

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

8-31-2010

August 31, 2010

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "August 31, 2010" (2010). *Minutes*. 1.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR 31 August 2010 (Vol. XXXIV, No. 1)

The 2010-2011 Faculty Senate minutes and other information are available on the Web at <http://www.eiu.edu/~FacSen> The Faculty Senate agenda is posted weekly on the Web. Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

I. Call to order by Chair John Pommier at 2:00pm. (Booth Library Conference Room)

Present: A. Adom, J. Best, J. Coit, M. Fero, T. Leonce A. Methven, F. Mullins, M. Mulvaney, K. Padmaraju, J. Pommier, J. Stowell, L. Taylor, D. Viertel, A. White, M. Worthington
Guests: Shelley Holmgren, DEN; Diane Jackman, Dean of CEPS; Jeanne Snyder, Associate Dean of LCBAS; Blair Lord, VPAA/Provost.

II. Approval of the Minutes of 4 May 2009

Senator Methven (Viertel) moved to approve the minutes. Motion passed unanimously. Abstain: Adom, Fero, Leonce, Stowell, Taylor.

III. Announcements

Chair Pommier urged Senators to attend President Perry's address 3pm Wednesday.

IV. Communications

- a. Email of 3 May, from Allen Lanham, re: Booth Library's Upcoming Exhibit
- b. Email of 7 May, from Pamela Collins, re: Technology Delivered Courses
- c. Document of 11 May, from Gail Richard, re: IAB 2009-10 Annual Report
- d. Memo of 3 June, from Bob Augustine, re: IRB Appointments
- e. Email of 3 June, from Bob Damrau, re: Council of Illinois University Senates
- f. Email of 23 June, from Les Hyder, re: IBHE Meeting
- g. Email of 24 June, from Les Hyder, re: Legislative Report
- h. Email of 2 July, from Bill Perry, re: Appointment Process – Interim Dean
- i. Email of 1 August, from David Viertel, re: CIUS meeting
- j. Email of 2 August, from Judy Gorrell, re: LCBAS Interim Dean
- k. Email of 12 August, from William Weber on behalf of Bill Perry, re: FY11 Appropriated Budgets

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee:
2. Nominations Committee: Senators Methven (chair), Viertel, and Best volunteered for the Nominations Committee. The Committee will consider possible changes to the process by which Senate makes nominations to campus committees.
Methven stated Senate needs nominations for a position on the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee. Senator Best volunteered for a 1-year appointment to the Philanthropy Communications Committee.
3. Elections Committee: Senators Adom and Padmaraju volunteered to serve on the committee along with Vice-Chair Mulvaney.
The Committee needs to run a special election as soon as possible for the position on the Council on Teacher Education vacated by Lisa New Freeland.
4. Faculty—Student Relations Committee: Senators White (chair), Taylor, and Fero volunteered for this committee.
5. Faculty—Staff Relations Committee: Senators White (chair), Leonce, and Viertel volunteered for this committee.
6. Awards Committee: Senators Stowell (chair) and Taylor, and Recorder Coit volunteered for Awards committee.
7. Faculty Forum Committee: Senators Padmaraju (chair) and Fero, and Recorder Coit volunteered for this committee.
8. Other Reports
 - a. Provost's Report

Lord requested 5-7 minutes be made available at the next Senate meeting for a presentation. Lord stated that he has asked College Deans to call College Faculty meetings, to give him a chance to get out and talk to a bit. Lord also stated that he is reinstitute the “Cookies and Conversation with the Provost” hour, and asked faculty to be on the lookout for invitations to this event. Lord stated he has put a call out for faculty to express interest in Faculty Development, and will call several meetings during the fall semester to sharpen the focus of the program.

Chair Pommier asked if the Provost could schedule a Senate session on the restructured Faculty Development. Lord stated that a Senate session would probably be a good sounding board once he receives feedback regarding faculty interest in the committee. He noted that it is often lost in institutional memory that the current Faculty Development initiative occurred after Faculty Senate passed a resolution asking the Provost to establish such an institution.

b. Budget Transparency Committee: Senators Methven (chair), Best, and Viertel volunteered for this committee.

c. Other

B. Other Old Business

VI. New Business

A. Bill Weber, Vice President of Business Affairs Bill Weber introduced Michael Maurer, the new Director for Planning, Budget and Institutional Research.

