I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 29, 2014 MEETING

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

   Doris Macdonald, Steering Committee Chair

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – walk-in

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and Andy Small – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

D. BOT Legislation and External Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Rosita Lopez – no report

E. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Alan Rosenbaum – no report

F. BOT Ad Hoc Committee on Sponsored Research Activity and Technology Transfer – Greg Waas – no report

G. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

H. Academic Policy Committee – Sean Farrell, Chair

I. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Paul Carpenter, Chair –

1. Committee meeting report – January 29, 2014 – Pages 11-17
2. Committee meeting report – February 7, 2014 – Page 18
3. Proposed Statement of Budget Priorities – Pages 19-21
J. Rules and Governance Committee – Jeff Kowalski, Chair

K. University Affairs Committee – Bill Pitney, Chair
   1. Proposed Grievance Procedures for Students – Pages 22-44

L. Student Association – Jack Barry, President – report

M. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – Page 45

N. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Deborah Haliczer, President – report – Page 46

O. University Benefits Committee – Deborah Haliczer, Chair; Therese Arado, FS-Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession Liaison – report – Pages 47-48

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

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

   A. Policy change addressing the issue of “D” grades in transfer course work – Pages 49-50
   B. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
   C. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
   D. Minutes, Athletic Board
   E. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
   F. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
   G. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
   H. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
   I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
   J. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
   K. Minutes, General Education Committee
   L. Minutes, Honors Committee
   M. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
   N. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
   O. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
   P. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
   Q. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT
HLC 2014

Campus Site Visit March 3-5, 2014
What HLC looks for

• Evidence over the past 10 years of
  – Alignment of all activities with institutional mission
  – Continuous institutional improvement
  – Assessment and evaluation of all institutional endeavors
  – Assessment of student learning outcomes
  – Integrated strategic planning and priorities
HLC Criteria

Criterion 1
Mission: Guides all university operations

Criterion 2
Integrity: Ethical and responsible conduct

Criterion 3
Teaching and learning: Quality, resources, and support

Criterion 4
Teaching and learning: Evaluation and improvement

Criterion 5
Resources, planning, and institutional effectiveness
Current Timeline

• 19 December 2013  HLC site team identified
• 4 January 2014  Self-Study Report submitted
• January 2014  Self-Study Report and Executive Summary posted
• February 2014  Development of site team schedule
• February 2014  Completion of Resource Room
• 3-5 March 2014  Site visit
Steering Committee

Bill Goldenberg (CVPA)
Kristen Myers (CLAS)
Mary Elaine Koren (CHHS)
Brianno Coller (CEET)
Murali Krishnamurthi (FDIDC)
Beth Towell (COB)

Marc Falkoff (COL)
Laura Vazquez (CLAS)
Doris Macdonald (Chair)
Carolinda Douglass (VPAPD)
Office of the Provost’s Staff
Site Team Visit

• Who?
  11 “consultant-evaluators”

• What?
  Verify, judge compliance, consult, and recommend

• How?
  Planned and spontaneous meetings with all campus constituents

• And Then?
  Team report and recommendation followed by institutional response
Campus Participation

• Know our mission
• Commit and prepare
  – Read the Self-Study Report and the Executive Summary
  – Encourage participation in open forums
  – Respond candidly to site team questions and requests
• Show our Huskie Pride
Questions?

NIU HLC website: www.niu.edu/hlc

Thank you
Committee on Resources, Space, and Budgets

Meeting With The President and The Provost

Wednesday, January 29th, 2014
10:00 - 11:00 Altgeld 225

Prior to the meeting the committee presented the President and Provost with a number of questions. Time did not permit all of the questions to be addressed and where that was the case it is noted. It is hoped that these questions will be addressed at subsequent meetings or information will be presented to the committee electronically.

1. Impact of the Affordable Care Act on the budget.
   - Steve Cunningham outlined some of the concerns around the Act. He noted that 80% of students are insured under their parents. The impact on the budget is seen as less of a concern than the need to establish new employment procedures and processes once the details of the act are finalized in tracking which employees fall under the act. At present it is not clear how graduate assistants, student employees, and extra-help need to be treated under the Act. Tracking this to avoid the stiff penalties under the Act for non-compliance is the area of concern.

2. Status of raises.
   - The President acknowledged that competitive compensation is important and that the university needs to develop a plan to fund salary increases as part of the budget modeling. He laid out in very clear terms the constraints being placed on the university which means raises are unlikely. This includes the budget situation in Springfield with the looming budget gap due to the non-renewal of the higher state income tax level in an election year. This could lead to NIU having to deal with a 10 – 12 % budget cut next year. Further, across the university enrollments are down 15% and with each student generating about $25K per year, this loss in revenue is significant. Given the enrollment numbers for 12 - 13, down 700 students, revenue continues to trend downward across the board. Tuition increases to address the gap will not work since the market will not bear higher rates. With the three major revenue lines going down (tuition, state funding, and student services revenue) it is difficult to fund salary raises. Moreover, without increasing revenues and turning around the downward enrollment trend furloughs and layoffs could arise but is not planned.
   - The President described how important it was to cut costs through efficiencies, increase enrollments, and improve retention to address the growing gap between revenue and costs. He noted that currently there is a growing gap between revenues and costs. Efficiencies can come through restructuring to reduce position redundancy, improve operational efficiency with specific reference made to areas such as accounting and purchasing as well hiring, restructuring, reviewing the university’s committee and governance structures, and breaking down the silos that currently exist and developing more horizontal structures in terms of processes.
The President reiterated statements he has made in several forums including the RSB about the moral and fiscal imperative of recruitment and retention, the need to connect with students, create a positive student experience in all aspects of campus life and academics, and improve time to graduation. If revenues and costs can be brought under control the climate to be able to fund needed raises will improve.

The committee stated that for reasons related to employee morale and NIU’s competitiveness in the job market, it was essential that the administration develop a budget plan to find ways to fund salary increases.

3. Implications of the recent pension bill on the budget.
   - This agenda item was not addressed due to a lack of time.

4. Implications of state tax non-renewal.
   - The President addressed this question as part of the discussion on the status of raises.

5. What specific university wide initiatives on enrollment are planned and/or in progress?
   - The President gave the committee two documents that listed all the current and ongoing initiatives for enrollment and retention. There wasn’t time to discuss the content of these documents but they are provided as part of this report.

6. What do the President and Provost see as the major strategic goals that will be linked to budget allocations?
   - The President and Provost both made reference back to the conversation earlier about the need to address enrollment and retention and that this along with the overarching goal of student career success was the key strategic goal that would guide decisions on budget allocations. They also noted that the university is well placed to move forward on these goals as it has a lot of assets to draw on including strong academic programs, expertise among faculty and staff, its location in a vibrant region, a strong alumni base, and a developing plan focused on the key goal of student career success. The President stressed the need for urgency and taking positive proactive steps forward. The need to remove barriers to success and innovation incentivizing people to promote this was also mentioned.
   - A specific case of where change has been made was described, namely, the move by the Provost and CFO to push recurring expenses within centrally funds to where they are needed locally at the unit for them to control. Base budgets were being adjusted to reflect this change and to address budget alignment. This is viewed as an example of providing full authority, responsibility and accountability to individual units.
   - The new fiscal model will be designed to allow for greater flexibility for carrying funds forward to allow for multiyear planning. The intent is to remove the “use it or lose it” budget planning model and also to avoid making across the board cuts and instigating contingency planning.

7. Growth of administrative positions at NIU relative to faculty positions.
   - Provost Freeman asked for clarification on what specific concerns the committee had and what information they wanted. It was explained that the essence of the question was whether the number of associate/assistant vice provost/presidents had grown in recent years at a faster rate than faculty and instructional positions as highlighted nationally. It was noted that a number of these positions had been recently advertised.
and that it wasn’t clear who was in these roles or why such roles could not be filled with less senior status which come with much higher salaries.

- Provost Freeman outlined the rationale behind the decision to seek a Chief Diversity Officer at the Vice President level. She explained that in order to give such positions authority, the higher rank was needed. Moreover, this was to consolidate in one office and through one officer functions currently spread across multiple units at the university. Another example of this will be a change in title for the Unit Head for faculty development.

- The committee commented that this rationale could also be used to address a concern that had been raised that faculty positions were generally at the assistant professor. To be more competitive and recruit academics on the cutting edge of their disciplines, active grant recipients and leaders in their respective fields, academic units need to be able to hire at the full professor level to help strengthen their academic units.

- A request has subsequently been sent to Provost Freeman asking for a list of the Associate/Assistant Vice Presidents/Provosts and who is in the position along with an organization chart showing how these positions are linked. With the recent organizational changes, such a chart would be helpful in identifying all the new units and roles and how these units, and the individuals in them, are connected.

8. What is envisaged for the next round of budget hearings in terms of the involvement of the RSB committee?

- There wasn’t enough time to address this question although it was reiterated that the President and Provost believed the committee should play an important and active role in the budget process.

