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Minutes of the
NIU Board of Trustees
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, STUDENT AFFAIRS
AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
February 27, 2014

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Robert Marshall at 12:38 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room, 315 Altgeld Hall. Recording Secretary Sharon Banks-Wilkins conducted a roll call of Trustees. Members present were Trustees Robert Boey, Wheeler Coleman, Anthony Iosco, Cherilyn Murer, Marc Strauss, Student Trustee Elliott Echols, BOT Chair John Butler and Chair Marshall. Also present were Committee Liaison Lisa Freeman, President Douglas Baker and Acting Board General Counsel Gregory Brady. With a quorum present, the meeting proceeded.

**VERIFICATION OF APPROPRIATE NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING**

Confirmation of Open Meetings Act public notice compliance was provided by Acting Board General Counsel Gregory Brady.

**MEETING AGENDA APPROVAL**

Trustee Strauss made a motion to approve the meeting agenda. Student Trustee Echols seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

It was moved by Trustee Murer and seconded by Trustee Iosco to approve the minutes of the November 7, 2013 committee meeting. The motion was approved.

**CHAIR’S COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair Marshall recognized University Advisory Committee members Andy Small and Dan Gebo. Mr. Small acknowledged the participation of Chair Marshall as the Board of Trustees representative to the Merit Board for the State of Illinois. For those who do not know, Mr. Small said, the Merit Board is an organization that rules and governs the civil service state statutes for the State of Illinois. We wanted to duly note Trustee Marshall’s participation there and let him know that we truly appreciate his efforts.

Our agenda covers four information items and five action items, Chair Marshall said. The information items include the Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Update, an update regarding the Chief Diversity Officer/Associate Vice President for Academic Diversity, Faculty Presentations on Sabbatical Leaves, and the Fifth Annual Report on the Outcomes of Sabbatical Leaves. Action items include a Recommendation for Faculty and Supportive Professional Staff Sabbatical Leaves for the 2014-2015 Academic Year; a Request to Delete a Concentration; a Request for a New Minor, New Emphases and a New Specialization; the Report on Oral English Proficiency for 2012-2013, and a Request for Transfer of Tenure and Tenure-Track Locations.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

The Chair asked General Counsel Brady if any members of the public had registered a written request to address the Board in accordance with state law and Board of Trustees Bylaws. Mr. Brady noted that he had received no requests to address this meeting.
UNIVERSITY RECOMMENDATIONS/REPORTS

Agenda Item 7.a. – Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Update

After months of preparation, Dr. Freeman said, the time is upon us for the HLC site visits. Doris Macdonald, the Chair of the HLC Steering Committee will be providing us with a brief update on what has transpired since the last meeting of this committee and what will be happening between the time the peer review team arrives on campus Sunday night and the post-departure thank you celebration that Dr. Baker and I have planned for the steering committee.

I know you have received regular updates, Dr. Macdonald said, so I am going to fill you in on where we are today. The team will arrive on Sunday. They have been in contact with each other, but Sunday night the 11-member team will meet together for the first time. They will begin their work Sunday night and on Monday morning will begin meetings with many constituents on campus. This team of 11 will be splitting up to cover the over 60 meetings that have been scheduled.

The HLC is very evidence and outcomes based, so they look for evidence of what we have done in the past ten years (our last comprehensive visit was in 2004). They are reorganizing their process, so we will be changing in the future to more of an annual updating procedure. Over the past ten years, we are looking at evidence of alignment of what we do with our mission. The commission is very interested in understanding how we meet our mission in all that we do in every operation on the campus. They also are looking for continuous improvement. They look for assessment evaluation and are especially concerned with student learning outcomes and strategic planning and priorities. We have created our self-study report based on the criteria the HLC has determined we will have to address. The Executive Summary is organized around these five criteria: mission, that the mission guides all our operations; mechanisms in place for ethical and responsible conduct; teaching and learning, the support we have for learning and the support we provide for teaching and learning; teaching and learning, how we assess and evaluate and improve teaching and learning; and strategic planning, how we plan and integrate our planning across campus. The executive summary, in fact, is a redaction of the conclusions in the report that outlines our successes, opportunities and challenges that have come out of the report.

We received our final site team list of peer evaluators on the December 19, the last day of operations here before the holiday break. We submitted the report electronically, with an electronic resource room and other documentation, to the HLC and to the site team on January 4. Throughout January, we worked to create an executive summary and post both the executive summary and the self-study report on our web page. This past month, Carolinda Douglass and her staff have been developing a site team schedule. There are people that the site team chair wants to see and meetings they want to have, and there are people we can suggest they meet with. Through this iterative process, they have created a very comprehensive and incredibly detailed schedule for the two and a half days the peer evaluators will be here. Also, in February, we completed the electronic resource room and the physical resource room, which is housed in Holmes Student Center.