Maurer said he has been doing university financial administrative work since 1987. He worked as a financial officer for the University of Maryland overseas college in Heidelberg, Germany, on a U.S. military contract for 15 years. The program provided a unique challenge because their average time to graduation was about 18 years. Maurer stated he worked most recently at the University of California of San Francisco, and noted he has relatives on EIU faculty and in Coles County. Maurer stated he really enjoys working with Dr. Weber and my colleagues in the University Planning and Budget office, noted that Lord joked that he will have a very short honeymoon. Maurer stated that he looks forward to what he looks at as very gratifying and challenging work, it’s probably going to be the biggest challenge he’s faced in his career.

Pommier asked if Maurer or Weber could provide some insight into what Maurer’s position actually entails. Weber stated that last December Jill Nielsen retired from her position as Vice President of External Relations at the end of fall 2009, President Perry decided to restructure that area to focus on foundation and advancement. He moved two areas out of External Relations; WEIU was moved to the Provosts’ area, and Planning and Institutional Studies was moved to the Business Affairs area. At the time we had an open spot for Director of Planning and Institutional Studies, and an opening at Budget Director, where Weber had served before VP. Weber stated that the work areas and reporting for both positions overlapped, and merging the two positions allowed EIU to economize on personnel expenditures. This is important because out of revenue from appropriated funds and tuition, personnel represents \$85 million of \$105 million, and we’re not going to survive these tighter budget times without doing something on the personnel side. Weber stated that the Budget Director before Weber had the position was Jim Shonkweiler, and the last Director of Planning and Institutional Studies was Julie Abell. Weber noted that both positions have been vacant for some time.

Weber referenced the budget memo sent out near the start of the semester, and stated that his office is doing a top-to bottom review of appropriated budgets, starting with fixed cost areas. They are attempting to determine whether some fixed cost areas need to be moved to the VP area, and if the costs in those areas are realistic. Weber stated that he has a goal to cut \$6 million from the EIU budget over the next two years.

Weber stated that the EIU Master Plan Update is focusing on two projects. The first is a new science building, as both our physical science and life science buildings are not meeting the needs of those departments anymore. The “tundra” area near Tarble Arts Center is being considered, and some exciting conceptual drawings of the building have been prepared..

The second project would tear down the Student Services Building, expand the north quad, and turn some of that into green space. The 1926 steam plant will be replaced in 1-1.5 years. That building has a lot of useable space, and the plan is to add an extension to that building to define the east quad. The refurbished building would house a one-stop shop for student services, and house our technology units. The Master Planning Steering Committee will have at least two more open sessions for faculty in the fall. Concerns or comments can also be submitted through the website at <http://castle.eiu.edu/mstrplan/schedule.php>. The Master Plan will be wrapped up in the next month or two.

Weber stated that after the Master Plan update is over, EIU will proceed with the Strategic Planning process. A steering committee for the plan will be appointed in the fall. The committee will have around 24 members, and 60% of the members will be faculty. The process will be broad based across campus. The committee will attempt to identify 3-5 major themes important to our future, prepare some white papers on those themes, seek comment from campus constituencies, and proceed from there with formulating action items. Most of the process will happen in calendar 2011.

Weber stated that the Renewable Energy Center is progressing very nicely, and he believes the community and campus will be pleased when it is finished. Right now the project is a hair over the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) gold certification. The project is virtually a lock for LEED silver. The expectation is that the facility will be open and running sometime during the summer of next year, possibly earlier. Weber stated he hopes we can start having visitors in spring semester.

Senator White asked if a date has been established for beginning construction of the new science building. Weber stated the start date is going to be dependent on funding. In our state budget request we've asked for the entire bundle, something in the neighborhood of \$116 million for planning and construction. There is no telling when we will get enough funding to pursue the building. Weber stated that the chances are we will have to do a modular approach. He noted the increase to campus improvement fee initiated last year, which will gradually increase from \$2.50 to \$10 per credit hour. The funds will initially be used to make improvements in the two existing science buildings, and to address deferred maintenance. When the fee matures, then it will be a revenue stream of \$3 million/year, which could finance a \$30 million bond, enough to start with one wing or so of the building. Weber noted that EIU is undertaking a capital campaign and another possibility for building funds is donor money. There are plenty of naming opportunities there. Weber stated that EIU will be looking at the grant area, and noted the recent addition to 9th street hall was done from grant money. Weber stated that hopefully the time the student fee increase reaches its maximum, in 3-4 years, EIU will get some appropriated dollars for the building as well.