- It was noted that the committee would use the Annual Statement of Budget Priorities to identify ways in which it could play an important and active role in budget planning and resource allocation.
# Enrollment Efforts Primarily by Admissions Office

## On-Campus Specific Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Number of Events</th>
<th>Category/Event Name</th>
<th>General Purpose(s)*</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Primary Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open House(Summer, Columbus Day, Veterans Day)</td>
<td>Recruiting / Yield</td>
<td>Large on-campus events primarily for potential freshmen and guests to meet with admissions, academics, student services, tour campus and specific academic departments.</td>
<td>HS SR, JR; potential transfers + guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Junior Preview Day (Open House) (Spring)</td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Large on-campus event - primarily for high school juniors (for Fall 2023) + guests. Potential for 'te freshmen and transfers also invited.</td>
<td>HS Juniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transfer Open Houses</td>
<td>Recruiting / Yield</td>
<td>Large on-campus event - primarily for potential transfer students + guests to meet with admissions, academics, student services, tour campus and specific academic departments.</td>
<td>Transfer inquirers, transfer applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Admitted Student Days</td>
<td>Yield - 'Cement The Deal'</td>
<td>Encourage admitted applicants (and guests) to continue to learn more about NIU, and to &quot;confirm&quot; their intention to enroll - &quot;Cement the Deal&quot; event</td>
<td>Admitted Freshmen and Transfer applicants and guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On-The-Spot</td>
<td>Recruiting / Yield</td>
<td>Provides opportunity for individuals to begin and/or complete the application process and to receive an admissions decision</td>
<td>HS Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>Huskie Den On-The-Spot</td>
<td>Recruiting / Yield / Retention</td>
<td>Combines the opportunity for Individuals to begin and/or complete the application process; and an opportunity for current NIU students, staff, faculty to enjoy meeting potential new students in a social setting.</td>
<td>HS Seniors and guests, limited invitation to current NIU students, staff, faculty (limited because of capacity of Huskie Den).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diversity Day*</td>
<td>Recruiting / Yield / Retention</td>
<td>Large on-campus event to generate applications and increase NIU awareness; and also offers opportunity for current NIU students, staff, faculty to participate in recruiting effort and meet with potential students.</td>
<td>Targeted at minority or under-represented potential student populations; also inviting current NIU students, staff, faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discover NIU - DeKalb Days</td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>On-campus events for local high school students.</td>
<td>Local high school juniors and seniors and their teachers and counselors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City Colleges of Chicago Day</td>
<td>Recruiting / Yield / NIU name awareness</td>
<td>Transfers-only-Information-Friday – 2 times each Friday - opportunity to meet with admissions personnel and tour campus.</td>
<td>Potential transfer students and counselors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Application Kick-Off Events (Sept for Fr; Feb for Tr)</td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Provides opportunity for Individuals to begin and/or complete the application process and to participate in a special event (football tickets, etc.)</td>
<td>Potential freshmen or transfer students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>File Completion Weeks</td>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>Provides opportunity for Individuals to begin and/or complete the application process in the week immediately preceding start of Fall or Spring semester.</td>
<td>Potential freshmen or transfer students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## On-Going - On-Campus Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Category/Event Name</th>
<th>General Purpose(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Primary Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Campus Visit</td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Individuals invited to visit campus - 2 times each day (Monday through Saturday) - opportunity to meet with admissions personnel and tour campus.</td>
<td>Potential students (high school seniors, juniors, potential transfer students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As scheduled</td>
<td>Special Group Visits</td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Information sessions and campus tours for visiting High School/Community College and Junior College groups</td>
<td>High School / Community College students and their counselors / teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>T.G.I.S.</td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Transfers-only-Information-Friday – 2 times each Friday - opportunity to meet with admissions personnel and tour campus.</td>
<td>Potential transfer students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season</td>
<td>Community College Football Initiative</td>
<td>Recruiting; Enhancing NIU relationship with CCs</td>
<td>Invite community college students and guests to visit NIU and obtain free or reduced price football tickets</td>
<td>Potential transfer students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>NIU academic program support</td>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>NIU faculty/departmental personnel contacting admitted students to answer questions, encourage &quot;continuation&quot; and enrollment.</td>
<td>Freshmen or transfer admitted students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Off-Campus Specific Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Number of Events</th>
<th>Category/Event Name</th>
<th>General Purpose(s)*</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Primary Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 +/-</td>
<td>Parents' Night</td>
<td>Recruiting / NIU name awareness</td>
<td>Guest speaking at high school Parent nights about the application process for public university, state schools or NIU specifically.</td>
<td>High school seniors and juniors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 +/-</td>
<td>On-The-Spot</td>
<td>Recruiting / Yield / NIU name awareness</td>
<td>Information sessions and file completion opportunities, with immediate admissions decisions - conducted at high school.</td>
<td>High school seniors and juniors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 +/-</td>
<td>NIU Comes To Town (working site)</td>
<td>Recruiting / Yield / Alumni</td>
<td>Mini info sessions located in out-of-state / non-local areas strategically identified as potential feeder areas. Offers opportunity for potential students and guests to meet individually with NIU representative. To be held in local Starbucks or restaurants, libraries, etc.</td>
<td>Current inquirers or applicants located in strategically identified areas. NIU Alumni also invited to participate and meet with potential new students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Out-of-state college fairs + high school visits</td>
<td>Recruiting / Yield / NIU name awareness</td>
<td>Create series of out-of-state recruiting trips that combine college fairs with series of high school / community college visits.</td>
<td>Meet with high school seniors, junior, CC students; HS and CC counselors, generate applicants and increase NIU awareness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Category
- Recruiting Events
- Yield Events
- Retention Events
- Diversity Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting Events</td>
<td>Generate applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Events</td>
<td>&quot;Cement the Deal&quot; - encourage applicants to complete the application process and &quot;confirm&quot; their true intention to enroll at NIU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Events</td>
<td>A recruiting / Yield event that lends itself to inviting current students, staff and faculty to enhance the recruiting efforts and retain students, staff, faculty. Plan to reform current event - contemplate this event into both a recruiting and retention event by balancing NIU's approach to diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource, Budget, and Planning Committee
Retention Initiatives at NIU

The Office of the Vice Provost has continued its collaboration with Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM) to advance and support multiple retention initiatives. Some are ongoing initiatives that, under new university leadership, have become more robust while other initiatives have been recently launched or are in the early planning stages.

1. Office of Student Academic Success (OSAS). Established in 2009 as an outcome of the Great Journey’s Strategic Plan. Multiple programs in place and being used. For 2012-13 annual report, go to www.niu.edu/osas. Click on “About Us” → “Assessment and Reporting.” Below is a partial listing.
   - Early Alert and Referral System (EARS). Collaborative between OSAS and faculty to identify students who may be experiencing academic challenges.
   - Absence Tracking. Student attendance is a major predictor of student success. Program identifies attendance problems early on and throughout the semester.
   - MAP-Works; 76% of students who took survey in AY 2012-13 enrolled in Fall 2013 semester. Data for Fall 2014 Map-Works surveys not yet available. Usage of Map-Works tool is increasing (adopted in residence halls, SAEM units, and FYComp faculty).
   - Student Success Specialists. Each specialist monitors student progress and has student cases. Specialists work with specific colleges on retention initiatives and provide college specific retention data. Specialists also foster campus partnerships that help students connect to the resources that support their success.
   - Student Success Collaborative. NIU worked with the Educational Advisory Board to develop this tool designed to combine technology, research and predictive analytics to promote student success. Expanding usage of program.
   - Transcript Tracking
   - Non-enrollment Calls. Calls to students who are eligible to enroll but have not done so. Based on information received, students are directed to appropriate individuals or resources.
   - Four-Year Degree Paths
   - MidSemester Check
   - Financial Cents (Peer Educators and Money Smart Week are two initiatives)

2. FYComp Peer Advocate Program. This new program grew out of the Retention Summit (November 2013) and then, later, a FYComp Retention Summit held in January 2014. The program is in the process of being implemented in Spring 2014 with a pilot version. The pilot places 24 peer advocates in English 104 writing classes to help students successfully engage in these classes and NIU communities. Applications are being
accepted and qualified students are being placed in ENG 104 classes. The Office of Student Engagement and Experiential Learning is assisting FYComp with the implementation of the program.

3. University Office of Educator Licensure
   - Ongoing preparation of teacher licensure candidates for the Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP) exam. Offered 93 workshops; 7 one-credit hour test preparation courses; 303 tutoring hours; 344 students participated in one or more of these offerings.
   - Dorothy Swanson Endowment for Teacher Licensure Candidates. Newly created fund (an estate gift) that will assist teacher licensure candidates with the costs of becoming licensed; e.g. paying the registration costs for the TAP or other required expenses related to the discipline. In Fall 2013, a committee was formed which established the guidelines, criteria and process for distribution of funds. Each college will receive monies to distribute to qualified candidates in their college starting spring 2014.

4. Transfer Initiatives
   - Updating of course articulations for colleges and universities that do not participate in the IAI. Currently, memo went out to all department chairs regarding articulations and asking that qualified R&R evaluation staff be allowed to articulate direct equivalences for certain transfer courses. In the process of hearing back from Colleges; LA&S is planning to propose a new process.
   - Reverse Articulation Agreements. Recently signed agreement with Kishwaukee Community College. Other agreements are in the works.
   - Preparation for the Spring 2014 Advising and Transfer Articulation Summit is underway. Venue for updating community college transfer officers about NIU programs and initiatives. Revisions to the General Education program will be covered and means of soliciting input from our community college partners will be discussed.