Faculty from across campus have participated as steering committee chairs. The largest committee was made up of these chairs, who broke up the task of addressing those five criteria into smaller tasks and gathered evidence, gave us data, analyzed the data, told us why they thought it was important to include in the report, and they have worked very hard for the past two and a half years. The Steering Committee has been really essential and key to the process, so if you see them, please thank them. Of course, Carolinda Douglass and all of the Provost’s Office staff have been essential to this, as well as every other division on campus. The 11-member team will consist of the chair and 10 peer reviewers. They will look to our self-study report and will verify that what we have said in the report is accurate. They will judge compliance, largely federal compliance, and that we are meeting all federal regulations. They will consult with us and they will make recommendations. After they finish their visit here, within, 30 days they will produce a team report which will be submitted to us for verification of facts. In June or July, when the Higher Learning Commission has its board meeting, they make their decision for accreditation or accreditation with follow up.
A couple of ways that everyone can participate is to know the university's mission. The Division of Marketing and Communications has created these wonderful pocket cards that have the Mission Statement and our web address on the back. Pass those down. It is a very straightforward mission. It is excellence in engagement and all that we do – teaching and learning, research and scholarship, creativity and artistry, and outreach and service.

You can commit and prepare for the meeting by reading the self-study report, reading the executive summary, knowing what this Steering Committee has seen come out of two and a half years of self-study. Encourage participation in any forums. We also have these handy little door knob hangers which have Bold Futures on one side and on the other is one of the initiatives we have been engaging in fairly intensively, our General Education program, and NIU Plus, a revisioning of the undergraduate studies. Lastly, we have the website where the self-study report, the executive summary and minutes of our meetings are posted, along with our countdown clock that says, “3 days” until the team arrives.

You have been extraordinarily organized, Trustee Murer commented, and you have brought together this Steering Committee that has done an incredible job. I do a lot of work in accreditation and always like to see this viewed as something very positive. It is a time for self-examination and it really forces us to look introspectively. This self-examination has been wonderful, and I just wanted to express our appreciation for the incredible amount of work that you have put forth.

Let me add in capital letters, THANK YOU, Chair Marshall said. I was able to serve on a couple of the visiting teams back when it was North Central that did the accreditations. There is a tremendous amount of work, and it is a cooperative effort of the whole campus.

**Agenda Item 7.b. – Update Regarding Chief Diversity Officer/Associate Vice President for Academic Diversity**

On January 24, President Baker used his weekly message to the campus to announce that NIU will soon launch a national search for a Chief Diversity Officer who will also serve as Associate Vice President for Academic Diversity, Interim Provost Freeman stated. The new Chief Diversity Officer will serve on both the President’s Cabinet and the Council of Deans and will report to the Executive Vice President and Provost. This is to emphasize that we expect this new colleague to be a vital member of NIU’s senior leadership and to assume responsibilities such as, but not necessarily limited to, working collaboratively with the university leadership, the academic units and other appropriate offices to recruit and retain faculty, staff and students from underrepresented groups and diverse backgrounds; leading or facilitating standing and ad hoc committees that support and promote academic diversity, equity and inclusion; coordinating activities and initiatives focused on academic diversity and multiculturalism; developing and maintaining active partnerships with the external community and the alumni affinity groups in support of diversity, equity and inclusion at NIU. The search will be launched officially in August. Before that, the President and I will be appointing a task force representative of the university community, and they will spend the remainder of the spring semester seeking stakeholder feedback and examining best practices and organizational models at other universities. This task force will report their findings to the President, Provost and a to-be-named search committee.

I very much appreciate the leadership in this particular area, Trustee Butler remarked. President Baker and Interim Provost Freeman know that this is a very important issue for the Board and one that has been discussed extensively in this committee. The Board has taken up a number of sometimes controversial, complicated and difficult issues related to diversity. I am very pleased with your process and that we are going to take some time to work with the stakeholders and determine what they would expect out of a hire of this nature, because they need to have that input for this to become an improvement within the institution.

**Agenda Item 7.c. – Faculty Presentations on Sabbatical Leaves**

As the Board of Trustees knows, NIU awards sabbatical leaves to faculty and professional staff for the purpose of supporting and encouraging scholarship, research and artistry that strengthens our academic
The next three agenda items are related to sabbatical leaves. The first of these provides the Board with a wonderful opportunity to see first-hand how two of our productive faculty members used their sabbatical opportunities. Our first presenter will be Professor Judy Ledgerwood, who received her Ph.D. from Cornell in 1990 in Anthropology and Southeast Asian Studies. She is Director of the Center for Southeast Asian Studies and a professor in the Department of Anthropology. Dr. Ledgerwood is a cultural anthropologist whose research interests include violence, memory, reconstruction of meaning in post-war and diaspora communities and gender. Her current research is focused on Cambodian Buddhism and ideas of cultural identity. Dr. Ledgerwood spent her sabbatical leave during the fall semester of 2010 in a rural village near Phnom Penh, Cambodia, where she has been engaged for a long-term research.

I am pleased to join you today to discuss my recent sabbatical, the research I conducted, the benefits to students of participating in that research, and subsequent teaching and outreach exercises, Dr. Ledgerwood began. As many of you probably know, between April 1975 and January 1979, a radical communist movement known as the Khmer Rouge, or Red Khmer, ruled Cambodia. In this brief timespan of less than four years, somewhere between 1.5 and 2 million Cambodians died. That is roughly between one in four and one in five people in the country, so no family was left unscarred. My academic career has focused on the lives of Cambodians in the aftermath of this tragedy. I have studied family structures, gender roles, social and political patterns, and, most recently, religion. My teacher, May Ebihara, was the only American anthropologist to conduct graphic research in Cambodia before the revolution. She lived in a village called Sabay in 1959-60. I was her research assistant when she returned to conduct follow up research in the same village in the mid-1990's. Since her passing in 2005, I have continued to conduct research there, including, most recently, my sabbatical in 2010. Our combined research documents the lives of people in one village across the war and the devastation of the Khmer Rouge years, the U.N. peacekeeping mission in the early 1990’s and now, the integration of Cambodia into the world economy.

