

1-26-2010

January 26, 2010

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 26, 2010" (2010). *Minutes*. 25.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/25

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 26 January 2010 (Vol. XXXVIII, No. 11)

The 2009 – 2010 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, at McAfee Gymnasium 1102, and on the third-level bulletin board in Booth Library. 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: J. Best, A. Brownson, J. Coit, M. Fero, A. Methven, M. Mulvaney, R. Murray, J. Pommier, J. Russell, D. Van Gunten, D. Viertel, A. White, M. Worthington, S. Lambert. Excused: M.-L. Li, K. Padmaraju. Absent: F. Mullins.

Guests: Jeff Cross (Associate VP, Academic Affairs); Jon Blitz (UPI, Vice President/Chemistry), Bob Augustine (Dean of the Graduate School), Diane Hoadley (Dean of LCBAS), Grant Sterling (CAA), Karen Drage (CUPB), Sarah Ruholl (DEN), Sandy Bowman (Human Resources)

II. Approval of the Minutes of 12 January

Senator Methven (White) moved to approve the minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

IV. Communications

- a. Email of 20 January, from Tim Taylor, re: Writing Across the Curriculum Proposal
- b. Email of 21 January, from Cheryl Siddens, re: Faculty Senate bylaws

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee:

2. Nominations Committee: Senator Worthington noted that the list of committees in the Senate's bylaws is outdated. Chair Pommier stated that Senator Worthington should make an updated list, and propose the list as a change to the bylaws.

3. Elections Committee: Vice Chair Van Gunten stated that Sace Elder has volunteered to serve on the Council on Graduate Studies for spring semester 2010, in place of Chris Hanlon. Van Gunten (Russell) moved to accept Sace Elder's nomination as a one-semester replacement on CGS for Chris Hanlon. Motion passed unanimously.

Van Gunten discussed setting a date for spring Faculty elections. She agreed to propose specific dates for nominations and the election at the next meeting.

Van Gunten noted that Senate needs a replacement for the Spring 2010 semester of Kiran Padmaraju's term. Van Gunten stated that, pursuant to the bylaws, she has examined the lists of alternates from previous elections, and none are available. After a call in the Senate's minutes, she has received one volunteer, and outlined several options to proceed, as Senate's bylaws prohibit us from seating a replacement Senator. Senate could, by a 2/3 vote, suspend bylaws and seat the replacement for Spring 2010; could conduct a special election to fill the seat for Spring; or could leave the seat vacant. A candidate selected in a special election would likely serve in March and April only, and be available for the Senate's summer meeting. Senator Van Gunten (Methven) moved to suspend the Senate's bylaws to allow senate to seat the volunteer replacement for Kiran P. for Spring 2010. Motion passed unanimously. Senator Van Gunten (Viertel) moved to seat Amy Rosenstein as Kiran Padmaraju's replacement for Spring 2010. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Faculty—Student Relations Committee: no report

5. Faculty—Staff Relations Committee: no report

6. Faculty Forum Committee:

7. Other Reports

a. Provost's Report: no report

b. Budget Transparency Committee (report attached): Senator Best stated the committee had examined the budgets of ledger 1 (appropriated) funds for several areas in the institution. He stated that their review has shown a significant increase in honors budget line, and stated that the honors college stated the increase was to help fund student research and presentations of student research. Best stated that this

funding is consistent with president's stated goals. Senator Methven reviewed the budget for grants for faculty research and presidential graduate assistants. While the figures on EIU's website indicate a large increase in fiscal 2010, these figures are inaccurate. Grants for research have been increasing by approximately \$5000 per year from 2008-2010, and has been increased since the last reduction in this category, fiscal year 2002. Best stated that this was a very interesting exercise, a challenging exercise, and all individuals contacted for the report were very forthcoming and cooperative. Senator Murray's report on the Faculty Development Office indicated substantial increases in that office's budget, largely to hire additional staff. Copies of the report were sent to Dean Augustine.