5. Financial Aid Programs – Retention Initiatives
   - Near the end of the fall semester the Office of Financial Aid had unused funds from the Huskie Advantage Program. The Director of Financial Aid (Rebecca Babel) identified over 200 students who could not register for spring semester because they had an outstanding balance on their accounts ranging from $500-$1,000. Each student was contacted and asked if they planned to register for the spring semester if their balance as paid.
   - The Office of Financial Aid also collaborated with the academic colleges in identifying students (mostly seniors) who had an outstanding balance on their
accounts. A few of the colleges had unused scholarship funds that could be distributed to their seniors, as well as other students.

- Academic Affairs and SAEM have a long range program that will be launched very soon. It will allow the academic colleges and the Office of Financial Aid to better organize our efforts to distribute unused funds to students who have financial holds on their accounts at the end of the fall and spring semesters.

6. Admissions – Recruitment Initiatives

- The On-the-Spot Huskie Den event is used to encourage students to complete the admissions process and receive an admissions decision on-the-spot. Small groups of current NIU students, faculty and staff are also invited to attend and enjoy bowling, games etc. and meeting potential new students/families. The event was a great success this past year. We look to expand upon the program in the coming year.

- NIU Celebrate Diversity Program – All students admitted to NIU are invited to attend this event. It is designed to celebrate diversity at NIU and was modeled after a program at USC Santa Cruz. There are a number of concurrent sessions that are offered which highlight the diversity that currently exists at NIU. This past year there was both a faculty and student panel.
Committee on Resources, Space, and Budgets

Friday, February 7th, 2014
9:00 - 10:00 Altgeld 225

The primary focus of this meeting was to prepare the Annual Statement of Budget Priorities to present to Faculty Senate and University Council.

1. Andy Small raised the question about the role the committee would play in the upcoming HLC visit and the importance of committee members understanding how the committee aligned with the university’s mission.
   a. Discussion followed about the committee’s alignment with the university mission and the four pillars identified by President Baker and the guiding goal of student career success.
   b. Given the committee’s remit to address resources, space and budget its focus cuts across all elements of the university’s mission and is well placed to see the ‘big picture’ and contribute to developing the institutions budget planning and resource allocations through the process of shared governance as the committee’s membership includes representation from all university constituents.
   c. Nancy Suttenfield updated the committee that she had been asked to meet with the site visitors to discuss budget planning and resource allocation. She had formed a group to meet the site team that included staff from her office and also the chair of RSB.
   d. It was noted that the self-report for the HLC had been submitted prior to the new administration and its refocusing on budget planning and resource allocation to incorporate transparency and wide input and consultation.

2. The committee spent the rest of the meeting discussing the statement of budget priorities and also the committee’s role in the proposed new fiscal model.
Committee on Resources, Space and Budgets  
Statement of Budget Priorities – Spring 2014

Preamble

The Committee on Resources, Space, and Budgets (CRSB) is very encouraged with the new direction being taken at NIU as it relates to fiscal transparency and the greater and timely involvement of the university community in the budget planning process. The changes that have occurred to date address many of the issues raised in the resolution passed by Faculty Senate and University Council in Spring 2013 that called for linking budget to goals, greater transparency, timely information, and a more active role for the committee is being realized. The committee wishes to thank President Baker, Interim Provost Freeman, Interim CFO Nancy Suttenfield, and Vice President for Administration Steve Cunningham for providing the committee with timely information and actively engaging with the committee as the university develops a new fiscal model.

With the continuing prospect of financial uncertainty and the changing fiscal landscape of higher education, the CRSB believes it is paramount that this new direction is carried forward over the next year and the momentum for change maintained. Moreover, the CRSB believes it is important that it be actively involved in the process and that changes in the allocation and reallocation of funds be guided by careful consideration of the consequences of such changes on academic quality.

In its advisory role, CRSB has prepared the following statement of budget priorities.

Resources

- Overall budget allocation needs to be prioritized to safeguard the academic mission of the university by supporting and improving the academic quality of those programs and services that directly promote excellence and engagement in teaching and learning, research and scholarship, creativity and artistry, and outreach and service.
- To stay competitive and be at the forefront of developments nationally and internationally, NIU needs to establish a coherent policy on course articulations, the approval of prior experiential learning, and explore the potential of competency-based education.
- Innovative teaching models (e.g., online education, hybrid teaching models, ‘flipped classrooms,’ flexible scheduling) need to be encouraged and supported through funding allocation models that incentivize faculty to develop such teaching resources and instituting operating system changes (e.g., in how classes are scheduled) to facilitate change.
- Enrollment is critical to NIU’s long-term sustainability. Resources need to be allocated to ensure the effective marketing of NIU’s current programs, identifying prospective students who meet NIU’s entry requirements, and to establish new student markets.
Additionally, we recommend that an integrated marketing plan be developed that works to connect prospective students applying to NIU with their interest in specific programs and to increase recruitment efforts on attracting students with the qualifications and potential to be successful in pursuing their degree and major.

- While changes to employee pension and insurance programs are largely occurring outside the control of NIU Administration, maintaining adequate pension and insurance benefits as part of an overall compensation package is essential to retaining current faculty and staff as well as recruiting highly qualified candidates in the future. The committee suggests that the administration explores other ways to offer attractive compensation such as dual partner hires and does all it can to ensure that accurate information on pensions is disseminated and to develop a plan to address how raises can be afforded. In addition, the committee advises that more attention be given to the impact of recent pension rules changes such as the 6% rule and the hiring of retirees.

Space

- The committee recommends exploring how existing space can be better utilized and maximized to meet the university’s academic mission through, for example, the shared and collaborative use of space and multipurpose space utilization.
- A master plan should be developed to identify where new space is required with a view to establishing a stronger sense of community and identification with the university.
- The committee is concerned about the long-term consequences of the need to defer maintenance due to budgetary constraints as it is undermining the university’s core education, research, and community service missions.
- With the challenges imposed by the State’s fiscal crisis, the committee believes the NIU Administration needs to continue to seek innovative ways such as through public-private partnerships to fund new facilities across campus to keep NIU competitive with other public universities.
- Existing space needs to be examined for its potential to be used to generate revenue through rentals fees, conferences, and conventions.
- As the use of space is repurposed and plans developed to build new facilities the CRSB believes, based on its remit, that it be part of these discussions.

Budget

- NIU’s faculty, staff, and student employees are central to the operation and success of the university. While meeting the university payroll must continue to receive the highest priority, it is essential that efforts be made to improve employee compensation, which remains substandard. This was identified as a top priority of the Vision 2020 initiative and should be treated as such.
- It is clear that the State fiscal crisis is not going to end anytime soon or past levels of funding will be restored. It is essential that NIU finds new and additional sources of revenue and the committee recommends that a working group be formed to identify these sources; to determine what support structures are needed to pursue these sources; and educate and incentivize the NIU community to seek such revenue streams.
• Effort should be directed toward initiating budget planning that allows units to roll over funding at the end of a fiscal year to help eliminate frivolous spending that sometimes occurs at year end.

• As new revenue streams are explored the role of the Foundation will be critical and an integral part of budgeting and fiscal allocations. Given this, the CRSB needs to be provided with financial information from the Foundation to ascertain how Foundation funds are integrated into the overall budget.

• The cost of a university degree has been highlighted as a growing concern for students and their families. The committee encourages the NIU Administration to examine the current tuition costs and fees with regards to individual programs and university set support fees in a manner that values a broad liberal arts education. As part of this, breaking down how student fees are used and whether students can opt out of paying for fees they do not use will be important to meet the goal of fiscal transparency. Further, the committee encourages the Graduate School to examine the impact of graduate student fees on graduate assistantships.

• The committee encourages the NIU Administration to continue to explore efficiencies and cost savings in university operations and governance processes including looking at energy efficiencies that are eco-friendly and sustainable. Several areas, Accounting, Purchasing, and Hiring, were highlighted as having the greatest potential for realizing efficiencies along with developing procedures and processes that aren’t subject to change or reinterpretation when staff turnover occurs.

RSB Role in the New Budget Process

• In the proposed new budget model, budget hearings will be an important part of the process. As the process of budget hearings is operationalized, the CRSB believes it should be a collaborative partner with the CFO, Provost, and President in establishing the metrics and benchmarks to be used in fiscal allocation decisions.

• The CRSB also believes it can play an active role and should be represented in the budget hearings.

• Through a consultative process with the constituents the CRSB serves, it will identify issues, concerns, gaps, and solutions and use this information to work collaboratively with the President, Provost, and Chief Financial Officer to help maximize institutional success as identified through the university’s mission and stated strategic goals.
University Affairs Committee Report to the University Council

Grievance Procedures for Students

February 21, 2014

Overview

During this past academic year the University Affairs Committee (UAC) met on several occasions to continue the work of the previous UACs (since 2011) and further develop a student grievance process. The UAC supports the need for a student grievance process in order to reinforce the civil treatment of students on our campus. A university-wide grievance policy also addresses accreditation expectations required in many programs. The Higher Learning Commission supports the need for a clear set of guidelines to address student complaints. In response to these issues, this report is organized to:

- describe the need and rationale for such a policy.
- suggest a proposed student grievance process developed by the UAC (with input from students, HR, and other relevant constituencies), and
- present a new article for the NIU bylaws for consideration by the University Council
- provide background information regarding the history of this issue with the Faculty Senate/University Council.

Why Is a Grievance Policy Necessary?