May Ebihara's original research was done in 1959 and is following the lives of those individual families who were resident in the village in 1959-60 all the way through today. What in 1960 was a rural rice growing village is today a suburb of Phnom Penh where most households have at least one member working as wage laborer in the city. Most of these are young women working in garment factories making clothing that have labels you would recognize, like Gap and Old Navy. I have documented these changes in journal articles and book chapters and plan to publish a book length manuscript on the history of this village.

While I would be happy to discuss my research more specifically, I wanted to discuss two other aspects of my work that directly involve students. First, in 2010, I took 12 students to Cambodia on an ethnographic field school, the third one I have run in the last 10 years. The students were paired with Cambodian students from the Royal University of Fine Arts and conducted research as teams in rural villages near the capitol. The topic of the research was The Rebirth of Cambodian Buddhism. Each team documented the history of rebuilding the local temple in a specific village, how they reprinted their books, how people were again ordaining as monks, how they were recreating works of Buddhist art. From these data gathered during the field schools, three students have gone on to write M.A. dissertations with those data and several students have done undergraduate research projects, including a few with USOAR funding. Second, during my sabbatical time in 2010, I contacted the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts and the documentation center of Cambodia to obtain permission to use documents and photographs held by those institutions for a museum exhibit here in the United States. I serve on the board of the Cambodian-American Heritage Museum and Memorial in Chicago. With funding from the Henry Luce Foundation, I organized a project with the museum to record the life histories of genocide survivors who now live in the Chicago area. More than a dozen students worked on this project in the early days as interviewers when we conducted the life history interviews, then to help analyze the data in a class on analyzing life histories, and some worked as interns to design and actually stage the exhibit. The exhibit opened at the museum in September 2011 and is still on display there. Another student will intern there this summer.
Finally, while I was in Cambodia in 2010, I was able to attend the verdict in the trial of Kaing Guek Eav, also known as Duch, the notorious commandant of a torture and execution center in Cambodia. Having spent half of my life studying this period and its aftermath, it was a very personally moving experience. I have since published two articles on the Khmer Rouge Tribunal, including one on that experience of seeing him convicted and sentenced to life in prison, called “The Other Day I Saw a Monster.” Through my field schools in Cambodia and through my work with the Cambodian Museum in Chicago, I directly involve students in research and community service. My research also directly influences and stimulates my classroom teaching, including a new graduate seminar on the anthropology of violence, courses on Southeast Asian cultures, Asian American cultures, gender patterns and anthropological theory.

I want to thank NIU for the opportunity to have a sabbatical, dedicated time when I can undertake research and do teaching in the field, Dr. Ledgerwood concluded.

Our next faculty presenter is Dr. Robert Sims, Professor of Voice at NIU, Dr. Freeman said. He has been highly praised for his moving interpretations of African-American spirituals and has given numerous recitals of them throughout the U.S., Cuba, Europe, Africa and Asia. Professor Sims made his recital debut at Carnegie Hall in 2005 and was subsequently invited by Jessye Norman to participate in a 2009 performance at the same venue. The purpose of Professor Sims’ 2011 sabbatical leave was to complete the first scholarly biography of Roland Hayes, and the resultant book will be released in the fall of 2014. Recently, Dr. Sims has begun a recording project entitled “My Songs, African-American Spirituals Arranged by Roland Hayes” and he will be sharing his vocal interpretations with us this afternoon as part of his presentation, just as he shares this music with his students.

**Roland Hayes, an American Legacy Restored,** Dr. Sims began. Once known as the Black Caruso, Roland Hayes, born in 1887, was hailed as one of the greatest concert performers of the 20th Century. During his 60-year career, the gifted American singer packed concert halls across the globe. At the height of his career, along with Fritz Kreisler, Nellie Melba and Pablo Casals, he was one of the few artists who could sell out venues like Carnegie Hall and other major auditoriums throughout the United States and Europe. In 1923, he was the first African-American musician to perform with a major symphony orchestra, leading him to sing under the batons of celebrated conductors like Eugene Ormandy, Bruno Volta and Pierre Monteux, among others. Like other acclaimed artists, he sang for crown heads of Europe, prime ministers, presidents and other heads of state.