Chair Pommier asked committee members to discuss the future of this report. Methven stated that the committee was unsure. He noted his concern that the information on the budget from the website was inaccurate.

c. Bylaws Committee:

d. Awards Committee: Senator Russell stated that the Distinguished Faculty Award committee has updated the award's application form, and the announcement is ready to be publicized. Nominations for the award are due March 5th. Senator White noted that the Senate's bylaws state that the committee must have four faculty members, one of whom must be appointed by President Perry. He noted that Perry requested a list of all previous faculty members. Russell asked if awards committee members were to make up the other three spots. Pommier agreed. Russell stated that she and White would generate a list of previous committee members appointed by the President, and have asked Student Senate and Steve Rich at Alumni Services for the other committee members.

VI. New Business

A. Proposed EIU Furlough Policy: Karen Drage, Chair of Council on University Planning and Budget (CUPB)

Drage stated that the CUPB's role in the furlough process was to obtain further information, clarify CUPB's role (advisory), and diminish anxiety regarding the furlough policy. President Perry established a deadline of February for the final policy. CUPB members were to reach out to their constituencies, generate comments, bring comments back to CUPB. Comments that CUPB received via their website were confidential, and were all released to the public.

Drage stated that the same day the draft policy was released the online comment form went up on CUPB site. To date CUPB has received 84 comments. Some have asked comments to be un-posted. CUPB member comments have been added to the comments posted online. CUPB gave a presentation to Perry December 11, and noted that a majority of comments were dealing with implementation. The minutes and PowerPoint from that meeting are on CUPB's website. CUPB held three open forums, with total participation at roughly 250-300. A volunteer took minutes in real-time, and comments were displayed and verified with the commenter. Perry received all comments in electronic form and paper form a grand total of 357 comments.

Drage stated that CUPB made some suggestions to the policy. She noted that the President, the Provost, and other administrators have all said that it is a last resort policy, stated CUPB wanted the verbiage in policy to state, that furloughs would be imposed only after other cost-saving measures had been considered. She noted that many commenters wanted accountability for the policy, and wanted VPs to come up with an additional list of the projected cost savings in each area would result from other proposed cuts. CUPB stated that the policy should reflect the operational needs of the university as a whole. CUPB urged that impact of the policy on grant-funded employees needed to be clarified. CUPB stated the policy should refer to "furloughed employees" rather than as "affected employees." CUPB also asked Perry to lower the number of potential furlough days, from 30 to 20-22. CUPB also urged Perry to tabulate furlough days on the standard as well as fiscal year calendar to prevent excessive furloughs in one calendar year.

Drage stated that Perry should release the revised policy within the week. She stated that the process is out of our hands at this point, and it is up to the President and Vice Presidents from here on out. She stated that CUPB is going to continue to look at collecting suggestions on cost containment. The council has been doing that for a year and have collected ideas. We're not going to solve the deficit by turning our lights off but we can make a dent. CUPB also will collect comments based on alternative cash-flow strategies.

Senator White asked if the furlough policy does go into effect, who is exempt from furlough? Drage said she did not know, and that CUPB is not involved with implementation, just collecting the comments on the draft furlough policy.

Senator Worthington asked Drage to clarify her comments on accountability. Drage stated that in the furlough policy it says that upon consultation with the President each Vice President will prepare a list of employees to be furloughed. The list will specify who will be furloughed, the number of furlough days in each area, and the projected cost savings of the furloughs for each area.

Senator Methven stated that we were told that the hiring of unit B faculty to replace retiring unit A faculty was a temporary measure in the 1990s, but has become part of the standard operating procedure. Drage stated that CUPB had several ideas about defining temporary and passed those along to the President. Chair Pommier stated that the CUPB did not develop language on that, and asked if Drage had emphasized this issue to President? Drage said she did not put it in writing, but that it was part of verbal recommendations. She stated she would send the President an email on the matter.

B. Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws

Chair Pommier initiated a discussion on the structure of Faculty Senate by noting that previous chairs has raised the issue, and stated that the Executive Committee has made a proposal regarding the issue. He asked Vice Chair Van Gunten to discuss her conversations with Faculty Senators at other institutions. Van Gunten noted that EIU's all at-large Senate is atypical for most institution. She noted that in discussing this with Faculty Senators at other institutions, colleagues suggested that it was unclear how an all at-large Senate could or would adequately represent different faculty constituencies on campus. Van Gunten stated that in two cases, colleagues described how their Senates has responded to crises, and stated that if their Senate seats had been all at-large, the Senate would have been totally ineffective at addressing the issue. She noted that the issue of reconstructing Senate had been raised several times at previous EIU Faculty Senate meetings.

Pommier stated that he was also concerned about the effectiveness of Senate representation. He noted that a serious issue had been raised last fall which indicated some disagreement with many of Senate's previous actions, but about which he was never aware until late last semester. He stated that there has been a problem with getting people to run for Senate, and suggested this indicated that Senate is not perceived as adequately representing campus concerns. He also stated that a more representative structure might make it more likely that President Perry and other administrators would listen to the Senate.

Van Gunten noted that the Executive Committee's concern is not about the current membership of Senate, which draws heavily from CEPS. She noted that representation does fluctuate, but that there's a historic pattern in which colleges are over-represented.

Senator Brownson stated that EIU's governance structure is set up to divide faculty, and the faculty's power is divided into several groups, CUPB, CGS, CAA, Senate, and the Union. Because we are divided into these groups each group is perceived as having more or less power. If you asked people on campus who has most power they would say CUPB and CAA.

Senator Murray asked were the other institutions, to which Van Gunten referred, also unionized? Van Gunten said yes, and the discussions included some significantly larger institutions, some similar to EIU.

Chair Pommier proposed a new system for Faculty Senate elections. As in the current bylaws, five senators would be elected each year for three-year terms. However, each slate of positions would include one designated seat for a representative from each college. In the first year, the fifth position would be designated for a representative from the library. The remaining two positions would be elected at large. Pommier noted several mechanisms for selecting at-large candidates were discussed. The proposal is to run every candidate in an election featuring an at large seat for both their own college seat and the at-large seat. Faculty would vote both for the seat designated for their college, and for the at-large seat. After all the votes are counted, candidates who win their college seat would be removed from the at-large slate, and the recipient of the next highest vote total would win the at-large seat.

Senator White asked what would happen if we go to this system and a college doesn't have any candidates? Pommier noted that Senate has had that problem, and under the new system it would be the same process as it is currently resolved, by looking for alternates from previous elections. Senator Coit noted that, in the case White described, it would be clearer than it is now who was lacking representation and who needed to run for Senate.

Senator Best stated that all he was hearing is what we are losing, and noted that we have a simple electoral process now. He stated that Senate would also lose a group where you learn about all the other constituencies. He stated he believes it was deliberate the way the Senate is set up because we want a body that can't work in a sectarian way. He said that if Senators feel we are not having enough influence, don't look at structural reasons, look at process reasons. He stated he did not believe that we come back and

draw campus's attention to the issues. If we perceive we're not being influential we should look at process first and not at structure.

Senator Viertel stated he agreed. He said he thinks it would be better to have more members from the same college that are engaged and want to be here than people who are only on Senate because their college had seats open. Best noted that the 5th most interested person from CEPS might be better than the most interested person from another college. He stated that Senate already has the means to make its voice heard. He noted that right now on Senate there are no coalitions, no sectarian behavior. He stated he had never seen anything like a "hijacking" of the senate under its current structure.

Senator Methven stated that he agreed with Best. He noted that he understood why CAA, CGS, and CUPB are constructed the way they are, but agreed that Faculty Senate is different than that. He said that if people are concerned that there are too many Senators from CEPS than people should run for Senate.

Brownson stated that when she was Vice Chair she asked numerous people, why don't you run for Faculty Senate, and respond that they teach during that time. She wondered if there is a better time? She stated that the bigger issue was whether there is a possibility of having a no-conflict time on this campus? She stated that if there was a no conflict time I think that could provide the opportunity for people who want to serve and couldn't.