Recorder Coit noted the substantial difference between the tuition of graduating seniors and incoming freshmen in 2010, and asked if there had been research done regarding an optimal tuition rate for enrollments. Weber stated he didn't know of any formal study per se, but noted that Amy Edwards in Maurer's office has pulled quite a bit of data for tuition rates, and when you look at tuition for public master's comprehensive institutions in a 3 state area, you will see two on the high end, Western Illinois University and EIU. We do think of ourselves as good value, and when you compare with all public universities in the state, EIU's tuition is in the lower third, but when you compare with master's comprehensive institutions, we are on the high end. Weber stated that some of the data are really quite disturbing, when you look at neighboring states. College tuition is much less in Missouri and Indiana. It really surprised me to learn that University of Missouri, Columbia, the flagship institution in that system, can be attended for a lower cost than Eastern, and Purdue is also lower. Tuition is not going to be a place to get more and more money, the "bank of student" doesn't exist any more, and Eastern is going to have to be very careful. Weber noted that the state legislature expanded the Joyce "Truth in Tuition" bill to cover a six-year degree, and stated that EIU is going to be very constrained in raising tuition.

Weber stated that in his opinion the bigger driving factor in tuition rates is going to be demographics. The research I've looked at suggests that over the next few years the number of high school graduates will decrease by 3-4 %, which will increase competition among colleges and universities for students. One important metric listed on the website is the cost of attending Eastern as compared to median Illinois income, right now EIU tuition is about 25% of the median income, that's asking families to make a pretty hefty commitment. Weber stated that if that figure starts rising too much, we will see increased legislative involvement with tuition rates.

Viertel asked if sources of FA are keeping pace with rising tuition and fees. Weber stated he didn't have a lot of good information on that, and said Jerry Donna or VP Dan Nadler might provide more information. He noted that President Perry reallocated funding for this year's budget to provide an additional \$.5 million for FA.

Senator Adom asked if Eastern has set a fundraising target for the capital campaign. Weber suggested Senate ask VPUA Bob Martin, but at this point there is no public target. Weber stated that when the campaign kicks off publicly in the fall, then a target will be named.

B. IRB appointments

Senator Best introduced Cheryl Siddens, the Compliance Coordinator for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of the Institutional Review Board, and Bob Chesnut, Director of the Council on Faculty Research and interim chair of the IRB.

Best stated that the IRB believes having the committee listed with the other committees/groups that Senate populates, might no longer fit. Best stated that the IRB is an entity mandated by federal legislation for the protection of human participants in research. It is an entity of the federal government that we staff on campus to protect peoples rights on campus. EIU has had this for 25 years, but there were changes in the federal law in 2003 that mandated that any project on campus be scrutinized by IRB. The IRB took an approach that there would be some positions appointed by the administration, and some that are nominated by Faculty Senate. Best stated that IRB appointing ability must be given to some institutional official. Best noted that the Senate gathers its IRB nominations by asking people that are interested in service to put their name forward. Those names are drawn through a random process, and randomly sent forward.

Best said that the committee has found is that as regulations have increased, the volume of regulations to administer has increase. EIU faculty have been conducting to a "moderate" level of research, but, given the institutuion's focus on teaching, relatively speaking a high amount of research. The IRB needs to move through proposals fairly quickly, and needs expertise and experience in reviewing protocols. The institution has invested a considerable sum of money for training individuals, many have gone off campus for training. A random process is not meeting the needs of the IRB any longer, it is not going to serve the interests of the research community, and is not adequately protecting people. IRB wanted to try to start a conversation about what alternatives exist for allowing some egalitarian participation by faculty, but meet IRB's needs.

Siddens stated that the original EIU policy gave Senate nominees to three year terms, and asked Senate to nominated 4 of the members. The rest of the board's membership is nominated or appointed by the Dean of the Graduate College. Siddens noted that most of the work of the board takes place outside of the monthly board meetings, and that it is the responsibility of each individual member, several times at the semester, to look through a proposal. Best noted that the procedure mandates using a 5-page checklist to review each protocol, and members really have to examine these protocols in detail.

Siddens stated that the IRB is 6 or 7 years into this process, and is looking at the policy, asking how can nominations be made to provide for experience, and the best reviews. Siddens stated that faculty and students are concerned about turnaround time. IRB has begun a discussion, and will start proposing some alternative ways for nomination or appointment. For example, Senate may choose to relinquish its nominating function and simply forward all the names to the Dean..