The Roland Hayes story brings from the shadows a portrait of a man as complex as the music he performed. His trail blazing career carved the paths for Paul Robeson, Marian Anderson, Todd Duncan, Dorothy Maynor, and a host of other African-American concert artists. He was one of the first concert artists to routinely program African-American spirituals, thereby beginning a tradition which continues among African-American classical singers today. He transcended cultural, geographical and musical boundaries with his mastery of genres and a repertoire from some of history's greatest composers. Between the 1920's and the 1970's, Hayes's life was peppered with relationships that would place him among some of the most influential thinkers and artists of the 20th Century. He counted among his friends, George Washington Carver, Eleanor Roosevelt, W.E.B. DuBois, Mary McCloud Bethune, Walter White, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Alain Locke, and Langston Hughes. He also crossed paths professionally with Booker T. Washington and Thurgood Marshall. At the same time, Roland Hayes was forced to confront the struggles of his era, such as whether to play the race man and challenge Jim Crow laws as his contemporary, Marcus Garvey, or to cater to this mostly European and White American audiences. He understood quite early the importance of placing his name before the public as a career building strategy and advertised in well-respected media outlets of his day. But, when he had multiple opportunities to be featured on radio broadcasts, perform at the White House during the presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt, or record during his vocal zenith, all of which would have catapulted his career to yet a higher level, he declined them because he believed that doing so would compromise his art.

I embarked upon this work not only to restore the legacy of this great artist but to explore the complex issues surrounding this once famous personality in an era of segregation and censorship. Roland Hayes always intended that his story be told. To document his rich life, he left more than 100,000 personal
papers, photographs, correspondences, manuscripts and recordings, which are now available for research in the Detroit Public Library. However, this search for Roland Hayes went well beyond the Detroit Public Library. I examined additional documents and archival collections in Boston; New York; Washington, D.C.; Rome, Georgia; San Francisco; Memphis and Chattanooga, Tennessee; not to mention several collections in Europe. I interviewed many direct descendants and relatives along with others who were in some way connected to this historical figure. I discovered that while Hayes went through great pains to carefully construct and preserve his legacy, there were aspects of his life he was determined to keep private. Roland Hayes operated in an era when African-American men did not speak or display their feelings publicly, adding a layer of complexity to researching this book. I was interested in exploring how Hayes negotiated his way through the sometime volatile concert musical world.

Roland Hayes, An American Legacy Restored, published by Indiana University Press, offers an account of a long-forgotten musician and historical figure whom the world once recognized as great. There are several attributes that contributed to Hayes’s success that I pass on to my students at NIU. A strong belief and confidence in one’s abilities, talents and training are essential to reaching one’s goals. Also, Hayes had an entrepreneurial spirit which served him as he created opportunities for himself as a performing artist. He started his own record company in 1918, selling his records at local churches and through mail order. He self-managed and promoted his solo concert tours from Boston to California. Often, I remind my students that Roland Hayes was a major success without the aid of television shows like American Idol. I have also shared Hayes’s varied vocal repertoire of European, African and American music with my students. Hayes arranged and performed many African-American folk songs for his recitals. He proudly programmed songs that he heard sung by his enslaved ancestors next to Bach, Beethoven and Brahms. In the tradition of Roland Hayes, I offer this Underground Railroad spiritual.

Dr. Sims proceeded to sing a medley of spirituals that included Swing Low Sweet Chariot, I’m Goin’ Home on Mornin’ Train, and Get Right Church and Let’s Go Home.

Agenda Item 7.d. – Fifth Annual Report on the Outcomes of Sabbatical Leaves

Our next item provides additional detail about the high level of productivity of the 53 faculty members who were awarded sabbaticals in the same timeframe as professors Ledgerwood and Sims, Dr. Freeman said. Collectively, this group published 27 books and book chapters, 197 journal articles, made 18 contributions to conference proceedings, 3 contributions to exhibit catalogs and 4 contributions to public media. They produced 43 works of art, and submitted 29 applications for external funding that produced $7.5 million to support 22 initiatives. Faculty also reported that they revised or created a total of 29 graduate and undergraduate courses and a new doctoral program with direct benefit to 650 students annually. There is no question about the return on the investment our university makes in sabbaticals.

I really appreciate this report, Trustee Butler remarked. It originated with a question from Trustee Murer several years ago and has consistently been presented to this committee, and I hope it continues, because it is a worthwhile brief sketch of the return on investment and the outcomes of this important enterprise.

Both individuals were outstanding in their own right, Trustee Murer commented, and it continues to show us why we excel in various areas, in particular, Southeast Asian Studies and our music programs. These are examples, and it is very important to us.

Agenda Item 7.e. – Recommendations for Faculty and Supportive Professional Staff Sabbatical Leaves for the 2014-2015 Academic Year

Dr. Freeman stated that the Faculty and Supportive Professional Staff Sabbatical Leaves for the 2014-15 Academic Year recommended to the President are listed in the Board Report. Chair Marshall asked for a motion to endorse the university’s Recommendations for Faculty and Supportive Professional Staff Sabbatical Leaves for the 2014-15 Academic Year. Trustee Boey so moved, seconded by Trustee Murer. The motion was approved.
Agenda Item 7.f. – Request to Delete a Concentration

The Request to Delete a Concentration in Southeast Asian Studies is being made in order to offer a Certificate of Graduate Study. Dr. Judy Ledgerwood, Director of the Center for Southeast Asian Studies, stated that both requests to delete the Concentration and to add the Certificate went through the curricular process at the same time. Dr. Carolinda Douglass stated that though both requests went through at the Curriculum Committee at the same time, the Certificate in Graduate Study has not come back to Academic Affairs as yet. Chair Marshall asked for a motion to approve the Request to Delete the Concentration in Southeast Asian Studies. Trustee Strauss so moved, seconded by Trustee Boey.

