

PUBLIC NOTICE AND AGENDA

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

Voting Members Present:

- Carolinda Douglass
- George Slotsve (for Kendall Thu)
- Cathy Doederlein
- Richard Siegesmund
- Jeffry Royce
- Rebecca Hunt
- Monique Bernoudy (for Vernese Edghill-Walden)
- Ann Kenney
- Betsy Hull

Others Present:

- Greg Brady
- Andrea Radasanu
- Jessica Reyman
- Laura Vasquez
- Dara Little
- Khalfani Mar'Na

Voting Members Absent:

- Kendall Thu

I. Call to Order

Policy Librarian **R. Hunt** called the meeting to order at **1:02 p.m.**

II. Verification of Quorum

A quorum was established.

III. Approval of Meeting Agenda

G. Slotsve moved, second by **C. Doederlein**

Motion passed. Agenda Approved.

IV. Approval of Minutes for November 18, 2019

C. Doederlein moved, second by **G. Slotsve**.

An. Kenney and **B. Hull** abstained.

Minutes approved.

V. Public Comment

None.

VI. Consent Agenda

None.

VII. Unfinished Business

None.

VIII. New Business

a. Workplace Breastfeeding Policy and Procedures

R. Hunt introduces Andrea Radasanu, Laura Vasquez and Jessica Reyman.

A.Radasanu explains that this proposal was a result of looking at the FMLA policies and a recommendation for a website for showcasing work-life balance policies. As a result, they've considered an overhaul regarding language and supervisor role, and adaption to law (amendment to workplace procedure passed in Aug 2018). Majority of the proposal makes NIU compliant.

A.Radasanu continues discussing changes regarding breaks taken with breastfeeding and burden: whether employee gets all of the breaks they are entitled to, burden falls much more squarely on employer now to assure those rights to the lactating employee.

Discussion:

G. Slotsve questions whether this protects employee enough from arbitrary decisions by the supervisor

A.Radasanu responds in the affirmative. Changes include clause if supervisor wants to say no to accommodation for "the following reasons" they must check with appropriate HR supervisor. This is very different than what was there before.

M. Bernoudy notes other differences which fall under affirmative action and Executive Director Roselyn Snell.

G. Brady: even with consultation, does that HR person understand what “undue hardship” is under the Illinois Human Rights Act? Should we put the definition in?

L. Vasquez agrees with this implementation.

A. Radasanu and **J. Reyman** add that it’s included in “action that is prohibited or excessive.” **J. Reyman** notes possible clarity issue **A. Radasanu** expresses similar concern as **J. Reyman** and proposes purpose of clarity will essentially reduce risk of misinterpretation.

G. Brady reiterates those without experience understanding what “undue hardship” means may be limited. **G. Brady** notes that having that understanding would allow pushback on supervisor who says “no.”

G. Slotsve question: to what extent can those proposing the term, define it?

G. Brady responds that a state entity can regulate it but not regulate lower than the law (it can regulate higher).

G. Slotsve: could this be part of the policy for guidelines for HR and supervisors?

G. Brady: it could be part or separate for guidelines

J. Reyman notes preference for everyone to receive the paid break and no one gets denied the request. In previous policy it was completely up to supervisor discretion.

G. Slotsve notes possibility of regulating higher (re: guidelines). **G. Slotsve** question, “can we go beyond? Is it worth adding a section?”

L. Vasquez responds: nothing in policies that defines how a supervisor addresses things like this.

M. Bernoudy questions whether there is anything that can be provided to supervisors to help guide them.

R. Siegesmund: “the only question is does it belong to the policy library and procedure is different than policy. It seems long term, the sense of the committee is to keep the policy library, a policy library.”

G. Slotsve: would it better to put the guideline in (temporarily) until a proper guideline is in place?

R. Siegesmund: we still see policy and procedure intertwined.

G. Slotsve expresses concern with not having guidelines set out.

J. Reyman notes the potential of creating a set of guidelines and procedures that would be attached to the policy.

L. Vasquez: is there a way to refer to the human rights act that says, unless the institution grinds to a halt, you can't deny [as a supervisor]. **L. Vasquez** continues, "maybe it's an addition that this policy should be referred back to the law (Illinois Human Rights Act).

G. Slotsve notes that as of now, that would signal to HR to go "look here" which doesn't exist.

A. Radasanu: the law is cited under "references," but we could link to it at a later point.

G. Brady in the policy itself we could put the definition of the law. Alternatively, when admin is assessing this question they need to look to the following factors or pass the policy as is and issue separate guidance documents that HR or affirmative action officials must look at...we don't need to amend the policy to lay everything out, but the university could decide to do that.

L. Vasquez questions whether this assessment document is for this policy only or other policies as well.

G. Brady responds stating that it can apply to any policy for the institution.

L. Vasquez: would it apply solely to this policy?

G. Brady: yes, if you want it to be.

R. Siegesmund notes that the PLC has never taken a formal stance as to which option to take, "we've (PLC) been approving them both ways."

R. Hunt asks **A. Radasanu** and **L. Vasquez** how they would like to implement this possible change.

A. Radasanu, L. Vasquez and **J. Reyman** agree that they would like to link it into the policy. One sentence with a link is perfectly fine.

L. Vasquez: "what is the process if we want to add one line?"

R. Hunt response, "we can vote to accept the policy provided it's sent with the inclusion."

G. Brady response: "if its just an understanding that the policy will be sent back with the inclusion, it would just be sent to 30-day comment period."

R. Hunt calls motion for accepting the policy with inclusion of following statement:

“Under the Illinois Human Rights Act (IHRA), undue hardship is defined as an ‘action that is prohibitively expensive or disruptive’ when considering nature and cost, and the overall financial resources of the facility and employer.”

