

2-8-2011

February 8, 2011

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 8, 2011" (2011). *Minutes*. 10.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/10](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/10)

This Article 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](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

<b>FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR 8 February 2011 (Vol. XXXIV, No. 10)</b>
--

The 2010 – 2011 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available on the Web at:  
<http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>

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, J. Prillaman.  
Guests: Blair Lord (Provost/VPAA); Steve Rich (Alumni Services); Bob Martin (VPUA); Bonnie Irwin (Dean of CAH).

**II. Approval of the Minutes of 25 January**

Senator Methven (Stowell) moved to approve the minutes. Motion passed unanimously. Abstain: Mullins.

**III. Announcements**

a. CORE – Faculty Senate Retention Forum, 8 March 2011, 2:00 – 3:30 p.m., Arcola-Tuscola Room (MLK Union)

**IV. Communications**

- a. Email of 25 January, from Jon Coit, re: Online Learning
- b. Email of ?, from Gary Reed, re: improvements to walkway between Lumpkin and Life Sciences
- c. Email of 7 February, from Gail Richard, re: IAB minutes
- d. Email of 8 February, from Bob Martin, re: FAQ for Capital Campaign

**V. Old Business**

**A. Committee Reports**

1. Executive Committee: no report

2. Nominations Committee: Senator Best stated that the Institutional Review Board has been working to craft a way to take the IRB out of the Faculty Senate nomination process and follow alternative staffing process. Best stated that the IRB's preferred procedure would be that in spring semester of each academic year, coinciding with Senate's nominations process, the Dean of the Graduate School will issue a faculty-wide call for nominations for IRB. Prospective members of the IRB would briefly describe their interest, and the Dean would make the necessary appointments.

Chair Pommier stated that the nominations committee was asked to look at three committees, the IRB, the Intercollegiate Athletic Board, and Student Standards, to determine if they have some unique needs that aren't well served by a random appointment process. Senate adopted the random selection method because having Senate choose among nominees for committee posts caused concerns about transparency, and the random process seemed to address those concerns. The issue that does come is that some committees are governed by regulations outside of shared governance. Pommier suggested the Senate might retain nominating authority but could ask for more information and guidance from committees on the process.

Senator Viertel stated that we're opening a can of worms if we treat a few committees differently than others. I think it would be best to remove ourselves from the process instead.

Best stated that the one thing that makes the IRB different is that it has a layer of regulations, it's not an Eastern committee unlike some of the other committees that are created for us and by us. It's really a federal instrument, and it was probably a mistake to have members nominated by Senate originally, and rather than creating a problem, I think we're fixing a problem if we remove IRB.

Best stated that if faculty members are concerned about shared governance, in every semester he remembers there have been uncontested elected positions, while the nominated positions are over-subscribed. We need to get our faculty running for more things. We govern an elective process, where we actually authorize faculty to participate. If we converted some of these nominations to elective positions, that might be one way out of this random process.

Pommier stated that we may find out that there are qualifications to run for the IRB, and voters might be able to judge whether candidates meet the qualifications.

Recorder Coit stated that he supported the change for IRB. If the nomination process had been changed due to concerns about transparency, won't the new process raise the same questions?

Best stated that federal regulations mandate that the chief research officer is the one that constitutes the IRB. A faculty-wide call gives everybody access, and if any faculty member wanted to know why they were not selected the Chief Research Officer can say, this is why. If we look at this 10 years in the future, and find there are problems, we can address them then.

Senator Stowell stated that there's also a similar committee, for the use of animals, and is not Senate-monitored. Best stated that it never was; it is the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, and it preexisted the current incarnation of IRB, and it is appropriate that Senate never played a role.

Pommier asked for the Senate's view on the issue.

Coit stated he agreed with the change. Pommier called for a motion regarding the removal of the IRB from the listing of boards and committees. Coit suggested that any motion wait on the institution of a new procedure.

Senator Worthington stated she agreed with Viertel that adding qualifications to one of the Senate's nominations would make the process much more complicated.