A Student grievance policy can help ensure that students are treated with respect and dignity, a cornerstone of our constitution. In addition, many accrediting agencies expect programs and the larger university to already have student grievance policies in place. Having a policy also provides an internal feedback mechanism for the university. That is to say, each year a report would be provided by the committee to the UC that summarizes the previous year’s cases. Similar to the report issued by the Ombudsman, the yearly report would be presented in summary form only. Specific individuals and/or cases will not be disclosed. The yearly report would, however, potentially help identify areas of concern, training and/or support.

Benefits to students—Treatment

The preamble of the NIU constitution states that “[r]espect for the intrinsic dignity of each member of the university community, both by the university itself and by each member of that community, is the basic cornerstone governing all community activities.” As a constituent, if not the key constituent of a student-centered institution, students deserve to be treated with respect and dignity.

In its joint statement on rights and freedoms of students, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) comments that “Freedom to teach and the freedom to learn are inseparable facets of academic freedom” and that the “…general conditions conductive to the freedom to learn is shared by all members of the academic community.” (AAUP, pg. 273). If a student is treated in such a way by faculty or staff as to substantively interfere with his/her ability to fully engage in the learning process, there are currently only informal processes in place to address the dispute.

By way of example, one area of concern for student rights relates to the treatment of students with disabilities. In March 2012 and again in November 2013, Professor Greg Long, UC/UAC member and chair of NIU’s
Presidential Commission on Persons With Disabilities (PCPD) since 2007, presented reports to the UC stating that students with disabilities, particularly those with invisible disabilities (e.g., chronic illness, LD, mental illness) routinely encountered faculty/staff members who expressed frustration to students in having to make accommodations. In some instances the faculty/staff member discloses the student’s disability and creates an environment where the student feels humiliated and degraded leading him/her conflicted in terms of whether to actively engage in the classroom experiences or advocate for himself/herself for fear of more humiliation. The regularity of the behavior was noted in the 2012 report and prompted the development of the NIU Accessibility and Disability Tutorial. During the UC’s November 2013 meeting, Long shared resource materials designed to support the tutorial and increase disability awareness among faculty and staff. All the aforementioned materials are available on the PCPD’s home page (www.niu.edu/pcpd).

The AAUP states that protection against such things as improper disclosure of “…student views, beliefs, and political associations” is a critical component of student rights. Although students on the NIU campus have access to Human Resource Services for issues related to discrimination and harassment, they lack a formal avenue to address any instance when they may been inappropriately treated by faculty or staff. Beginning in 2003 and raised again more recently, the idea of giving students a voice in instances they are treated inappropriately by faculty and/or staff remains a concern. The proposed student grievance process establishes a mechanism for allegations of misconduct.

**Accreditation Requirements and Institutional Improvement**

Among its assumed practices, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) includes procedures for receiving complaints and grievances from students. Practice A.4 under Integrity: Ethical and Responsible conduct states: “The institution provides clear information regarding its procedures for receiving complaints and grievances from students and other constituencies, responds to them in a timely manner, and analyzes them to improve its processes” (Higher Learning Commission, 2014). The processes currently in place with AADR address issues of discrimination and harassment may certainly address this accreditation standard, however, for uncivil acts that do not fit the legal definitions of discrimination and harassment, however, there currently exists no formal procedure in place at NIU.

The UAC examined accreditation standards from a sample of programs in each college. We identified the various accreditation agencies from the NIU website, examined the accreditation requirements from the documented standards from the accrediting bodies’ websites, and compiled a table (see Table 1, Attachment A, pp. 8-10). Of the 17 program standards we examined, 11 accreditation agencies have a requirement that a student grievance process be in place. Here are two examples:

- The Commission on the Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE) standard 95 states: “The institution must have a published procedure available for processing student and faculty grievances” (p. 11).
- The National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences (NAACLS) Standard IV A 1 k.3 states that policies and procedures for student grievance/appeals must be published and readily available.

With respect to these examples, the CAATE standard clearly indicates that an institution must have a published procedure in place; while the NAACLS allows the procedures to be documented in one of six publications (e.g., catalog, website, program brochure). This variation is likely true when comparing other bodies. We recognize that this sample is not representative of all accredited programs at NIU, and various standards can be interpreted in different ways. However, what is clear is that student grievance processes are identified by the majority of accreditation agencies.
As a point of reference, Northern Illinois University is one of six Illinois public institutions of higher education that do not currently have an established student grievance policy in place (see Table 2).

**Table 2. The Status of Student Grievance Policies in Illinois Public Universities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions with a Published Student Grievance Policy</th>
<th>Institutions with no Published Student Grievance Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governors State University</td>
<td>Chicago State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>Eastern Illinois University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Illinois University</td>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University, Carbondale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois, Chicago</td>
<td>University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois, Springfield</td>
<td>Western Illinois University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This reflects whether a university-wide policy is in place for complaints not related to discrimination or harassment.

In another comparison with similar institutions, the UAC examined Mid-American Conference (MAC) institutions. The following four institutions had published student grievance policies: Bowling Green University, University of Buffalo,Kent State University, and University of Massachusetts.

**History of the Grievance Policy**

A timeline of the student grievance issue can be found in Attachment B (pp. 11-13). The student grievance process issue is not new. A student grievance process was originally included in the drafts of article 11 (Grievance Procedures for Faculty and Staff) between 2000 and 2003, but was not supported. In April of 2003, the faculty senate faculty rights and responsibilities committee recommended that the senate support the development of a student grievance process for allegations of misconduct against students. Despite the creation of a faculty senate ad hoc committee in 2004-2005 to study this issue, no action was taken at that time.

The student grievance issue was resurrected in January of 2011 and the ombudsperson, Tim Griffin, reported that about 6-10 complaints from students per year could be addressed by a student grievance process. Dr. Griffin stated that there was no current process in place for such complaints. In the Fall of 2011 the student association president expressed the need for a student grievance policy on two occasions and this issue was sent to the UAC for consideration.

From January 2012 to present the UAC has worked diligently to understand concerns from the perspectives of students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The UAC developed a draft process and presented this to the UC in April 2013 for discussion purposes. Subsequent to this presentation, additional concerns were raised. In the Fall 2013, the UAC continued to meet and modify the draft process in order to allay concerns from various constituents. The chair of the UAC also met with Human Resource Services (HRS) personnel to understand their concerns and modify the process accordingly.

**Spring 2014: UAC Proposed Student Grievance Process**

**When would a grievance process be used?**

An overview of the proposed grievance process for students is displayed in Attachment C (pg. 14-16). An actionable grievance is defined as a "good faith claim of incivility, misuse of authority, intimidation, retaliation or
professionally inappropriate acts or decisions by a member of the faculty or staff of the university that adversely affects the status, rights, or privileges of a student in a substantive way.” If such an act is alleged to occur, students must attempt informal resolution with the faculty or staff member and his/her immediate supervisor before a formal grievance is made. If the student is dissatisfied with the outcome of the informal resolution then she or he may file a written complaint with the executive secretary of the University Council. The timelines associated with each stage of the process are outlined in Table Three.

**Who is involved when a grievance is filed?**

The proposed grievance process includes expanding the current Grievance Committee (GC), selected each year through faculty senate, to also include 15 student members selected from the student association of each college. This would also include a representative for the vice president of administration (VPA). When a grievance is filed, Executive Secretary will appoint a five-person student grievance panel (SGP) to oversee the complaint. Each SGP would consist of at least one faculty member, one student, the VPA representative and at least two members from a respondent’s employment classification.

**What timeline should be followed?**

A student has 20 work days (from the last event) to attempt an informal resolution. If dissatisfied with the informal resolution, the student may then initiate a formal grievance process by filing a formal complaint form (See Attachment D, pp. 17-18) that documents the steps taken to that point. This complaint is filed with the Executive Secretary of the University Council. Once a formal complaint is made, the role of the SGP is to examine the complaint, obtain additional facts, collaborate with Human Resource Services if an investigation is necessary, conduct a preliminary hearing to clarify information, and act accordingly. The time periods and cumulative total for each stage of the complaint process are included in Table Three.

**What are the four possible outcomes that could occur?**

1) Denial of the grievance (grievance not sustained): This would result when the examination finds no basis for the complaint.

2) Referral of the matter to Affirmative Action Diversity Resources (AADR): In instances where the committee finds that a complaint is related to another issue, sexual harassment for example, the matter would be referred to the appropriate authority.

3) Referral of the matter to Alternative Dispute Resolution: This would result when the SGP determines that the complaint is related to a minor dispute or conflict that would best be addressed by a neutral third party.

4) Referral to administrative authority (e.g., Unit Director and Division Director) with an SGP recommendation for action: This will occur when the committee is presented with facts that an inappropriate act did indeed occur and this adversely affected the status, rights, or privileges of a student in a substantive way. The panel itself is not responsible for taking action; rather, it is for enacting due process and identifying a problem and offering a potential solution.
**Table 3. Proposed timeline for student grievance process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step One</th>
<th>Possible extension informal resolution period (20 work days)</th>
<th>Step Two</th>
<th>Step Three</th>
<th>Expectations, examination, screening, and action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By activity</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Must attempt and document attempt at informal resolution**
- Dissatisfied with informal resolution, student files written grievance with Exec. Sec. of UC (ESUC)
- Once formal complaint submitted, ESUC has 5 work days to contact respondents to request a response. Additionally, ESUC has 5 work days to provide GC names to both grievant and respondent for their review.
- Respondents have 10 work days to submit responses to ESUC. Respondents and grievant have 10 work days to provide written request to the ESUC that persons on the GC list be excluded from consideration as SGP members.
- Within 10 work days of the establishment of a pool of acceptable candidates, the ESUC will select the SGP members and convene the panel. The SGP will select a panel chair at this first meeting.
- SGP has 15 work days to review and obtain information and arrive at a decision.
- SGP may call a hearing as needed.
- Final report from SGP due no later than 15 work days following hearing.