C. Doederlein notes that it could be linked to Public Law No.

J. Royce moved, second by **C. Doederlein**.

C. Doederlein questions whether the procedure should be removed.

R. Hunt: second amendment removing the procedure.

Motion passed.

b. Cost Sharing Policy

R. Hunt introduces Dara Little. **D. Little** begins to explain the policy.

This is an existing policy so a few revisions have been made. The general principles outlined are already in place.

D. Little: they basically highlight what we need to do as an institution and that we act in compliance with federal regulations.

D. Little continues, “we felt we needed better clarity on whose ultimately responsible for making sure we meet those cost-sharing commitments [to prevent penalty for failure to meet those commitments and thus having to pay back the federal government].”

D. Little continues: identifying the roles and responsibilities when committing resources to externally funded grant or contract, its important to note that when we do commit, we meet that commitment.

Regarding roles and responsibilities: making it clear the principle investigators are ultimately responsible to ensure that commitments are met.

D. Little: second key change is having the VP of Research approve all voluntary commitment to cost share (either mandatory which is condition of eligibility “clearly states must contribute X amount to the project and voluntary”).

D. Little Voluntary committed cost-share. Want to make sure we’re controlling, make sure we document quantified commitments to the sponsor, lots of decisions need to be made regarding making those commitments, but we wanted to control that a little more. We do about 400 (four hundred) proposals a year and have cost share on less than 10% (ten percent) so it will not impact all of the principal investigators.

D. Little continues: this has prompted a broader conversation for units involved in external funding and managing risk to the institution.

B. Hull question: what happens the next time? Repercussion? what's in this policy preventing that?

D. Little response: if we follow this policy we would have clear approval of commitments at proposal stage, introducing another approval form that can be understood clearly and also asking individuals to address how we'll meet those commitments (those individuals being principle investigators), and it makes it clear that we monitor the commitments. Procedurally, having more project kickoffs so that everyone understands that when those awards come in, everyone understands what those commitments are. Additionally, it also helps investigators understand where they are throughout the life of the project so when you have retirements or staff leaving, and you rely on those salaries to meet cost-share or can't find a grad student for tuition remission, we [aren't in a situation where we] can't meet cost-share commitments. Finally, building more special circumstances into policy raises awareness.

B. Hull: if there's a grant where midway through the grant [someone] realizes that we won't meet this, what's the action that can be taken by grant agency? Can it revise commitment to cost share?

D. Little response: yes, under the roles and responsibilities, one of them is to notify the agency or provide notification regarding proposals.

M. Bernoudy question: any challenge understanding education needs in those circumstances?

D. Little response: it's very easy to put together proposal to include tuition remission and fringe benefits but have to be mindful of what's going on with personnel to make sure you're consistently meeting cost-share commitments. So greater awareness and clarity is in place to ensure individuals are aware.

D. Little continues: there's a risk to the institution for not meeting those commitments and agencies will reduce their grant funding if we fail to meet those cost-share commitments. Additionally, this policy helps interpreting voluntary cost-share commitment as well.

C. Doederlein moved, second by **B. Hull**.

Motion passed.

c. Property Control

R. Hunt explains the policy has been revised to be in compliance with state Property and Control Act. Changes to policy include: tagging of property less than \$1000, as of Aug 16 2019 [so already implemented].

J. Royce notes his desire for a clear definition of equipment (differentiates between equipment, supplies or materials).

B. Hull question: who proposed? It seems odd that it's its own policy.

A. Kenney notes: it used to be lower

R. Hunt response: property control, materials, and management

J. Royce response: I don't remember tagging anything green especially when it was less than \$500.

B. Hull question; how do they know the value and how/when to tag?

C. Doederlein notes that wording of second bullet point is odd "second in" re: taking out the second in? Or specify?

R. Siegesmund notes that there is a definition of "equipment" listed.

A. Kenney as others, explains the only viewable policy is a single page.

R. Hunt request motion to send policy back requesting clarity on definition of "equipment."

C. Doederlein moved, second by **J. Royce**.

Motion passed.

d. Bringing Your Own Device (BYOD) Policy

R. Hunt explains that the policy has been up for 30 days – comments and answers are on separate documents and changes were made which include: links removed entirely, changed inside the policy so that it's no longer there.

Question of whether NIU needs to provide laptops and cellphones

Response: policy not intended for that purpose.

R. Hunt requests motion to approve.

C. Doederlein moved, second by **C. Douglass**.

Motion passed.

Policy will be sent to President for final approval

e. Information Security Policy

R. Hunt explains that there is one comment asking whether incident response guide can be linked in the document? Seems strange to reference a hard copy.

Response from Marissa explains why, seems response is enough to warrant no changes.

R. Hunt requests motion to send to President.

C. Doederlein moved, second by **A. Kenney**

Motion passed.

B. Hull question: have we made it that far on any policies? Has president made any comment on how or what we need to do to make this more efficient.

R. Hunt response: she's pleased with the process.

IX. Announcements

J. Royce makes a request for an agenda item: formalize our stance on policy versus procedure. Whether [PLC] will accept procedures and guidelines with policy moving forward.

G. Slotsve question: what do we have to control procedure? If restricted to just policy, narrowing to just linking procedure could be more efficient.

B. Hull response: isn't that internal audit?

G. Brady response: not necessarily, for next meeting I can discuss the history/role of PLC. Additionally, why doing so [accepting procedure/guidelines] allows the individuals creating the policy autonomy in deciding their own procedure. **G. Brady** notes that it was not intended to frustrate an entity wanting to put policy and procedure into one. This is a decision the PLC needs to make.

X. Adjournment

R. Hunt request motion to adjourn.

G. Slotsve moved, second by **C. Doederlein**.

Motion passed.

Meeting Adjourned at **1:57 p.m.**