PUBLIC NOTICE AND AGENDA

Policy Library Committee
Monday, September 16, 2019, 1:00 p.m.
Altgeld Hall, Room 225
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

Voting Members Present:
- Beth Ingram
- Kendall Thu
- Richard Siegesmund
- Jeffry Royce
- Cathy Doederlein
- Greg Brady
- Rebecca Hunt
- Ann Kenny
- Naomi Bolden

Others Present:
- Brad Bond
- Khalfani Mar'Na

Voting Members Absent:
- Bryan Perry
- Betsy Hull

I.   Call to Order

      Policy Librarian **R. Hunt** called the meeting to order at 1:01pm

II.   Verification of Quorum

      A quorum was established.

III. Approval of Meeting Agenda

      C. Doederlein moved, seconded by **R. Siegesmund**. Motion Passed.

IV.   Approval of Minutes for August 19, 2019

      R. Siegesmund moved, seconded by **C. Doederlein**. Motion passed.

V.   Public Comment

None.

VI.   Consent Agenda

None.

VII.   Unfinished Business
   a.   <u>DoIT – Update on Their Process for Updating Policies</u>

   Betsy Hull unable to attend meeting.
   B. Ingram motions to table this policy for the next meeting.

   B. Ingram moved, seconded by **J. Royce**. Motion passed.

VIII.   New Business
   a.   <u>Commercial Card Program Policy (P-Card)</u>

   R. Hunt informs PLC of the two pages of additions and corrections made to the policy. **R. Hunt** request for discussion on additions and corrections made to the policy.

   Discussion: none.

   R. Hunt requests motion to accept revisions.

   K. Thu moved, seconded by **B. Ingram**. Motion passed.

   b.   <u>International Travel Policy and Procedures</u>

   R. Hunt: policy brought back to PLC for review of comments on policy. R. Hunt requests questions or comments from PLC.

   Discussion:

   K. Thu notes issues with drop-down box function that he and Kurt Thurmaier tested. Both felt the idea was right, but some of the functioning did not work. Specifically, some data did not automatically generate in the drop-down box and had to be searched. **B. Bond** notes having no issues with the function. **K. Thu** makes several suggestions for improved user interface. **B. Bond** expresses that

they've already implemented those suggestions. **K. Thu** and **B. Bond** continue discussion of functionality of the portal including the drop-down feature. **B. Bond** advises that most of the inputted information will be retained, however, some changes in information (e.g., phone numbers) will have to be updated by the user.

B. Ingram questions Section 3(a) of the policy, "The Executive Vice President and Provost may. . .prohibit travel. . ." **B. Ingram's** expresses concern in determining whether the ban relates to a categorized level 3 or 4 advisory [or if implied] and the procedural steps taken if the Provost were to prohibit travel to a certain area. Further concern is expressed that the policy, as written, bans travel with no appeal process or "check" on prohibition by Provost.

B. Bond clarifies that the policy doesn't provide a strict ban. Instead, it adds another step in the process. **K. Thu** notes that he would want the Office of Executive Vice President and Provost to consult with faculty. **B. Bond** states that according to the policy, the Office of Executive Vice President and Provost does have the ability to take a country or area and prevent travel to it, but this is on the recommendation of other bodies (e.g., State Dept ban triggers ban by Office of Executive Vice President and Provost).Question raised about where in the policy it states this and what if the CDC or State Department hasn't imposed a travel advisory.

B. Ingram requests greater clarification in the policy. Specifically, in what circumstance is the Provost allowed to ban travel [in the absence of a State Department or CDC ban]. **B. Bond** responds that the Provost can do so upon the recommendation of the International Travel Safety Committee. **B. Ingram** responds with question regarding appeal process "there is nothing in the policy about what a person can do if the Office of Executive Vice President and Provost bans travel to a certain area." **B. Ingram** reiterates desire for very clear direction on procedural steps if/when provost bans travel. **B. Ingram** suggests amendment to policy "US State Department has assigned a level 3 or 4 advisory" which clearly indicates the basis for banning travel.

G. Brady provides clarity on the role of the PLC regarding further vetting on policies presented before the committee.

K. Thu and **R. Hunt**: changes to the policy can be made without the policy being posted for another 30-day comment period, so long as those changes are not substantive.