**What’s being done to promise consistency among panels and participants**

The UAC recognizes that education and training will be needed at several levels, including training the GC on their professional responsibilities, devising training procedures as remedies for actionable grievances, and educating students and administrators about the new procedures. We envision that training would be required of all GC members so they are well versed in all facets of the grievance process.

**How will the UC be kept informed about the Student Grievances?**

With the student grievance process in place, we envision an annual report from the Executive Secretary to the UC that summarizes the complaints. This information can be used to influence organizational policy and lead to institutional improvement, much like the annual report issued by the Ombudsperson’s Office.

**What faculty and staff protections exist?**

The article draft is presented in Attachment E (pp. 19-22) of this report. We believe there are several facets of this article that address previous concerns expressed by faculty and staff, yet provide students with a means to resolve complaints.
One concern expressed by faculty in 2013 related to how deceitful complaints from students would be handled in the process. The current NIU student code of conduct has areas that address this issue (see Attachment F pp. 23), most notably article 10 (dishonesty) and 15 (fraud). If a complaint provides false or deceptive information, the SGP is empowered to report the violation to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct. (Northern Illinois University Office of Community Standards & Student Conduct, 2013).

A second concern related to whether academic freedom would be violated. Grounds for grievance do not relate to course content or the rigor of one’s course. In fact, the article explicitly states that the procedures do not pertain to the level of academic rigor expected of students in the classroom and that faculty and staff have an obligation to pursue free search for truth.

The last major concern revolved around having a grievance committee with punitive power. In the current draft of the process the SGP does not have punitive power against faculty or staff. That is, the panel cannot sanction a faculty or staff member. The SGP is tasked with following due process by examining information from all parties and recommending action based on its findings. If an allegation is upheld and the SGP believes action should be taken, this is referred to an administrative authority who would act in collaboration with Human Resource Services. The process still gives students a voice and creates an avenue to have allegations documented, examined, and when substantiated, creates a level of notification to administration.

Conclusion

The need for a procedure to resolve student complaints of unprofessional and/or unethical conduct by faculty and staff has been raised for over a decade by students and faculty alike. Respecting the dignity of our students and addressing accreditation requirements creates a convincing justification for implementing a student grievance process.

The student grievance process outlined in this document:

1. affirms academic freedom and rigor;
2. requires informal resolution of a complaint prior to filing a formal grievance;
3. requires a formal, written complaint from a student;
4. involves an independent panel review of evidence from both the complainant and respondent(s);
5. results in one of four actions: a) denial of the grievance, b) referral to AADR, c) referral to alternative dispute resolution, or d) referral to administrative authority with recommendation for action;

Having such a process in place will provide students with a voice for instances when they believe they have experienced incivility, misuse of authority, intimidation, retaliation or professionally inappropriate acts or decisions by a member of the faculty or staff of the university that adversely affects their status, rights, or privileges in a substantive way.

Respectfully Submitted by the University Affairs Committee

William A. Pitney, Chair
References


## Table 2. Grievance Policy Requirements of Selected Accredited Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE AND ACCREDITATION BODY</th>
<th>GRIEVANCE POLICY REQUIRED</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L.2.e. Before the beginning of the first term of enrollment the following should occur for all new students: A student handbook is disseminated that includes the following: A student appeal policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on the Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95. The institution must have a published procedure available for processing student and faculty grievances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING &amp; ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and technology (ABET)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Association of Technology Management and Applied Engineering (ATMAE)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE OF HEALTH &amp; HUMAN SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech Language Sciences (CAA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.6 The program must adhere to its institutional policies and procedures to ensure compliance with all nondiscrimination statutes, including non-harassment policies, internal complaint procedures, and appropriate training programs to ensure that all staff and faculty are made aware of the policies and the conduct they prohibit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences (NAACLS)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV A 1 k. 3. Policies and procedures for student grievances and appeals must be published, defined, and readily available to prospective and enrolled students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Council for Education of Nutrition and Dietetics of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. The program or sponsoring institution must produce and make available to students/interns a complaint policy that includes procedures to be followed in the event of a written complaint related to the ACEND accreditation standards, student rights to due process, and appeal mechanisms.

| Commission on Accreditation for Marriage & Family Therapy Education of the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) | Yes |

IV E. The program has established policies and procedures by which it defines and reviews formal student complaints.

| Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) | Yes |

Published rules that govern the implementation of the academic program including, but not limited to, policies related to admission, progression, graduation, grievance, and grading.

I-G There are established policies by which the nursing unit defines and reviews formal complaints.

| Council on Education for Public Health | No |

| COLLEGE OF LAW |

| American Bar Association | Yes |

Standard 512(a) A law school shall establish, publish, and comply with policies with respect to addressing student complaints.

| Association of American Law Schools | No |

| COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES |

<p>| Committee on Professional Training of the American Chemical Society (ACS) | No |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Association (APA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain E.1 of the G&amp;P addresses the need for accredited programs to recognize the rights of students/interns/residents to be treated with courtesy and respect, to inform them of the principles outlining ethical conduct of psychologists, and to ensure that they are aware of avenues of recourse should problems with regard to these principles arise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF VISUAL &amp; PERFORMING ARTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. B. 12. A catalog or similar document shall be published at least biennially and shall cover: grievance and appeals procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. B. 12. A catalog or similar document shall be published at least biennially and shall cover: grievance and appeals procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B

Note: This attachment was originally constructed by the 2012-2013 UAC; it has been lightly edited and only Fall semester 2013, and Spring Semester 2014 information has been added.

Student Grievance Procedures Timeline of Key Developments

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 legal 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. The 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; Ombudsperson 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 Office of the Ombudsperson receives approximately 6 to 10 complaints a year that fall in that 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 regarding 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 Bylaws 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 Resource Services 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 HRS, 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 flowchart 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 flowchart, 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 HRS 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 HRS and university legal counsel; committee agreed to recommend formation of volunteer working group to continue preparing draft in order to avoid losing momentum over the summer.

Fall semester 2013

UAC met on September 9th to examine student and faculty concerns raised in the April 2013 April status report. The UAC chair met with Human Resource Services in September to explore lingering HRS concerns. The UAC met in October to further develop an alternative model and identify the appropriate actions that may result from the process, as well as the relationship of the student grievance committee and student grievance panel. The UAC met in November to complete the draft of a new article for the bylaws. An oral report was provided to the UC during the December meeting. The draft article and process model for a grievance policy for students was forwarded to legal counsel on December 20th.

Spring Semester 2014

The UAC met in late January to fine tune language in a draft article for the bylaws and give a first read to the UAC report to the UC. The committee worked electronically to make appropriate revisions to the report. On February 6, the chair of UAC, along with Deborah Haliczer, met with Dr. Blakemore for legal consultation pertaining to a draft of the new article for the bylaws. It was suggested that the preamble of the article be changed to align with the pillar of ethically inspired leadership, and that language be added to prevent a formal grievance being processed in the event the issue had been addressed through another mechanism (e.g., through AADR).
## Attachment C—Overview of Process and Timeline

### Proposed timeline for student grievance process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All days represent work days</th>
<th>Step One</th>
<th>Possible extension informal resolution period (20 work days)</th>
<th>Step Two</th>
<th>Resolution fails, grievance filed</th>
<th>Step Three</th>
<th>Expectations, examination, screening, and action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative</strong></td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By activity</strong></td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Must attempt and document attempt at informal resolution</strong></td>
<td>Dissatisfied with informal resolution, student files written grievance with Exec. Sec. of UC (ESUC)</td>
<td>Once formal complaint submitted, ESUC has 5 work days to contact respondents to request a response. Additionally, ESUC has 5 work days to provide GC names to both grievant and respondent for their review.</td>
<td>Respondents have 10 work days to submit responses to ESUC. Respondents and grievant have 10 work days to provide written request to the ESUC that persons on the GC list be excluded from consideration as SGP members.</td>
<td>Within 10 work days of the establishment of a pool of acceptable candidates, the ESUC will select the SGP members and convene the panel. The SGP will select a panel chair at this first meeting.</td>
<td>SGP has 15 work days to review and obtain information and arrive at a decision.</td>
<td>SGP may call a hearing as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Step 1:** Conduct grievance giving rise to actionable grievance.

- Required attempt at informal resolution, including right to request mediation.
- This will typically involve the respondent and/or his/her immediate supervisor (e.g., department chair).

**Step 2:** If informal resolution fails, a written complaint must be filed with the Executive Secretary who will then construct a student grievance panel (SGP) from members of the grievance committee (GC).