In view of the fact that they did not have an item for endorsement of the Certificate of Graduate Study, Trustee Strauss said that he was concerned about students who might possibly be caught in the middle of the two approvals. He then made a motion to postpone this item until the next Board meeting where both could possibly be approved together. Trustee Butler seconded that motion.

Per a query from Trustee Murer on the parliamentary dimension of not going through the committee for endorsement before being presented for approval by the full Board, General Counsel Blakemore stated that this Board would have the authority to have the Board take action without the committee recommendation. It is outside what the normal course of business would be, he said, but there are circumstances that merit that type of action.

Trustee Strauss then withdrew his original motion subject to the approval of the second to postpone this matter until the next regularly scheduled meeting of the full Board later today. Student Trustee Echols seconded the motion. The certificate approval process is a presidential one, President Baker said, so we should be able to complete that in time for the next Board meeting.

Chair Marshall asked that the motion be repeated. Trustee Strauss made the motion to continue this matter to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the full board later today. Trustee Butler seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Agenda Item 7.g. – Request for a New Minor, New Emphases and a New Specialization

Dr. Freeman stated that this item contains requests for a New Minor in LGBT Studies that will be administered by the Women’s Studies program within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; a new Specialization in Engineering Management within the Masters in Industrial and Systems Engineering; and two new Emphases, one in Applied Manufacturing Technology within the B.S. in Technology from the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology and one in Instructional Technology Training and Evaluation within the Bachelors of Science in Applied Management. Chair Marshall asked for a motion to approve the Requests for a New Minor, New Emphases and a New Specialization. Trustee Boey so moved, seconded by Trustee Butler. The motion as approved.

Agenda Item 7.h. – Oral English Proficiency Report 2012-2013

The 2012-13 Oral English Proficiency Report is an annual report required by the State of Illinois, Dr. Freeman said. Trustee Butler noted that the Board usually received an itemized report. Dr. Freeman stated that the itemized report would be forwarded per the Board’s request. Chair Marshall asked for a motion to approve the Oral English Proficiency Report for 2012-2013. Trustee Murer seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Agenda Item 7.i. – Transfer of Tenure and Tenure-Track Locations

This action is requested as the result of a departmental name change in December 2013. The request is for Transfer of Tenure and Tenure-Track positions from the Department of Literacy Education to the Department of Literacy and Elementary Education. Chair Marshall asked for a motion to approve the Transfer of Tenure and Tenure Track positions from the Department of Literacy Education to the
Department of Literacy and Elementary Education. Trustee Boey so moved, seconded by Trustee Butler. The motion was approved.

**NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting of the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee is scheduled for Thursday, May 29.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Trustee Strauss moved to adjourn, seconded by Trustee Boey. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Marshall at approximately 1:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon M. Banks-Wilkins
Recording Secretary

*In compliance with Illinois Open Meetings Act 5 ILCS 120/1, et seq, a verbatim record of all Northern Illinois University Board of Trustees meetings is maintained by the Board Recording Secretary and is available for review upon request. The minutes contained herein represent a true and accurate summary of the Board proceedings.*
RECOMMENDATION FOR FACULTY PROMOTIONS, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONS WITH TENURE FOR 2014-2015

The following individuals are being recommended for tenure and/or promotion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COLLEGE/DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn, Wendy</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain, Paul</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Yolanda</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddali, Anita</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widman, Amy</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aygen, Gulsat</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burch, Kerry Thomas</td>
<td>Leadership, Educational Psychology &amp; Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Shi-Jie</td>
<td>Industrial and Systems Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Teresa A.</td>
<td>Counseling, Adult &amp; Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gau, Jenn-Tern</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartenhoff, Lori</td>
<td>School of Theatre &amp; Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung, Wei-Chen (July 1)</td>
<td>Educational Technology, Research and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La France, Betty H.</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Chih-Chen</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukaszuk, Judith</td>
<td>Family, Consumer &amp; Nutrition Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martens, Kimberly</td>
<td>School of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi, Lin</td>
<td>Family, Consumer &amp; Nutrition Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortridge, Rebecca T.</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Thomas J.</td>
<td>Educational Technology, Research and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trankina, Frank</td>
<td>School of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Artemus</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Paul</td>
<td>Kinesiology &amp; Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zittel, Lauriece</td>
<td>Kinesiology &amp; Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapp, Leonard</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tenure and Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Arnold, Stanley
Blood, Erika
Bonomo, Joseph
Chen, Xuwei
Clark, Michael
Demir, Veyesel
Finley, Wayne F. (July 1)
Geline, Michael (Early)
Gray, Jennifer
Honig, Sheryl L.
Hou, Minmei
Kidder, Jeffrey L. (Early)
Koss, Melanie
Manning, Jimmie (Early)
Matos, Lucia
Mayer, Jamie
Mincheva, Maya
Montana, Ismael
Musker, Kathleen
Muthuswamy, Shanthi (Early)
Myers, Charles E.
Naidu, Deepak
Nicolosi, Gina
Olson, Janet
Patro, Sukesh (Early)
Pohlman, Nicholas A.
Santuzzi, Alecia
Sharp, Barton
Vilaseca, Stephen
Walther, Carol S.
Waymire, Tammy R.
Wickens, Corrine
Yu, Shaokun

Tenure and Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Hire/Tenure with Rank of Associate Professor

Thomas, Reginald

Recommendation: The university recommends that the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee endorse this request and ask that the President forward it by means of the President’s Report to the Board of Trustees for approval at its meeting on June 19, 2014.
REQUEST FOR A NEW EMPHASIS AND CONCENTRATION

New subdivisions of existing undergraduate programs are called emphases. New subdivisions of existing programs, not exclusively at the undergraduate level, have multiple titles, including concentrations. Emphases and concentrations, require the approval of the Board of Trustees. If the board approves these additions, the university will report them in the Annual Listing of Changes sent to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in June 2014. These requests come to the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee after receiving approval from the curriculum committees at the department, college and university levels and the concurrence of the provost.