Murray noted that in a unionized institution, it is unclear what the role of the faculty senate should be. She asked if that was something Senate could discuss in the future.

Best stated that he has been here 30 years, since the beginning of the contract, and he has come to see it as, the union has a very narrow, sharp pointed focus, but everything else about being a faculty member is Senate's purview. He stated that there is way more outside what the union does.

Pommier asked what Senators against the proposal would suggest the Senate do about about representation, noted the recent difficulties finding alternates for Senate seat. He noted that in looking at other institution's Senates he couldn't find another example of an all at-large body.

Best noted that the recent discussion over academic freedom, in which the Board of Trustee's asked for Senate's opinion on a proposed Board Governing Policy, was evidence that the Board is interested in what we talk about. Best stated that Senate should go back and look at the issues raised at meetings see where they are rather than pass them off to other committees or administrators.

Russell stated that she was still not sure what the Executive Committee wanted to change about the Senate's role on campus. She stated that until she understand what we want to be different, she was unwilling to debate procedural or structural change.

Worthington noted that what convinced her last year not to pursue this is that in its current form the Senate represents the Faculty as a whole. She asked if we changed the makeup, would it change the culture of the Senate, and it may change the Senate into something we might not want.

Murray asked Senators what changes in process might give Senate a stronger voice. Recorder Coit noted that the Senate rarely votes on matters of substance.

Best stated Senate has done a lot of vote-taking in the past, and noted Senate does not have as much of that as it used to. He was unsure if he would support establishing the Faculty Senate as an overarching approval grounds, but if we really thought someone was going the wrong way then Senate should make its opinion heard. He stated that he thought there are strengths Senate has now that it are not using.

Brownson noted that the process changed the year Assege Haile-Miriam was chair, and the presentation/ question and answer format came into being. She noted that often times there was no continued response to the issues raised at meetings. Best noted that 10 years ago the Senate was more like a debating society, and stated that wasn't much fun.

Van Gunten stated that some of her concerns are a consequence of the format and noted that this was the longest conversation she has been a part of on Senate.

Pommier stated that individuals are much more prepared when they address Faculty Senate now than they used to, in part because they receive Senators' questions beforehand, and this can leave Senate little to discuss.

Methven stated that if, for example, the Senate wanted to take a position on the furlough policy, there's no reason that Senate couldn't have discussed that and voiced our recommendations to the President as Faculty.

VII. Adjournment at 3:55pm

Future Agenda items:

WAC Writing Intensive Graduation Requirement proposal, Renewable Energy Center

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Coit
February 6, 2010

January 21, 2010

Report for Subcommittee on Budget Transparency

In meeting of October 27, 2009, questions arose about the amount of appropriated funds listed on the University Budget webpage for Research and Sponsored Programs (Acct 127210) relative to Grants for Research and the Graduate School (Acct 127110) relative to Presidential graduate assistantships. After initial review, it appeared that funding for these accounts had declined in FY 2009 and then risen dramatically in FY 2010.

Grants for Research	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
	\$88,000	\$85,000	\$165,256

Presidential Graduate Assistantships	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
	\$111,928	\$100,980	\$163,296

Dr. Robert Chesnut, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, was contacted regarding changes in appropriated budget for Grants for Research. After discussions with Dr. Chesnut, Ms. Cathy Thomas, and Mr. Brad Green, it became apparent that the figures listed on the University Budget webpage for FY 2008 and FY 2009 were incomplete. The figures listed for FY 2010 were accurate. The figures that Dr. Chesnut and his staff provided actually showed that the budget for Grants for Research had increased each year. The figures provided by Dr. Chesnut and his staff follow:

Grants for Research	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
	\$155,256	\$162,256	\$165,256