**Step 2 Continued:** The SGP reviews the written grievance, examines the facts presented, conducts an investigation as necessary in collaboration with Human Resources, and may also conduct a preliminary hearing. The SGP will decide on an adequate course of action and file a report. One of four courses of actions may be taken:

- Deny the Grievance/Grievance Not Sustained.
- Refer the matter to AADR.
- Refer the matter for Alternative Dispute Resolution (impartial third party facilitates communication between disputing parties to promote reconciliation, settlement, or understanding).
- Refer to Administrative Authority Unit director (e.g., Chair) and Division Director (e.g., Dean) with a SGP recommended action.
Step One: Event occurs and information resolution attempted.

Actionable grievances are defined as “Good faith claims of incivility, misuse of authority, intimidation, retaliation or professionally inappropriate acts or decisions by a member of the faculty or staff of the university that adversely affects the status, rights, or privileges of a student in a substantive way.” Complaints of discrimination or harassment, appeals of disciplinary decisions, complaints about grades, and other complaints for which written procedures are provided by separate university policies or regulations would be excluded from this Student Grievance Procedure. The new grievance procedure is only available to an undergraduate or graduate student who is enrolled at the university at the time of the conduct giving rise to an actionable grievance, who has a documented attempt at informal resolution, and who filed a written grievance in accordance with the time limits established.

As a condition to filing a written grievance under, 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 the party against whom the grievance is raised, or the individual’s supervisor. Whether further informal meetings with faculty or staff up-the-chain of command 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.

Step Two: Informal resolution fails and formal grievance filed

Initiation of Formal Grievance. After the expiration of the 30-day period (20 work days) for informal proceedings (as shortened or extended), students would have 14 calendar days within which to file a written grievance. The written grievance will be submitted to the executive secretary of the University Council.

Step Three: Examination, screening review, and actions

Once a grievance has been received, a student grievance panel (SGP) will be established to oversee it. The SGP will be composed of five members from the GC and must include 1 faculty member, 1 student, the VPA representative, and two additional appointees from the Executive Secretary. At least 2 members must be from the respondent’s employment classification.

The GC is to be composed of 60 members with 15 representatives from the following constituents: faculty, operating staff, supportive professional staff, and students. The GC will also include the vice president of administration or his or her designee which must be included on the SGP.

Examination and Screening. Upon receiving a written grievance, the SGP will review the student’s written grievance form. The panel will work with the AVP representative to obtain additional facts as necessary and relevant to the grievance. The SGP may request additional information from either party and may conduct a preliminary hearing in order to sort out details pertaining to the case. In the event a preliminary hearing is conducted, all parties may have a representative present at the hearing for support, but not to speak for
them. Following the hearing, the SGP will prepare and submit a report with written findings of fact and identify an appropriate course of action.

In instances when the SGP calls a preliminary hearing, the panel may request legal counsel support for itself concerning procedural and substantive matters. The grievant and respondent(s) are entitled to consult with any person(s) they choose, prior to or outside of the hearing. In addition, each party is allowed to have present during the hearing one non-participating advisor. The hearing shall be closed to all other non-participants. Witnesses shall be present only if invited by the committee and only when providing testimony or being otherwise involved as invited by the committee. Prior to the hearing, the grievant and the respondents shall each deliver to the SGP all relevant written information and other material as evidence supporting their respective positions, including a description of the original grievable act. This information will be shared with both the grievant and respondent(s).

The specific hearing proceedings will be conducted consistent with these stipulations and in a manner determined by the SGP. The grievant and respondent(s) are entitled to be present during any presentation by another party. The SGP may admit any evidence it feels may be important in addressing the issues under consideration, including written or oral testimony from any persons who might provide evidence or information relevant to the grievance. If a witness is unable to appear personally at an information hearing, a signed written statement may be accepted by the SGP. These statements will be made available to all parties.

The grievant, the respondent(s), and each member of the SGP shall have the opportunity to question each witness. Grievants and respondents may not question each other without express permission of the SGP chair. The vice president for administration or his or her designee will ensure the participation of all respondents and witnesses summoned by the SGP, including the guarantee of work-release time as necessary for participation.

Committee Actions. Based on the SGP examination and screening of the grievance, four outcomes are possible: 1) Denial of the grievance (grievance not sustained), 2) Referral of the matter to Affirmative Action Diversity Resources, 3) Referral of the matter to alternative dispute resolution, or 4) Referral to Administrative Authority (e.g., Unit Director and the supervisor(s) to whom the director reports) with a SGP recommendation for action. Within five (5) working days of the SGP decision, the chair of the SGP shall forward a written report of the findings and recommendations to the Unit Director, Division Director, the grievant, and the respondent(s). This report need not contain negative judgment of the actions of any party and it may include recommendations for systemic change, such as modification of procedures or working conditions. In instances whereby an action is recommended by the SGP, the Unit and Division Director will work with Human Resource Services to act on the recommendation.
Attachment D

Formal Student Grievance Complaint Form

Last Name          First Name          Middle Initial

z-id:               Home Phone Number   e-mail address

Major College       Major Department

Today’s Date        Date of Alleged Act(s)

Who is this grievance against? ____________________________________________________________

                      Name          Department

Describe the act for which you are filing a grievance:

Steps of informal resolution that you sought:

With whom did you meet to seek information resolution? The faculty or staff member’s immediate
supervisor must be included in the informal resolution process.

                      Name          Department

                      Name          Department

One what date did you seek informal resolution: ______________
Witness(s) (if any):

_________________________________________________________________________________
Name                                                                              Contact Information
_________________________________________________________________________________
Name                                                                              Contact Information
________________________________________________________________________

Describe how the act has adversely affected your status, rights, or privileges in a substantive way:

Is the act for which you are filing a grievance related to:
A grade in a class? __Yes __No
Sexual Harassment or Discrimination? __Yes __No
Threat of Violence? __Yes __No

I, the undersigned, do hereby authorize the student grievance panel and any designated University officials pursuant to the procedures established in Article 22 of the University Constitution and Bylaws to conduct inquiries or investigation procedures as needed with respect to the investigation/resolution of this grievance. I understand that information regarding my grievance may be shared with applicable University officials in order to acquire sufficient information with respect to the investigation as well as any follow-up activities that may be required in relation to the University’s response to my grievance. I also authorize the University to use whatever information may be obtained with respect to this grievance in any legal or formal grievance proceedings that may involve the issues contained herein. I affirm that I have read the above grievance and that it is true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

___________________________________       _______________________________________
Signature                     Date        Student Grievance Committee Chair          Date
Attachment E

Grievance Procedures for Students

Article 22

22.1 Preamble

As a student-centered institution of higher learning, Northern Illinois University strives to create a professional environment that is free from incivility, misuse of authority, intimidation, or retaliation. This grievance policy is intended to be consistent with the preamble of the Northern Illinois University Constitution which declares that “Respect for the intrinsic dignity of each member of the University community, both by the university itself and by each member of that community, is the basic cornerstone governing all community activities.”

Enactment of the grievance procedures shall promote the values inherent in the American Association of University Professors’ “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.” That is to say, faculty and staff have an obligation to (a) promote the common good, (b) pursue a free search for truth, and (c) protect students’ freedom in learning. The pursuit of these values shall not be cause for grievance, especially if conducted within the individual’s discipline or as a member of a learned profession. Students do, however, have a right to expect that these values be demonstrated throughout the university.

Throughout these procedures, all persons involved should exercise discretion in receiving and transmitting information pertaining to the complaint.

22.2 Summary of Time Lines for the Grievance Process

Initiating the formal grievance process is possible once an attempt at informal resolution has been completed. A written complaint must be filed with the Executive Secretary of the University Council within the next 10 work day period (see formal procedures).

Once a formal grievance is filed, each respondent is to be contacted within 5 work days and allowed to submit a response within 10 work days. Within 5 work days the Executive Secretary forwards to the grievant and respondent(s) the names of Grievance Committee members eligible to serve on the Student Grievance Panel (SGP) to oversee the complaint. The grievant and respondent(s) will have 10 work days from receipt of the GC members’ names to request the Executive Secretary to exclude people from consideration as members on the SGP. members who are eligible to serve will have 15 work days to review the facts, gather additional information as necessary, and come to a decision regarding the complaint. If an initial hearing is necessary, it must be called by the SGP by the end of its 15 work-day review period and the hearing must be executed within 15 work days of being called.

22.3 Grounds for Grievances

These procedures provide opportunity for a student to seek resolution of allegations of unfair treatment by faculty or staff in the University setting. Grievances may include good faith claims of incivility, misuse of authority, intimidation, retaliation or professionally inappropriate acts or decisions by a member of the faculty or staff of the university that adversely affects the status, rights, or privileges of a student in a substantive way.

22.3.1 Exceptions. These grievance procedures apply only to those claims that are not expressly covered under other University, Board of Trustees, or state procedures. Other procedures exist for the following matters, which shall not be subject to this grievance procedure: discrimination, sexual harassment, title IX, appeals of disciplinary decisions, claims pertaining to student employment, graduate assistantships, and grade complaints. In some situations (e.g., situations involving violence, or the threat of violence), informal conciliation may not be appropriate. In such cases, response should follow procedures established in accordance with Illinois state law, including workplace violence protocols, and established threat assessment procedures. These grievance procedures are not applicable to faculty and staff governed by collective-bargaining agreements. A formal grievance cannot be filed for complaints that have been addressed by another procedure (e.g., discrimination).
22.3.2 Academic rigor. These procedures do not pertain to the level of academic rigor expected from faculty of students in the classroom.