R. Hunt: changes to the policy can be ready for next PLC meeting.

B. Ingram on subsection 3(a)(1): travel advisory area is when the state dep has assigned a country a level 3 or 4 advisory.
Further questions were asked for clarification of General Counsel's role. G. Brady provided clarification.

B. Ingram moves to add clarification to point 1 and 2 as amendments to policy

B. Ingram moved, seconded by **K. Thu**. Motion passed.

c. <u>Change 30-day Comment Period</u>

R. Hunt requests discussion to consider change to the 30-day comment period. Explains that the Policy on Managing University Policies is available on Policy Library site. The current policies that are up are available until this Friday. PLC has to wait another month to view them again which extends the timeline to two months vs one month. Questions whether PLC consider changing 30 day to 21 days.

Discussion:

N. Bolden: questions whether PLC would be able to reconvene prior to the scheduled meeting. Reason: Not to limit the time for response but allow meeting to review comments on policy sooner. **R. Hunt** and **J. Royce**: difficult to schedule another meeting given the schedules of the group. **K. Thu**: expresses that most people still do not know about the 30-day comment period. **B. Ingram**: offers alternative, each person on the PLC takes a policy and comments on the policy **R. Hunt**: explains the current process, with the drafter of the policy taking note of the comments then meets with **R. Hunt**. Re-draft or amend the policy based on comments before **R. Hunt** brings it back to PLC. **K. Thu**: do you see the 2-month period creating problem? **R. Hunt**: no, I do not.

B. Ingram suggests sticking to the 30-day period.

d. <u>Review Policy Writing Template</u>

R. Hunt handed out copies of the template to each member. **R. Hunt** explains that the template will be a word document available on the Policy Library website.

Discussion:

K. Thu questions the "fill in" sections. **J. Royce** suggests using Microsoft forms

R. Hunt explains that the method of document filling has yet to be determine, but Microsoft Forms is a current consideration. **R. Hunt** also explains that some policies may/do require more information than others. This is a determining factor regarding what method of document filling will be used.

Questions raised about policy narrative and other sections that would need to be filled in.
R. Hunt explains the process of filling in information.

J. Royce: is there a difference between a responsible officer and contact person?

K. Thu and **R. Hunt**: it could be the same person, but there are some exceptions or situations that require separate persons.

B. Ingram questions whether the template, as is, will be in the Policy Library. Concern about "tips" needing to be taken out prior to this. Further discussion about the length to which the drafter would need to go to delete the "tips" section. **B. Ingram** and **A. Kenney** discuss the option of the "tips" being provided in a separate document.

R. Siegesmund discusses the usefulness of "tips" section as a reminder to include critical information when drafting policies. **R. Siegesmund** raises point that there could be issues with missing information if "tips" are moved to separate document.

R. Hunt explains that the template is also a tool for record keeping (retention**).**
R. Hunt comments if "tips" are separate then critical information may be absent.
B. Ingram expresses that there should be an instruction to the drafter for removal of "tips" prior to submission.

K. Thu asks for clarification on the bullet points ("tips") and whether these could be considered different sections of the policy narrative.

B. Ingram responds with clarification on usefulness of "tips" section and questions what part(s) of the template will be included in the Policy Library.
R. Hunt clarifies that the "tips" section will be included in the template, but solely intended for the drafter to fill in when submitting a policy. By default, the "tips" section will be in the Policy Library but only as a template and not in the actual submission.

K. Thu raises point that if [I'm] writing the policy, [I] may see this as sections that must be included. **R. Hunt** reiterates point of template and purpose of "tips" section.

B. Ingram: requests that if placed in [Microsoft] Word then it be a document that can be edited.

IX. Announcements

R. Hunt expresses that she's done research on other universities with committees like the PLC. **R. Hunt** spoke with the policy director at University of Minnesota who clarified the function of their PLC. **R. Hunt** notes that PLC is functioning as other universities have.

R. Hunt requests that those in attendance view the updated website.

X. Adjournment

J. Royce moved, seconded by **R. Siegesmund.** Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 2:05pm.