Pommier asked if Senators wished to table the matter

Senator Leonce asked if Senate could revisit all the committees, and consider similar issues with other committees may surface eventually. Pommier stated that was the intent of this committee, and this was these three committees who stand out. Best stated we've already done that step, I think we're at the stage of proposing changes.

Best stated that if Senators wished to table the matter for two weeks to talk to colleagues, they should tell colleagues that if we don't have an IRB, human subject research comes to a halt.

Colleagues would need to be aware of that too.

Senator Methven (Mulvaney) moved to table removing IRB from the list of boards and committees for which Senate nominates faculty. Motion passed unanimously.

Senator Methven stated that he talked to Heather Webb about Student Standards, and asked if they had similar, but Webb stated she did not want to change the process. She stated her challenges are diversity issues, that when she puts a board together she'd like the Board to be diverse, and we both agreed that there's no way to address that with the current process. Worthington asked if Webb can select board members? Methven stated that this must be how student members are appointed, but for faculty members, she just said that it's a challenge it's an ongoing. Pommier asked if Webb specified these diversity issues. Methven stated that she didn't specify. The only thing she did suggest, if we use the same process, if Senate might prioritize the reappointment of outgoing members that wanted to be reappointed. If Senate replaces 13 positions each election, 2/3 of the board could be brand-new. Best stated that's just what this random process won't let us do. I don't know what we are trying to do with that hat draw. Methven stated her words were: reappointment would be appreciated. Best stated then we'd need reappointment directions from all committees. Pommier stated he believes Senate has had more success being seen as transparent with the draw.

Methven stated that his recommendation with Standards is leave it the way it is for the time being. As long as those are just concerns and not creating a huge problem we should leave it the way it is.

Viertel asked if there was anything that precludes current members from being reappointed.

Methven said there is not. Pommier stated that a lot of committees have bylaws which establish a rotation system. They have the authority to constituted panels, maybe they could increase the pool of committee members. In the last 6-7 years we've seen more individuals desire to serve. Best stated that was true only in the nominations, because Senate does it. We're doing everything for them, what are they putting in to it. Pommier stated that if it was exciting people would run, maybe the committees nominations are more interesting.

Methven stated he the nominations committee would meet next week, compose a list of committees and appointments, and share it with Senate in the next two weeks.

Methven stated the third committee the nominations committee discussed was the Intercollegiate Athletic Board. Gail Richard and I have met a few times and talked about what were the issues that the committee was confronted with and what might be potential solutions. We had talked about the model that IRB was using, had talked about Vice President Nadler being the one to do that, I had asked Gail to talk about this at the next IAB meeting, and they passed this resolution. Gail Richard: a few years ago, at that time the appointment system required appointees to indicate, this is the board I'm interested in and say why they were interested, and we very carefully made those decisions. In the last couple of years it has been a random draw process. Last year we went through NCAA recertification process, and it was really embarrassing, because the committee is supposed to represent the diversity of the campus, by gender, department, etc. and basically our whole board more than 50% was two departments, and there were no female appointments. One of the things that we wanted to do is request that there be a process where there really is an appointment. We are responsible to the NCAA, we have a book of rules and regulations we follow, and have to represent diversity. When it is a random draw we can't always get the representation we need. IAB is an incredibly intense committee, it is involved in a lot of confidential information, does student athlete exit interviews, and oversight of programs, and we need members coming to the board ready to work and having some information and interest. This resolution was our means of getting an appointment process that would get interest, and experience. We are not trying to pull out from under Senate, we will still be accountable to Senate. Because the Faculty Athletics Representative is ex officio on the board, and is appointed by the President, we think that person might be best suited to do the appointment process. Our concern with having the Vice President for Student Affairs supervise appointments is that this is a faculty appointment, and that person might not be as familiar with faculty. We preferred that it stayed with a faculty member consulting with the VPSA. The resolution was to bring a possible solution to you for consideration.

Best stated he supports this 100%, one other point that I worry about, it's also the case when you have a pool of members who indicate an interest in continuing on the board its very much in the interest of the board that members continue, the institution has invested their time and training in those individuals, they've invested their time and training to subject them to an appointments process, and now I didn't get drawn again, it's not serving the best interest of the student athletes or the institution as a whole.