Dr. Robert Augustine, Dean of the Graduate School, was contacted regarding changes in the appropriated budget for Presidential graduate assistantships. After discussions with Dean Augustine, it again became apparent that the figures listed on the University Budget webpage for FY 2008 and FY 2009 were incomplete. The figures listed for FY 2010 were accurate. Dean Augustine provided the following history of the awards. When the Presidential graduate assistantships program was established in FY 2002, the appropriated budget was \$115,334 and was intended to support eighteen awards, three of which were allocated to campus offices and fifteen of which were for graduate programs. The Presidential graduate assistantship budget increased by 3% each year until FY 2009 and brought the balance to \$142,745. In FY 2010, President Perry allocated new funding to create three additional Presidential graduate assistantships for First Choice graduate programs. This brought the total number of awards to twenty one, with three awards allocated to campus offices and eighteen awards allocated to graduate programs. The new funding, plus the annual 3% increase, raised the total budget to \$163,256.

We would like to express our appreciation to Dr. Chesnut and his staff as well as Dean Augustine for their willingness to openly discuss and clarify these budgetary issues for the subcommittee.

Re: Budget Transparency Subcommittee
Faculty Senate 2009-2010

As part of my duties on the Budget Transparency Subcommittee (BTS), I examined the Ledger 1, Appropriated Funds budget for the Honors College for the fiscal years FY08, FY09, and FY10 (the current budgetary year.) I compiled the following figures:

Budget line	FY08	FY09	FY10
128000 Honors College Dean	\$275,941	\$310,444	\$375,877
128010 Presidential Scholars	\$488,562	\$497,324	\$500,000
128020 PSAT Recruiting	\$2379	\$1570	\$2379

As this table shows, two of the three budget lines in the Honors College (128010 and 128020) have been relatively static across the last three fiscal years. There has been a substantial increase in one budget line (128000), which increased by 12.5% from FY08 to FY09, and increased again by 21% from FY09 to FY2010. Most of this increase appears to be localized in a category of funds called “Non-Pers Budget” in the FY10 budget. This amount (\$127,982) seems to be a substantial increase over the FY09 budget where the same category appears to have totaled \$40,277. However, it should be kept in mind that advancing the role and mission of the Honors College is one of the President’s stated goals for the institution. Also, most of this increase has apparently gone to travel funds for students to attend and present at research conferences nationwide. Again, this increase is congruent with the President’s objectives for this unit, and it shows that the budgetary process does result in increased funding flowing to those units within the institution whose mission has been prioritized. Thank you.
John Best

**Report for Subcommittee on Budget Transparency
Faculty Development Budget Changes: 2008-2010**

In an October 27, 2010, meeting questions arose regarding the change in appropriated funds listed on the University Budget webpage for Faculty Development Programs, relative to personnel and commodities accounts, since these accounts had risen dramatically in FY 2009 and were maintained at 2009 levels in 2010, and contractual and travel accounts had risen less dramatically.

Here are some details from the Faculty Development Budget:

FY 2008:

Personnel Services Equipment	Commodities	Travel	Contractual	Telecom	Total
\$77,116	\$4894	\$6968	\$20,519	\$1,074	\$654
\$111,225					

FY2009

\$173,208	\$15,069	\$11,615	\$26,608	\$1,684	\$110
\$228,295					

FY2010:

Student	Non-Student Personnel	Total Personnel	Non-Personnel	Total
120220 \$600	\$169,511	\$170,111	\$56,628	\$226,739

Dr. Mildred Pierce, Director of Faculty Development, was contacted regarding changes in the appropriated budget for 2009. After discussions with the director, it became apparent that figures listed in the budget reflected one major change—increased personnel. An assistant and two graduate assistants account for the majority of the budget change from FY2008 to FY2009. Changes in commodities were accounted for in relation to publicity materials for presenters and evidence for participants in Faculty Development

workshops and presentations. The budget remains stable for FY2010. The travel account and contractual accounts increased in FY2009, as well, and remain stable in FY2010. We would like to express our appreciation to Dr. Pierce for her willingness to openly discuss and clarify these budgetary issues for the subcommittee.