Proposed Grievance Procedures
April 26, 2013

1. Comments regarding the requirement that informal resolution of grievances be sought first:
   
a. Suggestion to emphasize this requirement more to be sure students understand that they cannot proceed immediately to the filing of a written grievance with the new grievance committee

b. Suggestion to reconsider the decision to leave the development of procedures for informal resolution to the discretion of each college, department or unit because the resulting lack of uniformity may lead to charges of unfair treatment

2. Comments regarding the composition and powers of the proposed student grievance committee:
   
a. Concern expressed that the powers proposed to be granted to the committee raise due process issues, particularly the power to issue written warnings or letters of reprimand

b. Questions raised whether a grievance committee of more than 15 members would be necessary in order to handle the workload

c. Need to clarify who enforces committee-ordered sanctions

3. Suggestions of features that would be desirable in the final proposal:
   
a. Include a clause prohibiting retribution or retaliation against students bringing a grievance

b. Ensure that faculty or staff member’s side of any dispute is documented

c. Encourage or allow the participation of the Ombudsperson and the faculty/SPS personnel advisor

d. Include a member of the general counsel’s office on the grievance committee and, perhaps, on each investigating or hearing panel

b. Allow the use of electronic notice and proceedings

---

1 The due process issues are being referred to university counsel for advice and suggestions for resolution.
f. Make clear that a grievant must participate personally in an investigation and appear at any hearing

g. Make clear that an attorney may not speak for the grievant and only one recording of any hearing proceedings may be made

h. Clarify where students may obtain the paperwork to bring a formal grievance

4. Other suggestions and comments:

a. Consider revising one of the existing university procedures, rather than proposing an entirely new procedure

b. Need to provide for periodic review of the grievance procedures and allow for amendment

c. Consider further the logistical problems that may result if an individual grievance procedure is not completed before the spring semester ends

d. Note that education and training will be needed at several levels, including training faculty and staff in their professional responsibilities, devising training procedures as remedies for actionable grievances, and educating students and administrators about the new procedures

---

2 This alternative was considered at a number of points by both the 2011-2012 and the 2012-2013 committees, but none of the existing procedures was deemed appropriate or workable for this purpose (in part because the grievances covered will be against both faculty and staff).
The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Vice-President Heike Hofstetter. After the announcements and correspondence was discussed, the President’s report was given which included:

A) Update on the subcommittees of the Board of Trustees
B) Previous meeting minutes from the Faculty Senate: Alan Rosenbaum gave an update on the Presidential Search as well as on Joint Appointment Policies for Faculty.
C) Update on the issues discussed at the University Council

The subcommittee reports included:

A) Workplace Issues: the committee is working on a survey for OS.
B) Elections and Appointments: Candidate Data sheets for the upcoming OSC elections were sent out to OS (due date 4/19/2013). Elections will be held beginning of May. There are currently 6 vacancies to be filled.
C) Public Relations: The 2 winners of the 2013 OSC Dependent Scholarship were Evan Wittke and Jaclyn Zimmerman.
   Verda Gochee won $82.50 in the 50/50 raffle. Additional funds will be deposited into the expendable account of the Foundation so OSC can use it for Scholarships, etc.
D) APAC: Pat Siebrasse retirement will take place 4/11 at 4 pm in the Chandelier room.
MEMORANDUM

TO: NIU Faculty and Staff

FROM: Steve Cunningham
Vice President of Administration
Acting Executive Vice President, Business and Finance

DATE: April 17, 2013

RE: 2013 Summer Work Schedule

NIU first implemented a four-day summer work schedule in 2003. Following consultation with and recommendations of our staff councils and representatives, President Peters has authorized the continuation of the four-day work week for the DeKalb campus during the summer of 2013. However, over the past few years, an increasing number of offices and services have been required to maintain a normal five-day operational schedule throughout the summer months. Further, current and prospective students, and clients of the university community, are increasingly interested in having access to university facilities on a five-day basis in the summer. As these trends continue, the benefits of maintaining university operations on a five-day basis have grown considerably. Therefore, although the continuation of the four-day summer work week for the DeKalb campus will be implemented during the summer of 2013, this will be a transition year. Alternative summer flex procedures will be coordinated with campus in advance of the 2014 summer timeframe.

The 2013 summer four-day work week schedule will be ten weeks in duration, beginning on Monday, June 3 and extending through Friday, August 9. The regular five-day schedule will resume as of Monday, August 12.

During the Monday through Thursday work week, university offices will be open from 7:30 a.m. through 5:30 p.m. each day. All university offices will be closed on Friday with limited exceptions related to essential service functions and other events/functions that may be scheduled at the university during the summer time frame. The general lunch period is scheduled from 12:00 noon until 12:40 p.m. Individual lunch breaks may vary depending on employee schedules. Additional flex time options are also available, subject to operational needs.

As indicated above, the summer work week schedule is being implemented with the general concurrence of our staff councils and the university community. University supervisors are asked to allow as much flexibility as possible with respect to employee schedules. However, individual supervisors will also be responsible for ensuring that university offices remain open during the required hours of operation and that the business needs of the university are fulfilled. The divisional vice presidents will monitor implementation of summer work schedule options within their respective areas.
of administration.