22.4 Informal Procedures

STEP 1. The University encourages the maintenance of positive student-faculty/staff relations that includes effective communication and feedback and attempts to informally resolve complaints. The University strongly encourages attempts to resolve issues through informal procedures, beginning, if possible, with the faculty or staff member against whom the student has a complaint, and, prior to invoking formal grievance procedures, must include his or her immediate supervisor (e.g., department chair, unit supervisor). Initial attempts will normally include discussions with those alleged to have committed the action or conduct described above. Where confidential mediation or alternative resolution option is agreed to by the parties, such processes may be used as a substitute for their grievance procedures to conclusively resolve grievable issues. The complainant must be notified of the right to end the informal process at any time and initiate a formal grievance.

22.4.1 Facilitation. In an effort to resolve complaints informally, those involved in the discussion are urged to invite the assistance of other university employees or offices, such as, but not limited to, the University Ombudsperson, Human Resource Services, and/or the faculty and SPS personnel advisor, to facilitate communication and strive toward resolution of disputes. In all discussions the complainant and respondent shall have the right to choose, and be accompanied by, a representative (including student, faculty, or staff member) as a non-participating advisor, other than a person acting in the capacity of legal counsel. This is an administrative process, not a legal process and legal representation is not appropriate at this time. As these discussions look toward conciliation, no transcripts or recordings shall be made.

22.5 Formal Procedures

STEP 2. Should the problem not be satisfactorily resolved on an informal basis, the complainant becomes a grievant and may initiate the formal grievance procedures. The grievant must complete and submit a formal grievance form to the Executive Secretary of the University Council. Executive Secretary will forward a copy of the grievance form and accompanying materials to the respondent(s). Each respondent shall have 10 work days to submit a response to the Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary will provide both the grievant and respondent with grievance committee (GC) names and both parties can provide a written request to exclude any individual from consideration for inclusion on the student grievance panel. The Executive Secretary will then assign a 5-member Student Grievance Panel (SGP) to screen and review the complaint. The SGP will examine the complaint, any response received, and obtain further information as necessary from either party, and determine whether an investigation, in collaboration with Human Resource Services, is necessary to collect more information to make an informed decision. If the SGP determines that it would be appropriate to elicit more facts, assess credibility, or develop a record for potential serious disciplinary action, it may order a preliminary hearing. If a hearing is necessary, it must be called for within 60 work days of the formal grievance.

In the event a preliminary hearing is conducted, all parties may have a representative present at the hearing for support, but not to speak for them. Following the hearing, the SGP will prepare and submit a report with written findings of fact and identify an appropriate course of action.

In instances when the SGP calls a preliminary hearing, the panel may request legal counsel support for itself concerning procedural and substantive matters. The grievant and respondent(s) are entitled to consult with any person(s) they choose, prior to or outside of the hearing. In addition, each party is allowed to have present during the hearing one non-participating advisor. The hearing shall be closed to all other non-participants. Witnesses shall be present only if invited by the committee and only when providing testimony or being otherwise involved as invited by the committee. Prior to the hearing, the grievant and the respondents shall each deliver to the SGP all relevant written information and other material as evidence supporting their respective positions, including a description of the original grievable act. This information will be shared with both the grievant and respondent(s).

The specific hearing proceedings will be conducted consistent with these stipulations and in a manner determined by the SGP. The grievant and respondent(s) are entitled to be present during any presentation by another party. The SGP
may admit any evidence it feels may be important in addressing the issues under consideration, including written or oral testimony from any persons who might provide evidence or information relevant to the grievance. If a witness is unable to appear personally at an information hearing, a signed written statement may be accepted by the SGP. These statements will be made available to all parties.

The grievant, the respondent(s), and each member of the SGP shall have the opportunity to question each witness. Grievants and respondents may not question each other without express permission of the SGP chair. The vice president for administration or his or her designee will ensure the participation of all respondents and witnesses summoned by the SGP, including the guarantee of work-release time as necessary for participation.

The SGP will meet immediately after the informal hearing in a private session to reach a conclusion pertaining to the grievance. The SGP will then create a report to be disseminated as identified in the post-hearing process.

22.6 Post-Hearing Process

Appropriate courses of action can include: 1) Denial of the grievance (grievance not sustained), 2) Referral of the matter to Affirmative Action Diversity Resources, 3) Referral of the matter to alternative dispute resolution (eg, mediation), or 4) Referral to Administrative Authority (e.g., Unit Director and Supervisor(s) to whom the director reports) with a SGP recommendation for action. Recommended actions may include, but not be limited to, a letter of apology or an educational intervention. Within five (5) working days of the SGP decision, the chair of the SGP shall forward a written report of the findings and recommendations to the Unit Director, Division Director, the grievant, and the respondent(s). This report need not contain negative judgment of the actions of any party and it may include recommendations for systemic change, such as modification of procedures or working conditions.

In instances whereby an action is recommended by the SGP, the SGP will send a report to the Division Director and Unit Director with a recommended action. The Unit and Division Director will work with Human Resource Services to act on the recommendation.

The executive secretary is to maintain records pertaining to each grievance including the outcome. The SGC chair will provide a summary report of the number of grievances filed and the disposition to the UC at the April meeting each year.

22.7 Composition of the Grievance Committee

The grievance committee (GC) is to be composed of 60 members with 15 representatives from each of the following constituents: faculty, operating staff, supportive professional staff, and students. The GC will also include the vice president of administration or his/her designee who must be included in any SGP constructed to oversee a complaint. Faculty representatives, operating staff representatives, and supportive professional staff representatives are to be selected by lot through the Faculty Senate at its first meeting. Student representatives are to be selected from the student associations at each college and must include both undergraduate and graduate students.

22.8 Composition of the Student Grievance Panel (SGP)

The student grievance panel is to be assembled by the Executive Secretary as needed from the various members of the GC. The panel is to be composed of five members with representation from at least one faculty, one student, and the vice president of administration or his or her designee. At least two members must be from the same employment classification as the respondent(s). The SGP will select a chair from within the panel to be decided by the committee.

22.9 Conflicts of Interest

In instances where a grievance involves a member of the SGC or relates to a SGC member’s organizational unit (e.g., department), that member is prohibited from serving on the SGP that will screen the grievance. In the event that a member of the SGP has a conflict of interest related to the alleged act, he or she must recuse himself or herself and is to be replaced by an alternate. The grievant and the respondent(s) each have the right to present written justification to request exclusion from committee membership any panelist(s) as described in Section 22.8. Also, any SGP member can request to be excluded on the basis of a real or potential conflict of interest or personal relationship.
22.10 Retaliation

Retaliation is strictly prohibited against any individual(s) who participate(s) in the process in the following manner(s) utilizing the grievance procedures, providing information under these procedures, cooperating in an investigation under these procedures, serving as a witness in a grievance hearing, or otherwise participating in grievance proceedings. Claims of retaliation in Steps I and II should be reported to the VPA, and in Step III to the VPA and the Executive Secretary, and proven claims will subject the offender(s) to corrective measures, including disciplinary action.

22.11 Appendix

22.11.1 Definitions

Complainant. A student presenting a complaint.

Complaint. An allegation that there has been an adverse situation as described by:

Executive Secretary. The executive secretary of the University Council. Please visit http://www.niu.edu/u_council/ to identify the executive secretary.

Grievance. A formal, written allegation, not resolved by the informal steps of section 22.4, that there has been an adverse situation as described in section 22.3.

Grievant. A student who is presenting a grievance.

Observer. A person who is present at a preliminary hearing but is in no way a participant or advisor while the hearing is in session.

Respondent. A person whose action is identified as possibly contributing to the adverse situation described in the grievance.

Vice President for Administration (VPA). The senior administrator responsible for human resource services.

Work day(s). All days during which the University is normally scheduled for operations, excluding weekends, official holidays, and closure periods. For employees on appointments of less than 12 months per year, “work days” do not include any days outside of the period of their appointment.
NIU Student Code of Conduct – areas applicable to students who misuse a grievance process

10. Dishonesty: Acts of dishonesty include but are not limited to the following forms of deceit:
   a. Furnishing false information to any Northern Illinois University official, faculty member, or office representative;
   b. Forgery, alteration, or misuse of any Northern Illinois University document, record, or instrument of identification.

11. Disruptive Behavior: Disruption or obstruction of a University activity including but not limited to teaching, research, administration, disciplinary proceedings, athletic competitions, club sports, University public service functions, or other authorized non-University activities when the conduct occurs on Northern Illinois University premises; conduct that is disorderly, lewd, or indecent; or aiding or procuring another person to disrupt activities on University premises, functions, or events.

15. Fraud: Acts of fraud include deception, forgery, alteration, or the unauthorized use of University documents, records, or identification.

18. Harassment: Acts of harassment include the use of words or actions that persistently and wrongfully attack another person. The unwanted communication must be objectively offensive to a reasonable person before it may be considered actionable harassment.

22. Noncompliance with University Officials: Failure to comply with directions of Northern Illinois University officials or law enforcement officers acting in the performance of their duties and/or failure to identify oneself to these persons when requested to do so is prohibited.