Best stated that the idea would be saying maybe Senate can disengage, and noted that the IRB is not necessarily a faculty committee. He stated that the IRB's constitution doesn't state the members have to be faculty members, and the board is not in shared governance system that deals with Eastern policy, the IRB deals only with federal policy.

Senator Worthington asked to what extent is Senate participation in staffing IRB even needed anymore, and suggested that it sounds like the board needs to be populated with specific persons. Worthington stated that she did not think the Senate is in the position to know who those people are, speaking as the person who chaired the Nominations Committee last year.

Senator Methven stated that he believes the problem not limited to IRB, that he thinks Gail Richard would argue that the Intercollegiate Athletic Board is hampered by a similar process, and when she's worried about accreditation, and the board isn't representative of campus, there's a problem on campus. Methven stated that he wonders how many of these other committees are in a similar situation.

Senator Stowell asked if the IACUC has the same issues? Siddens stated that those are all administrative appointments, but that the IACUC isvery similar, in that the committee is established by federal regulations. Siddens amplified Best's explanation by stating that while the government requires that there are at least 5 members on an IRB, including one scientist, one non-scientist, and one person unaffiliated with the institution, the law doesn't require each board to have a faculty member. Siddens stated that some institutions hire board members from outside the institution. Best stated that members could be drawn from outside academic affairs, and that the regulations are silent about encouraging faculty to serve and have no requirement to have faculty board members. Best stated that there are a number of reasons why the IRB is different, and it's better serving the mission that the method used to populate the committee be changed. Dean Augustine could put out a call every year for people who are interested. Then the committee could invest money into training, without Faculty Senate involvement.

Vice-Chair Mulvaney asked if there are comparable institutions, and how they appoint IRB members. Siddens stated that there are some institutions that still take Faculty Senate nominations, and there are a few cases where Faculty Senate has relinquished that responsibility. Best stated that any type of institution that conducts research has to have an IRB (including hospitals for example).

Senator Viertel stated that he is not concerned whether it falls under Senate's purview, but is interested that people who are interested in the board have a chance to become a part of it. Siddens stated the board has had some attrition, and that at least every other year if not every year the board has openings.

Best asked to add to the response to Mulvaney's question, and stated that there are three models institutions use for appointing IRB members: 1. Including the body representing the Faculty; 2. All appointed by an administrator, and 3. Direct election by faculty. Best noted that institutions have problems with all three approaches, and that the whole IRB community is finding its way forward. Best stated that current developments are the next step in evolution, not the last step.

Pommier noted that Senate has appointed new IRB members for this fall and asked what the current committee would prefer to do. Siddens stated that the IRB had four existing members rotate off the committee, and those four members all put their names in the pool for renomination. Only one of the four was re-nominated, and Senate nominated three other individuals that have not served on IRB. Siddens said she contacted the three new members, and one said they just put their name in for anything, not specifically for the IRB.

Siddens stated that this year on IRB we have some extenuating circumstances. Best ended his term as chairman and resigned as a member July 1, and the committee had searched for a new chair beginning a year ago. Siddens stated that an individual that was on board had agreed to serve as chair, but informed the IRB this summer that they were going to leave the institution. Siddens stated that the existing board was concerned that the IRB would have a majority on the board that were new members. Siddens stated that the existing board has requested Senate reappoint as members the three not selected for nomination in the Spring, and the IRB would provide membership as alternates to those nominated by Senate. Siddens noted that alternates get all the same responsibilities as members, except they unable to vote at meetings.

Best stated that the board would like the next time members' terms end, to use some different process than the current process. Alternate membership for the new members this year would allow faculty who volunteered in good faith to still serve on the IRB.

Coit asked how long it takes new members to get up to speed with the IRB's procedures. Siddens said the committee offers an orientation session, and further training depends on the members' experience. She stated for at least one semester if new members receive a protocol to review, at the same time an experienced member is reviewing the same study. Siddens noted that the IRB sometimes affords members external training, but the board has had to cut back given the state of the EIU budget.

Senator White asked how long the new members would serve as alternates? Siddens stated they would serve as alternates all three years, and if a board member leaves, we'd either appoint someone or have an alternate fill the terms. White asked if there is a requirement that a certain percentage of board members be faculty. Siddens stated there is no federal requirement, and that the EIU IRB's policy has been to have 2 faculty members from each college and one non-affiliated member.

Stowell asked how many protocols the committee reviews per year. Siddens stated about 140, perhaps 150 this year.

