

3-9-2010

March 9, 2010

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 9, 2010" (2010). *Minutes*. 28.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/28

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 9 March 2010 (Vol. XXXVIII, No. 13)

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, F. Mullins, M. Mulvaney, R. Murray, J. Pommier, A. Rosenstein, J. Russell, D. Van Gunten, D. Viertel, A. White, M. Worthington, A. Boyd,
Excused: S. Lambert

Guests: Michael Hoadley (Associate VPAA/CATS), Bonnie Irwin (Dean of the Honors College), Will Hine (Dean of School of Continuing Education), Bob Augustine (Dean of the Graduate School), Diane Jackman (Dean of College of Education and Professional Studies), Jeanne Snyder (Associate Dean, LCBAS), Mary Herrington-Perry (Associate VPAA), Gary Aylesworth (Philosophy), William Weber (VPBA), Lakshmikara Padmaraju (Business Affairs), Erica Whelan (DEN), Bob Martin (VPUA), Blair Lord (VPAA).

II. Approval of the Minutes of 23 February

Senator Brownson (Methven) moved to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

Pearson announced the Faculty Development Spring External Speaker, Dr. Pat Hutchings, who will be speaking about integrative learning April 8, from 1-3pm, at the Grand Ballroom.

IV. Communications

a. Email of 25 February, from Mildred Pearson, re: Nominations Committee

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee: no report

2. Nominations Committee: no report

3. Elections Committee: Vice Chair Van Gunten reported that as of Friday, March 5, out of the 23 open positions, 7 positions had received no nominating positions, while 5 positions would have contested elections. She stated that Senate had 3 choices; Senate could proceed with election as scheduled with the current ballot of candidates; it could extend the nominating period for open positions only; or it could extend the nominating period for all positions. Van Gunten recommended that Senate vote to extend the nominating period for all positions until Thursday, March 11, 4pm. Senator Mulvaney (Rosenstein) moved to extend the deadline for nominations for Spring 2010 Faculty elections until Thursday, March 11, at 4pm.

Senator Best thanked all those individuals who recognize their obligation to serve. He noted that the University Personnel Committee is a negotiated body, which means that when we bargain with the institution, we give up something to have a UPC which makes recommendations, and stated that frankly it's very disappointing that people do not run to staff this committee. Senator Rosenstein stated that you have to be tenured to serve on the UPC, so that cuts out a big number of potential candidates.

Senator Mulvaney stated that he personally preferred the third option, because the Senate would treat each position consistently, and because it's always healthy to have the more contested elections. Senator Russell asked if the Executive Committee looked at past precedents. Van Gunten stated Senate has done a number of things, including extending the deadline, as well as having fall elections for unfilled seats. Senator Fero asked if in past instances when filing deadlines have been extended have the increased deadlines led to more candidates? Van Gunten stated that it wasn't certain that an extended deadline would bring in more candidates, because there appears to be a decreasing number of people willing to serve. Chair Pommier stated that extending the deadline for all positions might result in longer lists of alternates. Motion passed 13-1. Yes: Best, Brownson, Coit, Fero, Methven, Mullins, Mulvaney, Pommier, Rosenstein, Russell, Van Gunten, Viertel, Worthington. No: White.

4. Faculty—Student Relations Committee: no report

5. Faculty—Staff Relations Committee: no report

6. Faculty Forum Committee: Recorder Coit stated that the report on last semester's Faculty Forum was finished and would be circulated among Senators for comments.

7. Other Reports

a. Provost's Report:

Lord noted that the remaining open faculty searches are coming to a close, and the searching departments have improved our "hit" rate, and most searches are successful.

Lord stated that most of his time is being spent dealing with the fallout resulting from the state having failed to pay EIU \$33 million of its FY10 appropriation. Lord stated EIU is moving slowly and trying to extend cash-on-hand until either the state gets more money, or we get authority to borrow against \$33 million. For the next fiscal year the very best we will have is this year's budget less \$3million, and the conversations in the administration are how do we plan for next year. The VPAA's office, deans and department chairs are working on how most effectively deliver curriculum given the likely cuts from the state.

Lord stated that he is undertaking a review of the Honors College and its Dean position. Lord stated that he invites the campus give him comments on or ideas for the program. In replacing Dean Irwin, there are certain things precluded because of the time of year. It is too late to do a national search for a replacement Dean, and EIU can't do internal-only search. Lord said he wants faculty to consider and comment on short term options: one option would be to appoint a 1-year interim Dean, another option would be to look at Honors Dean like a chair, with a two or three year appointment.