26. Stalking: A pattern of behavior directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear for her or his safety. A person commits stalking when he or she knowingly engages in a course of conduct directed at a specific person, and he or she knows or should know that this course of conduct would cause a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety or the safety of a third person or suffer other emotional distress. A person commits stalking when he or she knowingly and without lawful justification on at least two separate occasions follows another person or places the person under surveillance or any combination thereof, and at any time transmits a threat of immediate or future bodily harm, sexual assault, confinement, or restraint and the threat is directed towards that person or a family member of that person.

Stalking also includes cyber stalking, when a person knowingly and without lawful justification on at least two separate occasions intimidates, torments, or terrorizes another person or that person’s family member(s) through the use of electronic communication and transmits a threat of future bodily harm, sexual assault, confinement, or restraint; or knowingly solicits another person to commit stalking or cyber stalking; or creates and maintains an Internet website or webpage accessible to one or more third parties for a period of at least 24 hours containing harassing statements as outlined above toward another person or that person’s family member(s). Repetitive, non-consensual communication of any kind, including that which involves the use of electronic equipment or technology for the purposes of cyber stalking, is also a violation of the University’s Acceptable Use Policy; examples include but are not limited to e-mail, voicemail messages, text messages, instant messages, global positioning systems (GPS), and cell phone software applications.
To: The NIU University Council February 26th, 2014
Fr: Andy Small, President Operating Staff Council
Re: Operating Staff Council Meeting, January 9th, 2014

The OSC meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by President Andy Small. During the announcements, there was a review of the university's mission statement and the upcoming HLC accreditation visit was discussed.

Nancy Suttinfield was the guest speaker for the day. She gave an excellent presentation of the financial structure of the university and the upcoming opportunities that her office is looking at.

The staff identified two areas that she could help with:

1) Streamlining the Accounting and Procurement areas.
2) Finding a way to keep "end of the year" funds so that they could be held over to purchase needed items rather than be wasted at the yearend state funding process.

The subcommittee reports included:

A) Workplace Issues: The staff survey will be completed at the end of February and will be distributed in March. This will help to identify areas of opportunity and areas that are functioning well for the operating staff.

B) Elections and Appointments: A restructuring of the Council was discussed. This included a discussion on what the Council membership should look like and how the duties of the officer's should be distributed.

C) Public Relations: A number of awards and scholarships were discussed including:

1) Outstanding Service Award Deadline for submission was 2/28/14
2) Pat Siebrasse AAPC Award Deadline for submission is March 28th
3) Operating Staff Dependent Scholarship Deadline was 2/28/14
4) Operating Staff Service Awards Banquet May 1st, 2014

Respectfully Submitted

Andy Small
The SPS Council met on February 13, with two guest speakers. Police Chief Tom Phillips gave a presentation of actions he has taken and activities of the NIUPD. Council members were pleased to hear reports of improved working relations with local law enforcement departments, and efforts to enhance perceptions and realities of campus safety. The second speaker was Professor Doris Macdonald, who reported on the upcoming Higher Learning Commission site visit, scheduled for March 3-5. Operating Staff Council colleagues were invited and a number attended this meeting.

After a number of announcements of campus activities and events, including the sixth anniversary February 13 Moment of Reflection, the Council discussed and voted on a number of proposed new awards and recognitions. Lesley Gilbert was chosen to receive the SPS Council Service Award. The April 15 awards reception will feature the four SPS Presidential Award for Excellence recipients, and the SPSC Service Award, approximately two dozen Certificates of Recognition, and the five new awards: the SPS Award for Excellence in Supervision; the SPS Award for Institutional Advancement; the SPS Award for Advocacy; the SPS Award for Cultural Competency; and the SPS Award for Collaboration and Partnerships. These new awards will recognize SPS or other individuals for their contributions to the campus mission and will be initiated this spring. The recipients of the SPS Dependent Scholarship will also be recognized.

The Council discussed results of our review of the SPSC Constitution, and voted to approve a number of revisions. The scheduled electoral reapportionment was postponed until next year in light of recent and potential further institutional realignments and reorganization. The elections for new Council representatives and alternates and for a Council president will take place in March.

Council members were encouraged to review the Higher Learning Commission’s self study and executive summary in preparation for the upcoming visit. Members were encouraged to participate and attend scheduled forum events. The Council will participate in the March 26 annual Health and Wellness Fair. The Council heard a report on proposed changes for faculty and staff recognition events. Starting this year, it is proposed that all faculty and SPS will be recognized for service starting at ten years, and again every five years. A luncheon is the proposed event.

It was announced that there will no longer be a four day work week this summer, but a policy on summer flex hours has been sent to all employees.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Haliczer, President, Supportive Professional Staff Council
UNIVERSITY BENEFITS COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT from January 30, 2014

The University Benefits Committee met on January 30, 2014. The Committee discussed extensively the status of pension “reform” and its implications for faculty and staff who are eligible to retire. A recent presentation by Dr. Steve Cunningham was given at the Faculty Senate, and many questions have been raised. SURS has posted current information on their Web site, and the NIU Annuitants Association and State Universities Annuitants Association have pushed out a fair amount of information on what the pension law means to employees and retirees, but many ambiguities exist, and many who have read the information or heard the presentations claim they feel confused. SURS has committed itself to come for retirement counseling sessions in late April, and has also committed to hold a campus meeting for faculty and staff about what the changes will mean. Ambiguities exist, and SURS is waiting for clarification from their legal counsel. It appears that the changes are likely to take place as stated in the law and not delay implementation until the lawsuits are resolved. Employees appear to be using the NIU Naperville site for retirement consultations with SURS.

Other business:

- The CMS Dependent Audit for employees who are insuring dependents on their health insurance will be delayed until August, rather than as scheduled in January. HR will provide guidance. CMS will have letters mailed to employees’ homes.
- The UBC recommends that all employees join the Annuitants Association to keep well informed about pension issues.
- Human Resources has continued a program of “vendor consolidation”, and has cut to two the number of vendors who may market their 403(b) plans to employees. Affected employees who are participants in the two other plans have been contacted. They have been “grandfathered” and may continue their contributions to those vendors, but no new employees can begin to participate in those companies.
- In the area of morale and workloads, the UBC sent a letter to President Baker and others urging that the University refrain from increasing parking permit fees in an era of financial stress on employees. It should be noted that the Parking administration and chair of the Parking Committee each gave reassurance of their practice of limiting increases and being sensitive to employee financial pressures.
- A second letter was sent to President Baker, thanking him and his cabinet for canceling classes and closing the University for several days during harsh weather. More important, however, was acknowledging the timely notice sent out to all students, faculty and staff in advance of the closures, using multiple communication routes.
The Committee continues to advocate for administrative attention to salaries and increments. We understand the fiscal pressures on the University, but continue to advocate for increments at the earliest feasible opportunity.

Responding to the committee’s and faculty and staff councils which have requested an enhanced recognition of employees’ service, the Administration is arranging for new faculty/staff events to recognize service. The three Councils are discussing what they prefer for such events.

The annual Health and Wellness Fair will be held on Wednesday, March 26.

A 403(b) vendor event will be held on March 4 at the Holmes Student Center, allowing all employees to speak with representatives of the two remaining 403(b) companies.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Haliczer, University Benefits Committee
February 14, 2014

Alan Rosenbaum
Executive Secretary of the University Council
Department of Psychology

Dear Dr. Rosenbaum,

In accordance with University Council Bylaw 14.5.5 which states that substantive changes in policy under the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council must be reported to the University Council, I am hereby notifying you of a change in policy related to the awarding of transfer credit. The change in policy addresses the issue of “D” grades in transfer course work.

The 2008-09 undergraduate catalogue states that NIU will accept D grades in transfer. With the implementation of the MyNIU system, NIU was no longer able to use the formula that had been in place for transferring in D grades. As a result, a policy change occurred and the undergraduate catalogue was changed in 2009-10 to state that NIU accepts no D grades in transfer. This change of policy has resulted in NIU no longer being in compliance with the statewide Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) agreement that allows transfer of completed Illinois transferable General Education Core Curriculum (GECC) between participating institutions without loss of credit. In changing the D policy language to what is stated below, NIU will respect the IAI agreement as well as not discriminate against transfer students who do not participate in the IAI/GECC agreement.

**Academic Regulations**

**Other Catalog Change**

**Transfer Credit**

- General Provisions
- NIU does not accept … … department concerned.

NIU accepts no D grades in transfer. Courses in which a grade of “D” is earned will not be included in the transfer credit evaluation.

NIU will accept completed transfer work with a grade of “D.” Be advised that a grade of “C” or better is necessary to meet the requirements for many core competency courses, prerequisite courses, majors, minors and certificates.
In arriving at this policy change, a sub-committee of the advising deans group consulted practices for accepting transfer credit at other Illinois institutions. The proposed change will place us in line with standard institutional practices. In addition, the sub-committee considered the policy change in light of student academic progress (SAP), financial aid, VA credit, and orientation. Their findings were positive. The proposed catalogue language was shared with the advising deans committee as a whole as well as the curricular deans committee, which was asked to share the change with their individual college curriculum committees. Both the advising deans and the curricular deans committees endorse the change. APASC approved unanimously this policy change at its October 30, 2013 meeting. UCC accepted the APASC recommendation by unanimously approving their minutes at the December 12, 2013 UCC meeting.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Cordially,

Anne L. Birberick
Vice Provost

cc: File
    D. Smith, Catalogue Editor