

3-8-2011

March 8, 2011

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 8, 2011" (2011). *Minutes*. 12.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/12

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.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR 8 March 2011 (Vol. XXXIV, No. 12)

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 3:04pm (Martinsville Room, MLK Union)** Present: T. Leonce, A. Methven, F. Mullins, M. Mulvaney, K. Padmaraju, J. Pommier, J. Stowell, D. Viertel, A. White, M. Worthington, J. Prillaman. Guests: Larry Goldstein, Pat Sanaghan, Grant Sterling

II. **Approval of the Minutes of 22 February**

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

III. **Announcements**

Chair Pommier discussed the strong interest and attendance of the Committee on Retention Efforts - Faculty Senate Retention Forum at 2pm on March 8, 2011, Arcola-Tuscola Room (MLK Union)

IV. **Communications**

- a. Email of February 25, from Dean Augustine, re: IRB Appointment Plan
- b. Email of March 7, from Gary Canivez, re: Faculty Senate Session 3/8 (Retention; Strategic Planning) and Minutes
- c. Email of March 1, from Les Hyder, re: Faculty Senate Session 3/8 (Retention; Strategic Planning) and Minutes

V. **Old Business**

A. **Committee Reports**

1. Executive Committee: Chair Pommier indicated the committee will meet with President Perry and Provost Lord at 9am on March 9.
2. Nominations Committee: Senator Methven discussed 2 items that were forwarded to Chair Pommier. The first item involved IAB and the concerns raised by Gail Richards regarding the committee appointment process currently adopted by Faculty Senate's Nominations Committee. Senator Methven (Stowell) motioned to remove IAB from the listing of boards and committees that are within the Nominations Committee's responsibility. A discussion ensued. Chair Pommier stated how the Senate had asked IAB for guidance on how to go about this process and how, in the past, the Nominations Committee Chair would decide how to organize the appointment process. Senator Worthington stated in the past, the Nominations Chair was charged with reaching out to certain individuals to serve on the IAB. Senator Viertel concurred with Senator Worthington and discussed the option of letting IAB manage the appointment process. Senator Viertel discussed the need for IAB to manage the appointment process in an open and transparent manner. Assuming IAB will operate under this open and transparent process, Senator Viertel was supportive of removing IAB from the responsibility of Faculty Senate. Senator Methven also indicated that IAB was attempting to be proactive with this situation as the IAB has tabled a motion regarding the committee appointment process until they have feedback regarding Faculty Senate's decisions associated with the IAB appointment process. Following the discussion, Senator White made a call to question. Vote on motion to remove IAB from the listing of boards and committees occurred and passed 9-1. Yes: Leonce, Methven, Mullins, Mulvaney, Padmaraju, Stowell, Viertel, White, Worthington. No: Pommier. Chair Pommier stated that with the passing of the motion by more than 2/3 vote, the change will also be made to the Faculty Senate's by-laws. Chair Pommier also asked if Senator Methven would communicate the results to Gail Richards and IAB. Senator Methven stated he would contact Gail Richards and inform her of the change. Senator Methven stated the list of nominations for all committees and boards has been reviewed by the Nominations Committee and will be presented to the Faculty Senate following the Spring Faculty elections.
3. Elections Committee: Senator Mulvaney stated that as of the March 4, 2011 deadline for candidate petitions and responses, several committees did not receive any interest. In particular, the following committees did not have any or

enough candidates for the open positions: Faculty Senate, Council on Graduate Studies (CAH & CEPS), CUBP (COS & CEPS), Enrollment Management Advisory Committee (CEPS & COS), Sanctions & Terminations Hearing Committee (CEPS), Academic Program Elimination Review Committee (COS), & University Personnel Committee (CEPS & at-large). Senator Mulvaney (Padmaraju) motioned to extend the deadline for candidate petitions for all positions until 4pm on Friday, March 11, 2011. Motion passed unanimously.

*******SENATOR PADMARAJU DEPARTED RESULTING IN A LACK OF QUORUM AT THIS TIME.*******

4. Faculty – Student Relations Committee: Senator White discussed three possible opportunities to encourage faculty-student interactions. First, Senator White suggested conducting a forum with students on student retention. Senator White discussed the possible merit of getting students more involved in something similar to the recent CORE – Faculty Senate Retention Forum. Second, Senator White suggested providing an activity during finals week such as a study break activity/event. Third, Senator White suggested bringing a speaker to campus. Chair Pommier reviewed the three options and asked the Senate if we had time to organize another forum this semester. Senator Worthington suggested surveying the students sometime during the spring (2011) semester to determine a topic for the forum and the Senate could implement the results of the interest survey sometime during the fall (2011) semester. Chair Pommier, Senator White, and Senator Methven expressed support for Senator Worthington’s idea. Chair Pommier asked Faculty Senate student representative Jennifer Prillaman for feedback on Senator Worthington’s idea and Prillaman expressed support for the timeline and idea.
5. Faculty – Staff Relations Committee: No report
6. Awards Committee: Senator Stowell indicated the committee will be meeting on March 21 to review applications.
7. Faculty Forum Committee: No report
8. Other Reports
 - a. Provost’s Report: No report.
 - b. Budget Transparency Committee: Delayed discussion until next official Faculty Senate meeting due to lack of quorum.