Richard stated that IAB had had that discussion. If the process was changed the IAB's Institutional Control subcommittee would revise our bylaws and specify what that process would be. We debated this quite a bit, and one of the suggestions was exactly what you said. With as many important responsibilities as we have sometimes it is helpful to have someone continue, but like to have new blood, and give opportunities to faculty. The Institutional Control committee proposed faculty could be reappointed for second consecutive term, then would have to reapply. Methven stated that last fall when we ended up with a vacancy on IAB we essentially appointed Melody Wolen for this and the reason we did that is because she had already served on this committee. Richard stated that in that situation you can't start from scratch, if you have experience you can be a productive committee member for this year instead of having to learn the ropes.

Senator Adom asked who appoints the Faculty Athletics Representative, and what would happen if there was a dispute over an appointment between that person and the VPSA. Richard stated that the FAR is designated by the NCAA and appointed by the President. They have to have faculty status, and have been at University for some time to be familiar with the university and athletics. They are basically the liaison between the academic community and the wellbeing of the student athletes. If this was turned over to us to make appointments we'd revise our bylaws to lay these things out. It probably would be the Institutional Control subcommittee consulting with the FAR and VPSA. The VPSA would probably know the faculty but not always all the faculty, so we would rather have some faculty input to that as we had when Senate was doing the appointments some years ago. We did talk about what would happen if there were two people equally qualified going for the same position and in that case we'd probably do a random draw.

Adom asked how the process the IAB proposed would address the concerns raised. Richard stated that call for appointments would ask faculty to express reason why they want to serve on IAB, and faculty would answer one or two questions, that's how we did it when I was on Senate. Faculty would express specific interest to this committee, have some awareness of the committee's responsibilities, and we would look at those to make the appointment. We can look at the make up of board, the departments listed, and make sure that get someone to represent a different college and get varying perspectives, as well as gender diversity.

Adom asked if it would be possible for the IAB to supply guidelines to Senate, and have the Senate use them in making their determinations. Richard stated that if the IAB if we did bylaws revisions, you would certainly see them. Pommier asked if Richards could see the Senate take on that process. Richard agreed, and stated that's what the Senate used to do. People would say this is why they were interested, the nominations committee would look at the departments that were represented, looked at the terms of existing members, and the gender balance. The last three years of appointments were embarrassingly one-sided. During NCAA certification, all we could say was the composition on the board was out of our control, and we are sorry there are no females, and sorry that 50% of board is two departments.

Viertel stated he is also in support of what you are doing here, and asked Richard to say more about the makeup of the board beside Faculty Senate appointees. Richard stated that the one Presidential appointment is to guarantee diversity. In addition to the Senate appointments, there are student representatives. Student Senate has two seats on the IAB, and the Student Athlete Advisory Committee has two seats.

Pommier stated that the random process came about to deal with situations when the nominations committee had to select between eight individuals with similar qualifications served here. Nominations still require faculty to rank their preferences, and if you ask for "any position" you are placed last in priority, and if there's some obscure committee no one applied for you are more likely to be appointed there. For some of these committees there is serious interest, and the only thing we could come up with that was fair was a random process. Richard stated that there were female applicants in previous years but none were selected. Pommier stated that a couple of years ago the Standards Board stated they needed female applicants, and we looked over the list, and there were no females applying. Pommier stated he agreed that IAB needs to have strong representation beyond just random draw, and the issues is to how to change the process. Could Senate implement this process. We wanted to make sure we discussed what is important to IAB. Richard stated that the IAB's roster is clear, and Senate could see what kind of representation we needed. The IAB needs appointees from different disciplines, and gender diversity. Pommier asked if the IAB wanted Senate to take up their resolution. Richard stated that the resolution from the IAB is a request for you to consider. You would need to put together your own motion. That's up to you what form it takes. IAB chose the resolution format so there was some rationale, that showed the reasons why we want this. Pommier asked if the nominations committee had discussed a motion. Methven stated the committee would meet next week to frame a motion for the February 22 meeting. Viertel asked how quickly do we need to mover forward on this to make sure there's something in place in the spring. Senator Worthington stated that nominations happen a bit after the election.