Coit asked if the legislature approved short-term borrowing, who would pay the interest. Lord stated that in the Senate version the institution is liable for the interest, and an amendment offered in the House would oblige the State to pay. Pommier asked if the Honors Dean position would be open to a national search. Lord stated that if it was converted to a position like a chair, there would be an internal search.

b. Budget Transparency Committee: no report

c. Bylaws Committee: no report

d. Awards Committee: Senator Russell announced the committee recommends Janet Marquart receive the Distinguished Faculty Award. Russell stated that the committee received 9 great nominations and came to consensus on Marquart. Pommier asked how many were first year nominations. Russell stated there were 6. Pommier asked the committee to contact the nominees who did not win the award to let them know they can update their existing file and be considered for next year's award. Russell (White) moved to name Janet Marquardt the 2010 Distinguished Faculty Award recipient. The motion passed unanimously.

e. Other: Pommier stated that the Executive Committee had met to draft bylaws for Article 13 referenda because officers felt the need for bylaws to provide some guidance in the procedure. Coit noted that the proposed bylaws were drafted after discussing the legal issues with the State Attorney General's office, and EIU and State records officials. Coit (Brownson) moved to approve the bylaws. Best asked regarding the proposed verification, if petition signature pages aren't made available once the Executive Committee does that, is there an appeal process if the Executive Committee determines the petition did not receive enough signatures. Coit stated that the bylaws would require the Committee to produce a report stating how many signatures were verified and what methods were used to verify them, which would make the Executive Committee's process transparent. Senator Methven asked who the bylaws intended to protect by ensuring the signature pages remained confidential. Coit stated that the context for that bylaw was a concern to not close off one avenue faculty have to participate in shared governance, given the discussions Senate has had about declining interest in Senate. Senator White asked what precipitated the drafting of bylaws. Pommier stated that bylaws were drafted because the currently circulating petition caused us to look at Article 13, and it was felt there are a lot of holes in the Article. White stated he was concerned about the process. Pommier stated that having some bylaws would improve the petition process. Van Gunten stated that if the petition signature pages are public, then verification takes care of itself. Methven stated that we could read the names into minutes, and ask faculty to contact Faculty Senate if they were erroneously listed. Coit stated that this solution might be impractical given the time limit to petitions imposed by Article 13, of four weeks. It would take at least a week to promulgate the list, and it is unclear what Senate could or should do if a group of faculty on the list stated that they were incorrectly listed the week of the vote. Senator Viertel asked if, in considering new bylaws, whether the Senate appears to be transparent. Should we be rewriting the rules in mid-stream if there's an active petition, what does that look like to the rest of the university, does it look like we are being favorable, to either side. Coit stated that the language in Article 13 does not directly provide for Senate to verify petition signatures, and the

bylaws were intended to make the petition process more transparent. Van Gunten stated that if you read the constitution we still have to verify signatures. She suggested that if Senators believed a broader conversation was necessary the bylaws could be tabled and reconsidered in the fall. Russell stated the Senate should consider looking at bylaws on an annual basis, to catch things that need to be revisited. Pommier stated that the intent of the bylaws is not to change the rules while the game is played. Senator Russell stated she was not comfortable voting right now, noted that there a lot of senators missing, and she had not had a chance to really consider this. White stated he needed to go through the changes too. Gary Aylesworth stated that it's customary to allow constituents to have time to consider the change and stated this is something as a faculty member and a constituent he would also like. Senator Rosenstein stated she didn't think we had an opportunity to talk with colleagues in our departments about the change. Viertel (White) moved to table the proposed bylaws. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. New Business

John Jackson/RATIO: [RATIO's brochure describing proposed improvements is available in the Vice President for Business Affairs office]

Jackson stated that RATIO had been involved with renovation of Blair Hall. RATIO is proposing schematic design improvements to 12 or 13 places on campus, as part of a landscape master plan. The initial design exercise also assessed probable costs of each improvement. The project's design would support either raising funds for the whole plan or prioritizing the individual projects, and the plan maps a way forward for improvements. Why is landscaping important? Research indicates that 62% of high school seniors base school selection on appearance of building and grounds, and make their decision in one-half hour. Their first opinion is formed in first ten minutes on campus. Research also indicates physical features can hinder or can promote learning. Gathering spaces and spaces for impromptu action can encourage out of classroom learning. Jackson stated there is a lot of talk about the experiential economy, in reference to retail environments. Starbucks is an example; for customers to pay \$4 for a cup of coffee, you're going in and having this experience in Starbucks, which creates an environment which speaks to contemporary culture. They spend millions of dollars perfecting that. This can be translated to higher education environments, and we should think of higher education as a package; knowledge is the product, but it must be delivered in a package which encompasses buildings and public spaces.

Jackson referenced the plant material proposed for the improvements, and indicated the map of bloom times, which focuses on plants that are going to be interesting during the winter months. The plant palette creates a more sustainable campus. Right now there is lots of turf on the ground plane, it requires mowing, there is a lot of embodied energy in maintaining a lawn, getting it to grow. RATIO proposes taking away lawn where appropriate replacing it with more native based plant palette. This will help make EIU a more contextual place, will reflect native plants in East Central Illinois.

Rosenstein asked if the proposed pergolas, tables, and chairs are made from sustainable materials. Jackson stated RATIO hasn't drilled down to that level yet, although sustainability is important. It's possible that metal structures would be more durable. Rosenstein asked if the Lawson Hall project would feature disabled accessibility from both sides. Jackson stated it would.