B. **Other Old Business** – Chair Pommier recommended deferring these items until next meeting due to lack of quorum.

VI. **New Business**

- A. CORE – Faculty Senate Retention Forum: President Perry began the forum by stating that the goal of the Committee on Retention Efforts is to look at retention in a data-driven way, and that this view often finds that a faculty or staff member made a huge difference in students finishing college, and in their life. Perry thanked the provost for his initiative in moving this along, and stated that he tells prospective students that Eastern is the place where you get personal attention, where you get great faculty and staff that are concerned about student success, and the Committee’s efforts are going to be important to that. Provost Lord stated that while Integrative Learning is a centerpiece of the academic agenda, recruitment and retention are important for students to succeed, and that if we don’t retain them they can’t achieve their goal of getting their degree. Retention is important for our students and for our institution, and it’s something we’ve talked about for a long time as the challenges in the world become ever greater. Lord stated that retention happens with students in all their interactions. Since we can’t anticipate the location of this interaction, ensuring student retention becomes an important job for all of us. Kimberlie Moock stated that the Committee on Retention Efforts is a joint committee from the Academic and Student Affairs areas. She stated that President Perry’s retention goal, established a couple of years ago as an aspirational goal, was to improve freshman to sophomore retention to 85%. EIU is not quite there yet, and we will talk about ways in which we can all work together to get to that 85%. She stated that EIU’s

current freshman to sophomore retention rate is 79%. EIU is above our benchmark class, and the personalization of the EIU experience comes through in our graduation and retention rates.

Moock stated that part of the committee's work has been an analysis of alumni survey data, which asked students to select elements of their experience that had either a positive or negative impact on them during their time at Eastern. 53% students noted a positive relationship with faculty and advisers, while this category was also highest among negative comments at 24%. The next highest positive element was EIU's academic programs, followed by social life, co-curricular activities, and the community. The community was also highly rated as a negative element. Compared to other institutions, students rank Eastern as highly demanding of critical thinking in the National Survey on Student Engagement.

Karla Sanders stated that how students spend their time can have a big impact on their success. A survey of seniors about how much time they spent on different activities in an average week showed the following results. Most students spent less than 10 hours per week on studying, for example.

One committee initiative looked at when continuing students are registering, and they found that in finals week of fall semester we had several hundred students that had not registered for spring semester. Email reminders to register were sent to the students. The committee sent out surveys at the end of the semester, asking students if they are going to leave EIU, and if so what are they doing, where are they going. The committee also sent lists of those unregistered students to department chairs, and chairs are doing a variety of things, some of them are making phone calls, some are sending out emails, and some having face to face discussions.

Moock stated that the committee is also taking a closer look at what was happening with holds on registration. The most common hold is the hold that comes up because students are not paying their semester bill. More students are finding themselves in that situation because of the economy, and we looking at putting something together for those financially at-risk. Towards the end of the semester we typically find a group of students that are just in a tight spot, and we are sending a survey to those students, to ask how they think they are going to move through on finances.

Sanders stated that students that are not doing well academically are not likely to stick around to graduate. There is about a 20% gap between students academically "at risk" and average students in their freshman to sophomore retention rate. Sanders stated the committee is also trying to develop a definition to identify groups with lower retention rates than average. These groups include: minority students; first generation college students; an ACT score below 21; a high school GPA below 2.75; students with no declared major; students with high financial need. If you put more than one of these factors together, the risk of leaving Eastern increases. Sanders stated that the Provost has asked the committee to create a kind of early alert system. Sanders stated that the biggest warning sign is failure to attend class.

Moock stated that the aim of the forum was to begin to create ways to get help to our students that need it, and asked attendees to discuss what they would be willing to do, or what they are already doing, to address these issues. The intent of the committee is to build a system that people will actually utilize.