Chesnut stated that he cannot stay chair of the IRB because there is an inherent conflict between my main position, to bring in as many grant dollars as possible to faculty research project, and protecting human subjects. Chesnut stated that it is commonly recognized that there's a conflict between positions protecting human subjects and bringing in grant dollars. He stated that if a protocol comes in that's applying for external grant funding, he would recuse myself from reviewing or voting on that protocol.

Pommier asked if Senate could postpone this discussion to a later date. Worthington noted that a specific discussion about each committee might be necessary, given the criticisms.

Pommier asked if the IRB's own bylaws are in conflict with what was proposed. Siddens stated the committee's bylaws require 2 members per college, and stated that there's nothing that governs the alternate positions on the bylaws now. Pommier asked if the nominees have been contacted. Siddens stated they were contacted by Dean Augustine, who told them there would be discussion. Siddens stated she would like to get this addressed now if possible.

Senator Fero stated that Senate has enough information to settle something now.

Coit stated that the Senate should vote on changing the designation of its Spring nominees, and expressed concern that failing to vote would set a precedent that other committees could ignore Senate nominations.

Methven stated that the proposal would be for Senate to reappoint Craig Eckert, Richard Cavanaugh, and Judy Barbour, and nominate Jeffrey Snell, Rose Gong, and Jane Scheer as alternate members.

Best stated that Senate has already sent all these names and that the final authority in this case isn't with Faculty Senate, and suggested the Senate state that it suggested a list of potential nominees.

Worthington stated she believed that last year's nominees were going to be appointed administratively. Siddens stated that this year the nominees all come from the Faculty Senate, but that the Dean has the authority to reappoint the current members. She stated that the IRB is offering the three new nominees the opportunity to be nominated as alternates.

Best stated that Senate recommend the three new nominees as alternates, and that Dean can do what he wants to do with the positions, and noted that Senate has heard a number of reasons why IRB wants to do this differently in the future.

Viertel stated that he was unsure if Senate has to do anything at all. He stated it was Senate's responsibility merely to nominate members, and asked if we really need to go back and modify that action. White stated he agreed with Viertel.

Best noted that the other committees for which the Senate nominates members aren't answering to anyone else, they exist because Senate nominates members, but that IRB answers to another line of authority. He stated he is in complete agreement with Andy, Andy, and David, Senate's already done what we're supposed to.

Worthington stated that if we submit these names as recommendations, it suggests they are just recommendations, and committees can disregard them if they so choose, but that Senate's recommendations should actually mean something.

Pommier asked for a motion.

Worthington (Best): moved to alter designation of IRB nominees Jeffrey Snell, Rose Gong, and Jane Scheer to alternate.

Viertel stated that his main concern is we don't know how these individuals feel about this, and he did not want us to change our process after the fact.

White stated that he did not know if it is legal or not, to change Senate's process, but that Dean Augustine does have the prerogative to make the change. Senate did what we were supposed to do.

Senator Padmaraju asked if there is a limit to how many members can be on the IRB, or just a minimum requirement. Padmaraju asked if anything would stop Augustine from appointing the three outgoing members as administrative appointments. Siddens stated that our IRB policy is for a board of nine members, and is silent about alternates.

Mulvaney asked if Dean Augustine contacted the new nominees. Siddens stated that Augustine told them they have been considered for nomination, but there was going to be discussion at this meeting about the nominations. One nominee said if it was a problem, that they'd be willing to serve in some other capacity.

Stowell stated that if we can't appoint the new nominees as members, and have to appoint them as alternates, then it's their choice to serve as an alternate or not at all.

Methven stated that if Senate does not do anything, Dean can do what he wants, all we've done is send forward the names, he can choose to do what he wants.

Siddens stated that the IRB is bringing this to the Senate's attention because of the extenuating circumstances, and stated that one of the three outgoing members was most likely to assume the chair position, and another is our prisoner representative for doing prison research.

Best stated that technically, without a prisoner rep, the IRB cannot approve a protocol for prisoner research, and that this would be a terrible outcome to have, where we are hindering research.

Motion passed 9-5. Yes: Best, Coit, Fero, Leonce, Mullins, Mulvaney, Pommier, Stowell, Taylor. No: Adom, Methven, Padmaraju, Viertel, White.

Best thanked the Senate for a thoughtful discussion.

VII. Adjournment at 3:57pm

Future Agenda items:

Enrollment Management and Financial Aid.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Coit
September 11, 2010