Emphasis in Educator Licensure—Environmental Science (within the B.A./B.S. in Environmental Studies)

Description: The university proposes to offer an emphasis in educator licensure—environmental science within the B.A./B.S. in Environmental Studies degree program.

Rationale: The emphasis in educator licensure—environmental science will allow students to pursue environmental science teaching licensure. The Next Generation Science Standards have been adopted by the State of Illinois, which have placed a renewed emphasis on the importance of teaching environmental science concepts in K-12 schools. The demand for science teachers with a strong background in environmental science will increase. Only teachers with an endorsement in environmental science are able to teach the AP environmental science course that is often a pathway for students into non-medical STEM careers.

Costs: No new resources are needed to implement the proposed emphasis. The courses and faculty needed to offer this emphasis are currently in place.

Concentration in Financial Economics (within the M.A. in Economics)

Description: The university proposes to offer a concentration in financial economics within the M.A. in Economics degree program.

Rationale: The concentration in financial economics will allow students seeking an M.A. in Economics to focus their studies in the growing field of financial economics. Course work will focus on models for financial markets, advanced econometric and statistical methods and numerical methods. Students completing this concentration will be prepared to enter the workforce as financial data and market analysts or to continue on to graduate school to obtain a Ph.D. in Economics. Students choosing this option would replace their elective requirements in the M.A. program with courses already taught in financial economics. By adding this concentration, the department will be able to reach a segment of the population that may wish to enhance their skills in financial data analysis.

Costs: No new resources are needed to implement the proposed concentration; most of the courses for the concentration are already taught in the department. One additional course has been proposed as part of this concentration. This course will also serve the students in the Ph.D. and M.A. degree programs. The faculty needed to offer this concentration are currently in place.

Recommendation: The university recommends that the Academic Affairs, Students Affairs and Personnel Committee endorse these requests and asks that the president forward them by means of the President’s Report to the Board of Trustees for approval at its June 19, 2014, meeting.
RESIDENCE HALLS/HOUSING AND DINING INCENTIVES

An initial update on the Second-Year Residency policy was provided to the Board in April 2012 as part of NIU's Residential Renaissance presentation. Since that time, this proposal has been investigated in a variety of formats, most recently through a study conducted by NIU's Center for Governmental Studies. Dr. Eric Weldy will present the findings of this study regarding students' perceptions of living on campus and the implications of changing the current policy.
SECOND-YEAR RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT SURVEY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction
Background and Purpose
At the request of the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, the Center for Governmental Studies Survey Research Group (CGS) conducted an Internet survey of Northern Illinois University (NIU) students to determine opinions of on-campus housing and a second-year residency requirement. The survey findings will be used to determine NIU housing policy.

Methodology
A list of email addresses for first-year students living on campus, second-year students living on campus, and second-year students who have moved off campus was obtained from NIU’s Registration and Records department.

The survey questions assessed the following topics:

- awareness, usage, and value of the resources/programs available in the residence halls,
- satisfaction with overall experience of living in the residence halls,
- opinion of second-year residency requirement, and
- opinion of potential incentives for second-year students to live in the residence halls.

On January 15, 2014, a total of 1,316 first-year students living on campus and 1,316 second-year students (549 students living on campus, 767 students who had moved off campus) were sent an invitation email with a unique link to the questionnaire. Those students who did not complete the questionnaire were sent reminder emails on January 19th, January 24th, and January 29th. A total of 337 students completed the questionnaire. A 12.8% response rate was achieved.

Key Findings
Awareness, Usage, and Value of Resources Available in Residence Halls

- More than three-fourths of first-year students living on campus are aware of all the resources/programs available in the residence halls that are asked about in the survey except for gaming facilities (51.1%) and First-Year Success Series (47.0%). More than four-fifths of second-year students living on campus are aware of all the resources/programs available in the residence halls that are asked about in the survey except for gaming facilities (46.9%). More than seven out of ten second-year students who have moved off campus are aware of all the resources/programs available in the residence hall that are asked about in the survey except for gaming facilities (57.1%).

- More than nine out of ten first-year students living on campus have used the residential dining centers (98.9%), laundry facilities (93.0%), and main desk services (91.9%). About seven out of ten first-year students living on campus have used the recreational facilities (68.7%) and the computer labs (73.4%). Approximately four out of ten (44.3%) first-year students living on campus have used the study rooms. Less than three out of ten first-year students living on campus have used or participated in the First-Year Success Series (27.0%), Living Learning Communities (26.5%), gaming facilities (23.6%), Writing Center (20.2%), and tutoring services (18.2%).