3. Elections Committee: Vice Chair Mulvaney proposed petitions for spring elections be due 4pm Friday March 4, that Senate publish list of candidates March 8 minutes, and hold elections March 29-30. Mulvaney stated he would send information about elections out before the next meeting. Mulvaney (Viertel) moved to set the proposed dates for Spring elections. Motion passed unanimously.

Mulvaney stated that he noticed after our minutes in 2010 voter turnout was not as high, and he believes Senate should look into that. He suggested he could get something in place at the end of the academic year, a committee of some kind. Pommier stated that the first time we did online elections we were very happy with the results, but participation has gone down since. Best stated turnout is now much lower than any time we used a paper ballot. **It's a disgrace.** Pommier asked if Senators have heard anything from colleagues about voting. Stowell asked if there was any way to find out whether faculty members began voting and stopped part of the way through. Senator White stated he has asked some of his colleagues about participating, and the word "relevant" kept coming up, they didn't think Senate was

“relevant” anymore. Coit stated that while he disagreed, he could understand why faculty might think that about Senate, but that this doesn’t explain similar problems with CAA, CGS, and other committees. Mulvaney suggested that if 5-6 people run for offices, it means 50-60 people have signed petitions and thus participated in the process, and voter turnout might be more a reflection of limited number of candidates. Senator Fero asked if Senators were concerned about lower voter turnout or lack of people willing to serve. There are some departments that focus so much on departmental service that people are afraid to run for university committees. In my department most service is departmental. Pommier stated the apparent lack of interest might be due to these committees being perceived as irrelevant. He stated that for the Strategic Planning Committee, 77 faculty volunteered for 27 spots, it was because individuals perceive that they are relevant, that there’s a transparent process by the administration, not just going to be a voice that’s going to be lost. That drives the numbers, to go for seats and to vote. People believe really going to have a say, and two or three of our ideas are going to be acted on.

4. Faculty—Student Relations Committee: no report
5. Faculty—Staff Relations Committee: no report
6. Awards Committee: Stowell: jon sent att. in emal re: DFA. Dates due March 4, forwarded to Jon
7. Faculty Forum Committee: no report
8. Other Reports

a. Provost’s Report:

Lord stated that we use that random various places. Cohorts of sabbaticals get selected out of a hat. Fairness= random is an interesting definition of fairness.

Lord thanked faculty for helping with the weather challenges last week, for being considerate of students, As soon as the email went out announcing that classes would be held Thursday I had a tearful call from a student who lives way out of town, hadn’t had power from Monday, couldn’t get out of her driveway, hence my note, err on the side of being understanding that some people simply couldn’t get here.

Lord stated that the last candidate for the Dean of LCBAS has been interviewed, and he will receive that information next week. Next week interviews start for ITS position, Associate Vice President of Business Affairs supervising ITS, and sometime after that we will start interviews for CATS position. The Strategic Planning Committee kicked off today, got to go and welcome folks large committee. While we are looking ahead in a systematic way, there are ongoing activities in Academic Affairs that will continue to be important. Recruitment and retention issues are going to remain front and center. Lord stated he put out a memo today to CORE, the Committee on Retention Efforts, and is probably going to do more as the week goes on. Lastly the integrative learning initiative is still going to be front and center, those kinds of initiatives are still going to be very much in front of us, and part of our lives as Strategic Planning looks at the long term issues.

b. Budget Transparency Committee: Methven stated that he would report to the Senate next week about the questions the Committee came up with last fall, and the answers Bill Weber and Mike Maurer provided.

c. Other

**B. Other Old Business**

**VI. New Business**

A. Capital Campaign: Bob Martin, Vice President for University Advancement; Steve Rich, Director of Alumni Services.

Martin stated that the quiet phase of the campaign started in 2006, and contributions are right at \$40 million right now, we still have another \$10 million to go to reach our goal. The campaign has had to revise their goal of planned gifts upward to \$12 million because of the success. The campaign is starting a new venture, the faculty-staff campaign. A lot of times we are asked, what percentage of faculty that give, donors don’t ask how much faculty give, they want to know the percentage that give. This campaign is about participation. The goal is to get key groups giving at 100%, e.g. Faculty Senate, CUPB, the Civil Service Council, Staff Senate. Ideally everybody giving is the goal. Michelle Payne is the director for this campaign.