Specific implementation procedures for the 2013 four-day summer work schedule are attached. We appreciate the dedication of the campus community and staff in adapting to the summer work schedule.

SC/mkm
Attachment
Via E-mail and Printed Copies
Coverage: The four-day summer schedule applies to the DeKalb campus and will include non-negotiated civil service exempt and non-exempt personnel, supportive professional staff, and twelve-month administrative faculty who normally work the regular five-day week. Negotiated employees’ work schedules will be subject to specific provisions of applicable collective bargaining agreements. The four-day schedule and overtime provisions outlined below pertain to the standard 37.5 hour work week. Related provisions shall be prorated for employees whose normal work schedules exceed the standard 37.5 hour work week. It is understood that certain operations cannot precisely conform to this schedule and designated employees therein will continue on regular or specifically amended schedules. Supervisors will continue to work with and notify respective personnel where such operational requirements exist. Seven-day, twenty-four hour operations, such as Public Safety, will remain on current schedules.

University Business Day: The standard work day and office hours will be from 7:30 a.m. through 5:30 p.m., each day, Monday through Thursday. A standard lunch period is scheduled from 12:00 noon until 12:40 p.m. The standard work week will consist of 37.5 hours per week.

Lunch Period: The regular lunch period for office operations should be observed from 12:00 noon until 12:40 p.m. However, supervisors may approve alternative lunch periods depending upon employee and operational needs. Hourly employees may not forego a lunch period for purposes of late arrival or early departure.

Flexible Work Schedules: To provide employees with additional flexibility during the extended four-day working schedule and subject to operational needs and supervisory approval, employees may adjust the starting and ending times of their daily schedules within a 7:00 a.m. through 6:00 p.m. schedule. Supervisors are encouraged to provide employees with as much additional flexibility as possible for this purpose. If an employee cannot adapt to the four-day schedule, the employee (with concurrence of the supervisor) may work something less than the 9.4 hours scheduled work day and utilize accumulated vacation time for the remainder of the day or take the time without pay.

Overtime: Hourly employees are eligible for overtime pay or compensating time off, if the employee works more than 9.4 hours in any one day or more than 37.5 hours in one work week. Overtime schedules are subject to supervisory approval.

Sick Leave and Vacation Days: Sick leave and vacation days will be earned and used on the basis of 9.4 hours per day. Exempt civil service and supportive professional staff employees will claim 1.25 days while hourly employees will claim 9.4 hours for each sick or vacation day used.

Rest Periods: With an awareness that employees will lose 30 minutes of rest period time while working a full schedule during four days instead of five days per week, supervisors may adjust employees’ rest periods on a daily basis to allow for the additional 30 minutes per week. The rest period must be preceded and followed by a substantial work period. Rest periods may not be taken as late arrivals or early departures. Given the shortened lunch period, employees may request (on a daily basis) to apply one or both break periods to an extended lunch time frame, subject to supervisory approval and operational requirements.

July 4 Holiday: Thursday, July 4, will be the scheduled holiday. During this week the four-day schedule will continue to be recognized with Monday, July 1; Tuesday, July 2; and Wednesday, July 3, remaining as the 9.4 hours per day summer work schedule. Those employees who continue on a five-
day workweek will observe the holiday on Thursday, July 4.

Temporary Suspension of Rules: In order to facilitate implementation of the four-day summer schedule, applicable provisions of university policies pertaining to scheduled hours and overtime are amended as outlined above during the four-day summer work schedule time frame.
14.6.4 Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum (CUC)

14.6.4.2 Duties

(A) To recommend general policies regarding the design of the undergraduate curriculum.

(B) To receive decisions from the college curriculum committees regarding the substitution, alteration, addition, or deletion of undergraduate courses and programs not in the area of general education. All curriculum decisions involving course content, description, title, and number shall be reported to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council without committee action or comment unless they involve course duplication or overlap between colleges, cross-college concerns, or university standards.

(C) To review and approve, or return to the originating department or college with appropriate comment, all curricular proposals involving course duplication or overlap between colleges, cross-college concerns, or university standards. Proposals approved by the committee shall be reported to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

(D) To negotiate and resolve questions concerning course duplication or overlap between colleges, cross-college concerns, or university standards that arise from or concerning proposals for curriculum change. If the committee is unable to resolve such questions to the satisfaction of the affected colleges and departments, the questions shall be forwarded to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council for final action.

(E) To make recommendations regarding university policies governing programs of undergraduate study.

(F) To review proposed new programs of undergraduate study and make recommendations to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council regarding them.

(G) To perform such other duties as the Undergraduate Coordinating Council may prescribe.

(H) To serve as the curricular body for interdisciplinary undergraduate curricular material not located in an academic college or colleges, such as UNIV 101 and curricular offerings from the Division of International Programs and the Center for Black Studies. This responsibility includes usual curricular activity (new, revised, and deleted courses as well as other catalog changes), general education submissions/resubmissions, and review of these units’ overall curricular offerings.