- Similar results to first-year students living on campus are obtained for second-year students living on campus. One difference found between first-year students and second-year students living on campus is for usage of the computer labs (first-year students, 73.4%; second-year students, 88.6%).
Second-year students that have moved off campus are considerably less likely than second-year students who live on campus to use all the resources/programs asked about in the survey except the computer labs (second-year students moved off campus, 92.3%; second-year students on campus, 96.4%) and the recreational facilities (second-year students moved off campus, 81.0%; second-year students on campus, 88.0%).

Eight out of ten or more first-year students living on campus find the residential dining centers (95.0%), laundry facilities (94.0%), main desk services (86.2%), computer labs (83.3%), and recreational facilities (79.3%) valuable. Six out of ten or more first-year students living on campus find the study rooms (65.2%), Writing Center (62.7%), and tutoring services (60.5%) valuable. Less than five out of ten first-year students living on campus find the Living Learning Communities (48.6%), First-Year Success Series (45.1%), and the gaming facilities (42.6%) valuable.

Second-year students living on campus are more likely than first-year students living on campus to find the computer labs (second-year students, 93.6%; first-year students, 83.3%), tutoring services (second-year students, 80.1%; first-year students, 60.5%), study rooms (second-year students, 79.7%; first-year students, 65.2%), and Writing Center (second-year students, 78.5%; first-year students, 62.7%) valuable.

A larger percentage of second-year students who live on campus than second-year students who have moved off campus indicate the each of the resources/programs asked about in the survey is valuable except for the computer labs (second-year students moved off campus, 93.8%; second-year students on campus, 93.6%).

Satisfaction with Overall Experience of Living in On-campus Housing

Among first-year students, the majority (78.4%) rate their overall experience of living on campus as excellent (29.7%) or good (48.7%). The other 21.6% of first-year students rate their overall experience of living on campus as fair (18.4%) or poor (3.2%).

The majority (77.8%) of second-year students living on campus also rate their overall experience of living on campus as excellent or good; however the percentage of second-year students (13.6%) rating their experience as excellent is lower than that of first-year students (29.7%), while the percentage (64.2%) of second-year students rating their experience as good is higher than that of first-year students (48.7%).

Satisfaction ratings differ depending on the residence hall the student lives in, with students living in New Hall being most satisfied and students living in Neptune Hall being least satisfied.

Those students who rated their overall experience of living on campus excellent or good were asked why they gave that rating. The most frequent responses are because they are meeting new people (14.9%) and they are close to classes/library/other resources (9.2%).

Those students who rated their overall experience of living on campus fair or poor were asked why they gave that rating. The most frequent responses are because they do not like the dining hall food (26.8%) and they have had problems with roommates or floormates (17.9%).

A total of 56.4% of first-year students living on campus plan to live in a residence hall during their second year at NIU, 29.3% plan to live off campus in a rented apartment or house, 5.5% plan to live in a Greek house, 1.7% plan to live somewhere else, and 7.2% do not know.

Those first-year students who plan to live in a residence hall during their second year at NIU were asked why. The most frequently given reasons are they are close to classes/library/other
resources (79.4%), they are able to be on a meal plan (78.4%), and access to the residence hall resources (70.6%).

- Those first-year students who do not plan to live in a residence hall during their second year at NIU were asked why not. The most frequently given reason is it is too expensive to live in a residence hall (81.8%).

- Those second-year students who live on campus were asked the reason why they live on campus. The two responses given most frequently are the residence halls are close to classes/library/other resources (63.4%) and the ability to be on a meal plan (59.8%).

- Those second-year students who moved off campus were asked the reason why they moved off campus. The majority (88.4%) indicate that it is too expensive to in a residence hall.

Opinion of Second-Year Residency Requirement

- Among first-year students living on campus, one-third (33.3%) favor and two-thirds (66.7%) oppose a second-year residency requirement. Similar results are found for second-year students who live on campus (33.3%, favor; 66.7%, oppose). Interestingly, one-fourth (25.6%) of second-year students who have moved off campus favor a second-year residency requirement.

- The most frequent reasons given for favoring a second-year residency requirement are a second-year residency requirement will increase students’ involvement in campus activities (14.9%), it will improve students’ academic performance (9.6%), and it will help students meet more people (6.4%)

- The most frequent reasons given for opposing a second-year residency requirement are a second-year residency requirement will not allow students to have a choice of where they live (50.8%) and many students will be unable to afford living on campus a second year (37.3%).

Opinion of Potential Incentives for Second-Year Students to Live On Campus

- The four potential incentives for second-year students to live in residence halls that are rated very valuable by the most first-year and second-year students currently living on campus are free laundry (first-year students, 84.1%; second-year students, 81.3%), free parking passes (first-year students, 80.8%; second-year students, 78.8%), use of meal plans at all campus dining locations (first-year students, 73.7%; second-year students, 69.2%), and loyalty program (first-year students, 68.2%; second-year students, 68.8%).

- Second-year students who have moved off campus rate the following potential incentives for second-year students to live in residence halls very valuable: private room/shared bath at double room price (74.4%), loyalty program (74.4%), bonus program (73.7%), reserved parking (71.8%), and pet friendly floors/communities (71.8%).