Rich stated the campaign will different approach, personal approach, working through chairs and volunteer faculty captains. The goal here is participation. Ideally 100% will give, I don’t know that there’s a

university in the country that has 100%. Donors ask what percentage of faculty donate to the University. We encourage people to take advantage of payroll deductions, which can break a donation out over 26 installments. If someone says, I can give \$5, we'll say thank you. Where does this money go? Wherever you want it to go. If you want it to go to the Math department, to the Tarble Arts Center, that's where it goes, 100%.

The campaign will kick off Monday after Spring Break, and end April 29. We will calculate the final percentage on June 30. We will have a video announcement from President Perry, and different email announcement from chairs. Volunteer captains will have pledge and payroll deduction cards. Before we publicly announce this we will have 100% donating in VP areas, and we would love to have 100% donating on Senate, the Councils, and President's areas. That sends a strong message.

Pommier asked how do you set up these accounts, for example if a faculty member wants to support travel. Rich stated you would go through your chair, most departments have gift accounts they use for travel. The majority of alumni funds go to department gift accounts, and are spent at the chair's discretion, and are made available to faculty in different ways.

Pommier stated that at end of the academic year, sometimes extra money is released, but an April deadline for gifts might not take advantage of that. Rich stated that some of those can be address through in-kind contributions. Martin stated that when we do our final count, it will be based on the whole fiscal year. Rich stated that we will continue receiving gifts through June 30 even though we'll celebrate the success of the campaign earlier.

Pommier asked Martin to discuss his experience raising money at Auburn University. Martin stated that when started only 9% faculty gave, and the goal was to surpass 20%, the percentage of faculty that gave to United Way. By the third year we overtook University of Alabama, and ended up at 74% of faculty giving. The campaign was done in a United Way style, it emphasized participation, \$2, \$5, asking faculty to remember us in estate plans, and to give to the area that means the most to you. Over 95% of gifts were designated to specific areas. We recruited team captains, and had up to 86 team captains who supported the campaign and told other faculty why they gave. Auburn led SEC in faculty and staff giving, which helped with a campaign that raised \$500 million. One donor said that it meant the most to me that faculty and staff were at 75%, that helped us get an additional \$27 million. Rich stated that the majority of faculty/staff gifts are restricted, and that mirrors the majority of gifts that come from donors, they donate to an area where they have passionate interest.

Stowell asked if donors to the campaign would receive anything. Rich yes, the slogan for the campaign is "Expect Greatness," and anyone donating during the fiscal year will receive a decal stating "I expect greatness."

Viertel asked how much money it takes to endow a scholarship. Rich stated it takes about \$20,000. As recent as 5-6 years ago it only took \$5-6000 with a spending rate is of 4-8% to endow a \$212.50 scholarship. Martin stated that someone endowing a scholarship would have five years to donate the endowment.

Mulvaney asked if they have a goal for percentage of faculty and staff donating. Martin stated we would like to be double where we are, to get to 40%, and then like to grow in stages. Eventually I want to call my friends back at Auburn and say we're ahead of you.

Pommier asked Martin to describe what departments did at Auburn to increase giving. Martin stated that the chair of the Pharmacy department told the faculty, if you get 70% you can have a pizza party or you can shave my head. They shaved his head. Different deans, head of ag/fisheries, did a fish fry; dean of arch had a day where he took pledge cards, you can hit my face with a pie.

Stowell: had a kiss a pig what ever more money had to kiss a pig.

Worthington: says you can give online is there a website? Martin: already give to website, FS campaign not quite up. Rich: alumni, phil or campaign site. Rich: dropdown menu to select destination for the gift.

Pommier: by doing that would 100% go to dept? Rich yes.

## B. Future Agenda

February 22: Barbara Burke, Division of Intercollegiate Athletics; Karla Sanders and Mike Cornebise, CASL.

## VII. Adjournment at

### Future Agenda items:

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Coit  
February 20, 2011