B. Strategic Planning Consultants: Larry Goldstein and Patrick Sanaghan (strategic planning consultants) provided an overview of their work experiences and their role in EIU's strategic planning process. Larry discussed how the process needs to be transparent. Larry stated the Faculty Senate is a key stakeholder group on campus and is hopeful the Senate can help educate the consultants about the university. Larry stated the consultants will not be the faces of EIU's strategic planning; rather, the Strategic Planning Committee and the co-chairs of the Committee will drive the strategic planning process at EIU. Pat Sanaghan asked the Senate to share their questions about the strategic planning process. Senator Stowell asked how individual faculty can provide input into the strategic plan. Larry stated faculty can contribute in a myriad of ways. Specifically, members of the Strategic Planning Committee will pair

up and conduct data gathering activities. The Strategic Planning Committee will develop a work plan during their March 8, 2011 meeting (7:00pm – 9:00pm, MLK Union). The work plan will include methods to engage faculty, staff, students, and external stakeholders. Patrick asked Senator Stowell and the Senate if anyone had other suggestions to elicit input in the planning process. Senator Stowell said he did not have any suggestions at this time. Patrick emphasized the important role of faculty in the planning process. Patrick stated 60% of the Strategic Planning Committee is comprised of faculty and that faculty “buy-in” to the plan will be important. Senator Methven asked how the consultants will encourage faculty “buy-in”. Senator Methven indicated he has experienced the development of three strategic plans while at EIU and expressed concern over the implementation of the final plan. Larry stated the plan utilizes a five phase, intentional, process. The last phase is the goal setting where five to six priorities will be identified. These priorities will be very specific and contain information regarding their implementation, who will be responsible for the implementation, when it will be completed (i.e., an established timeline). Larry indicated this specificity will create accountability. Larry also indicated he felt optimistic about EIU after meeting with the President’s Council earlier today (3/8/11). Larry stated the President’s Council informed him that every (Council) meeting focuses on strategic planning. Larry also cautioned the biggest problem with strategic plans is lack of involvement. Lack of involvement can lead to failure, according to Larry. Patrick suggested that Senator Methven’s concern is, unfortunately, what gives strategic planning a bad name. Patrick stated the President of a university plays a key role in the process. The process needs to be transparent and the university must keep the campus community updated on the status of the strategic plan, regardless if the news is good or bad. Patrick recommended annual reports be developed and shared with the campus community that provides an honest and specific overview of the status of the plan and its priorities. Larry asked the Senate to share their thoughts on the strategic planning website. Senator White stated his first thoughts and impressions were positive; however, his second thoughts were concerned with the campus community’s perception of “here we go again”. Senator White also stated that after reviewing the composition of the Strategic Planning Committee he felt the committee was a solid group of individuals who could hopefully guide the development of a successful plan. Larry stated the website looks better than most he has seen. Larry also cautioned the site will likely get a bit more cluttered once the data gathering stage begins. Chair Pommier felt President Perry has been well received on this campus for his open and transparent approach to campus issues and that this approach could go a long way in the success of the strategic plan. Chair Pommier asked the consultants to discuss how the Strategic Planning Committee will interpret the volumes of data that will be collected. Chair Pommier expressed some concern over the potential for varied interpretations of the data. Larry responded by discussing the role of the 28 member Strategic Planning Committee during the “Making Sense of the Data” phase of the planning process. In addition to the multiple perspectives within the Strategic Planning Committee, the development of white papers that discuss each priority will also address this concern, according to Larry. Patrick discussed how EIU must also understand that the university has a limited number of resources and, thus, must prioritize a list of five to six feasible priorities. Patrick also encouraged Faculty Senate to get involved whenever the consultants visit. Patrick encouraged the Strategic Planning Committee Co-Chairs to visit with Faculty Senate on a regular basis to update the Senate on the Strategic Planning Committee’s progress with the plan. Larry stated how the white papers will seek to provide a simplistic overview of the topic/priority and that these papers need to be readable by all. Typically, these papers are five to seven pages in length that discuss the internal issues related to the topic and a discussion of what others (outside the university) think about the topic. Larry stated that these papers can help shape the university’s vision by providing insight into the question, “What do you want the university to look like five years from now?” Larry also discussed how each university is unique and that the consultants have experience

with a variety of institutions and are confident they can help EIU develop a five year plan. Patrick stated he would like to visit with Faculty Senate again in the future. Chair Pommier asked Patrick when the next visit might be and Larry indicated the consultants would know their schedule following their March 9 morning meetings. Senator Padmaraju asked the consultants to share any past successes they have had with strategic planning. Patrick discussed St. Joseph University and Larry discussed an experience with West Indies. Patrick concluded the discussion by indicating he would forward the consultants contact information to Faculty Senate.

Future Agenda: Campus Security: Chair Pommier indicated Dr. Nadler and representatives of the Campus Security initiatives on campus would be present at the next meeting to discuss three questions: (1) What is EIU using as technology to keep the campus informed during security issues/threats? Are we employing any new technologies to improve this process? (2) In regards to the threat assessment, how are threats determined? (3) In regards to recent nationwide security issues (i.e., Arizona), how is EIU addressing the questions of, "What if the individual had help? Would this proactive assistance reduced the likelihood of the instance occurring?"

Disability Services: Chair Pommier indicated Disability Services will attend the Faculty Senate's April 5, 2011 meeting.

Faculty Retirement Reception: Chair Pommier indicated the Faculty Retirement Reception will occur following/during the Faculty Senate's April 19 meeting.