- More than seven out of ten first-year students who oppose a second-year residency requirement report that offering free laundry (82.9%), free parking passes (73.2%), and loyalty program (74.1%) would make them more likely to favor a second-year residency requirement.

- More than eight out of ten second-year students who live on campus and oppose a second-year residency requirement report that offering loyalty program (83.0%), free parking passes (81.1%), and free laundry (81.1%) would make them more likely to favor a second-year residency requirement.

- Approximately two-thirds or more of second-year students who have moved off campus and oppose a second-year residency requirement report that offering private room/shared bath at double room price (69.0%), loyalty program (65.5%), reserved parking (65.5%), pet friendly
floors/communities, and bonus program (65.5%) would make them more likely to favor a second-year residency requirement.

- Other suggestions students provide for potential incentives for second-year students to live in the residence halls are parking closer to residence halls, less restrictions/rules, free or discounted books.
PROFESSIONAL EXCELLENCE AWARDS FOR FACULTY AND STAFF

The university sponsors a number of programs designed to recognize excellence in faculty and staff performance. Two faculty members received the Board of Trustees Award, selected by a committee chaired by the Executive Vice President and Provost. Three faculty members are recognized as Presidential Teaching Professors, selected by a faculty and alumni committee chaired by the Vice Provost. Three faculty members are also recognized as Presidential Research Professors, selected by a faculty committee chaired by the Vice President for Research and Innovation Partnerships. Two additional faculty members are recognized as Presidential Engagement Professors, selected by a committee composed of members of the Outreach Advisory Committee, a dean, a student, and faculty chaired by the Vice President of Outreach, Engagement, and Information Technologies. Another three faculty members received the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Award, and one instructor received the Excellence in Undergraduate Instruction Award, through a selection process initiated by students and reviewed by student advisory committees in each college, with the final decision made by the university-level Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education. The Operating Staff and Supportive Professional Staff Councils each selected four employees for recognition following a university-wide nomination process coordinated by a subcommittee of each council.

2014 Board of Trustees Professorship Awards
   David Hedin  Professor, Physics
   Laura Vazquez  Professor, Communication

2014 Presidential Teaching Professors
   Brianno Coller  Professor, Mechanical Engineering
   Michael Kolb  Professor, Anthropology
   Kristen Myers  Professor, Sociology

2014 Presidential Research Professors
   Giovanni Bennardo  Professor, Anthropology
   Ana Calvo  Professor, Biological Sciences
   Nancy M. Wingfield  Professor, History

2014 Presidential Engagement Professors
   Christine Malecki  Professor, Psychology
   Jon Miller  Professor, Biological Sciences

2014 Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Award Recipients
   Mary Lynn Henningsen  Associate Professor, Communication
   Geoffrey Pynn  Assistant Professor, Philosophy
   Toni VanLaarhoven  Associate Professor, Special and Early Education

2014 Excellence in Undergraduate Instruction Award Recipient
   Kimberly Gatz  Instructor, Communication
2014 Operating Staff Outstanding Service Award Recipients
Lisa Clark       Routing Supervisor, Physical Plant
Amy Deegan      Office Support Specialist, Faculty Development and Instructional Design
Patricia Lee    Office Support Specialist, Campus Recreation
Liz Wright      Administrative Assistant, Research and Innovation Partnerships

2014 Presidential Supportive Professional Staff Award for Excellence Recipients
Steve Estes      Acting Director, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Advising Office
Dana Gautcher   Director, Office of Student Academic Success
Kathryn Maley    Assistant Director, History and Social Sciences Secondary Teacher Education Program
Jeanne Meyer    Director, Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct
HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION ACCREDITATION UPDATE

Northern Illinois University was evaluated for its 10 year reaccreditation by a team of eleven consultant-evaluators of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) on March 3-5, 2014. The site team completed its report on April 30, 2014 and NIU submitted its institutional response to the report on May 13, 2014. When on site, and in the report, the site team expressed positive regard for NIU and its programs, faculty, staff, and students. For each criterion, the team indicated whether the core component was met, met with concerns, or not met. The team determinations and recommendations were as follows:

- Criterion One: Mission, **Criterion One is met**
- Criterion Two: Integrity: Responsible and Ethical Conduct, **Criterion Two is met**
- Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support, **Criterion Three is met**
- Criterion Four: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement, **Criterion Four is met**
- Criterion Five: Resources, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, **Criterion Five is met with concerns**

Concerns related to Criterion Five were related to a lack of alignment between past budgeting and planning processes. The team was reassured by the current leadership’s emphasis on accountability, clarity, transparency and sustainability, and noted that “..interviewees and documents showed that effective methods of producing and using data in conjunction with strategic planning to connect budgeting to institutional priorities are being developed... with new leadership, new organization, and new budget processes, a linkage from budgeting to the progress of the strategic plan is needed.” The team recommended a monitoring report on budgeting and planning be submitted in May 2016.

The team also reviewed NIU’s request for approval to increase distance education offerings, specifically online programs, and recommended that NIU be approved to offer any of its programs by online delivery.

The team recommended that NIU be approved for its next reaffirmation of accreditation in 2023-2024.

The next step in the process is for the HLC Institutional Actions Council to review the team report and recommendations and take action on these materials. This is likely to happen in summer 2014.