---

The rationale for these proposed revisions to the bylaws pertaining to the CUC are:

1) to fix a few grammar errors;

2) to better align the bylaws with the APPM (Guidelines for the Development of Interdisciplinary Courses Section III. Item 18.), which states that the CUC will be the curriculum body for interdisciplinary undergraduate curricular material not located in an academic college.
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 the 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.
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO ARTICLE 19.4
OF THE UNIVERSITY BYLAWS, AS AMENDED

The proposed revisions to the University Bylaws set forth below, as amended, are the result in part of recommendations of the 2010-2011 and 2012-2013 University Affairs Committee (UAC), as conveyed to University Council in a report submitted on April 3, 2013. Those recommendations included a revision to Article 19.4 that would have replaced all annual reviews of the Ombudsperson with a single mid-term evaluation during each three-year term of office of the Ombudsperson.

At the first reading of the proposal at a meeting of the University Council on April 3, some members of the Council expressed the view that persons newly appointed to the office of Ombudsperson should continue to be evaluated annually during the first term in office in order to allow early screening of potential problems. Others have pointed out that it may be important to create an early “paper trail” if a new hire in the Ombudsperson position proves unsatisfactory. In response to those concerns, the members of the UAC met on April 10 and April 24, 2013 to discuss a proposed “friendly amendment” that would require annual evaluations of each person serving as the Ombudsperson during the first two years of that person’s first term in office and then move to mid-term evaluations thereafter (until a new Ombudsperson is appointed). After discussion, the committee voted to adopt an amendment to that effect and submit it to the University Council for a second reading.

Proposed Text of Revised Bylaw, as amended:

19.4 Periodic Evaluation of Ombudsperson

The University Affairs Committee of the University Council will evaluate the performance of each person holding the office of Ombudsperson early in the spring semester of the first and second year of that person’s first three-year term of office and during the fall semester of the second year of each three-year term thereafter. In its evaluation, the committee will take into account information obtained from (i) recent annual reports of the Ombudsperson, (ii) a written self-evaluation submitted to the committee by the Ombudsperson, (iii) the results of surveys of members of the university community who have used the services of the Office of the Ombudsperson during the current term of office; and (iv) other information deemed relevant by the committee. The committee will also provide appropriate opportunities for input from other members of the university community. By no later than the end of the semester in which each review is commenced, the chair of the University Affairs Committee will submit the evaluation to the president, with a copy to the University Council.
19.4 Periodic Mid-Term Evaluation of Ombudsperson

The University Affairs Committee of the University Council will evaluate the performance of each person holding the office of the Ombudsperson early in the spring semester of the first and second year of that person’s first three-year term of office and during the fall semester of the second year of each three-year term thereafter. In its evaluation, the committee will take into account information obtained from (i) recent annual reports of the Ombudsperson, (ii) a written self-evaluation submitted to the committee by the Ombudsperson, (iii) the results of surveys of members of the university community who have used the services of the Office of the Ombudsperson during the current term of office; and (iv) other information deemed relevant by the committee. The committee will also provide appropriate opportunities for input from other members of the university community. By no later than the end of December 31 of the semester in which each year of review is commenced, the chair of the University Affairs Committee will submit the evaluation to the president, with a copy to the University Council.

19.4 Periodic Annual Evaluation of Ombudsperson

The University Affairs Committee of the University Council will evaluate the performance of each person holding the office of the Ombudsperson early in the spring semester of the first and second year of that person’s first three-year term of office and during the fall semester of the second year of each three-year term thereafter. In its evaluation, the committee will take into account information obtained from (i) recent annual reports of the Ombudsperson, (ii) a written self-evaluation submitted to the committee by the Ombudsperson, (iii) the results of surveys of members of the university community who have used the services of the Office of the Ombudsperson during the current term of office; and (iv) other information deemed relevant by the committee. The committee will also provide appropriate opportunities for input from other members of the university community. By no later than the end of the semester in which each year of review is commenced, the chair of the University Affairs Committee will submit the evaluation to the president, with a copy to the University Council.

Submitted to University Council by the University Affairs Committee on May 1, 2013
### 2013-2014 MEETING SCHEDULE

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

**STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**

**FACULTY SENATE**

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</th>
<th>FACULTY SENATE</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY COUNCIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>3 – 5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-STEERING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Clara Sperling Sky Room</td>
<td>Clara Sperling Sky Room Holmes Student Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Holmes Student Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altgeld Hall 225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **August 28, 2013**  
- **September 11, 2013**  
- **September 18, 2013**

- **September 25, 2013**  
- **October 2, 2013**  
- **October 9, 2013**

- **October 23, 2013**  
- **October 30, 2013**  
- **November 6, 2013**

- **November 13, 2013**  
- **November 20, 2013**  
- **December 4, 2013**

- **January 15, 2014**  
- **January 22, 2014**  
- **January 29, 2014**

- **February 12, 2014**  
- **February 19, 2014**  
- **February 26, 2014**

- **March 19, 2014**  
- **March 26, 2014**  
- **April 2, 2014**

- **April 16, 2014**  
- **April 23, 2014**  
- **April 30, 2014**

Spring Break March 9-16, 2014