Brownson asked if the landscape plan include drainage improvements on the central quad? Jackson stated we looked at that on the south quad and central quad, and agreed the central quad is pretty bad. A lot of the same ideas proposed for the south quad would apply to any lawn areas.

Rosenstein asked what will south quad sidewalks be made of? Jackson stated they would be made of concrete.

Coit asked if the movable furniture proposed in several projects could be easily stolen. Jackson stated the preferred solution is to make them heavy enough so they can't be stolen.

Rosenstein asked if the project would allow reuse any of the plant materials, perhaps by making the unused plant material available to the community. Jackson stated that there would be a lot of detailed coordination necessary for such a program, and the project is not at that level yet.

Russell asked if priorities have been established for the proposed projects. Jackson stated that question was better addressed to Steve Shrake in FPM.

Pommier asked if changes proposed means to keep students off remaining grass areas. Jackson that curbs were planned for some areas.

Vice President for University Advancement Bob Martin: Martin stated his main focus is on philanthropy. He noted that the capital campaign is in the silent phase now, but the next phase will begin in

the fall and will focus on 4 areas: academic support for students, for faculty, academic-athletic support, and facilities. Martin stated the campaign will need everyone's help, and stated this is the biggest undertaking Eastern's ever done. Martin said he encourages volunteers and staff to get more active in soliciting funds, and stated that this is our campaign, and it will take all of us to succeed.

Pommier asked what faculty can do to assist? Martin stated faculty members can introduce the office to companies, foundations, and individuals interested in donating. The campaign will be donor-centered, meaning they want donors to choose their targets, but want them to give in ways that help university. Martin asked faculty to relay names of people you are connected with that you can help open doors. Martin also noted that one of the things donors commonly ask, is what percentage of faculty give back to EIU, what percentage of staff give back to EIU. His previous position at Auburn had a 29% rate, and he hoped to beat Auburn's effort at EIU. He stated that it's not about the dollars raised as much as participation, people being involved.

William Weber, VPBA. Weber stated that a long-standing faculty issue has been budget transparency. With the capabilities of Banner where we've got all this financial data in one place, Raju has been working on developing a budget dashboard. With the dashboard someone can log into Argos and take a look at what expenditure data is saying about our university. This is still in test, we hope to move this out to production, make this accessible campus-wide.

Raju stated the operator chooses what kind of funds to investigate: appropriated, nonappropriated, or all funds. Expense are shown by area and by line. A pie chart will show the percentage spent on operations vs. personnel. From appropriated funds, (general revenue funds and tuition), $\frac{3}{4}$ of appropriated funds were spent on personnel, less than a quarter on operating expenses. Weber noted that the result shows that the VPBA's office doesn't have any easy \$33 million cut to make. Raju stated that he operator can drill down see where money is going, by clicking on any portion pie chart. This shows expenses by area (for example, VPAA's area, President's area) in a bar graph, and also shows expenses by line, and by line items (e.g. type of employment). Weber noted that the dashboard shows that if I have to be cutting money because of a loss of state appropriations, the only sizeable amounts of money are in two areas, Business Affairs and Academic Affairs. The other areas really don't have a huge amount of appropriated dollars. Raju noted that the dashboard can go to the deans' level, and can go to department level. He noted the dashboard can perform the same operation for operating expenses, showing for example that 13% of operations funding in Academic Affairs is dedicated to travel. With all funds are included the split between personnel and operations is much closer to 50-50.

Russell asked when the dashboard is functioning, is it going to start with fiscal 2009? Raju stated the data begin with fiscal 2007. Russell asked if it will it just be preceding or current fiscal. Weber said that expenses to date don't give a clear picture, and he doesn't know if we'll make current fiscal available in production because it can be so misleading. Raju, stated that he dashboard can go all they way down to the granular level, and you can create tables to your heart's delight. He noted there's a more powerful tool available for financial managers called Olap.

Best asked if the dashboard contains the information available in a tabular form at your website? Weber stated that at the website 2009 dat is available. Raju stated that the VPBA data available goes deeper than the dashboard. Best asked if the VPBA's office is going to go back and make previous years available. Weber stated the dashboard would only feature data from 2007, since we've adopted Banner. Best stated that Weber made a reference of source of funds, and asked Weber to detail the ledgers for different sources, so we can make a match from the dashboard to ledgers. Weber stated ledger 1 is appropriated funds; 2 is local auxiliary, non-tuition revenues, for example income from Doudna tickets goes into 2; 3 is bond revenue accounts, these are the things we are collecting to pay off bonds holders for example for the TRS facility, housing, and steam plant; 4 is historical mystery, we don't have an idea why we don't have a ledger 4; 5 is restricted gifts, from grant agencies or donors; is 6 alumni and foundation; 7 is various types of reserves; 8 is also unknown; and 9 which is agency accounts.

Van Gunten asked if the dashboard has the capability to compare different years. Weber said the dashboard does not, but Olap, for financial managers, does.

Best noted that since everybody is a state employee, he thought all salary information was public, and asked where is that stuff? Weber stated it's in Banner, and he would have to check into what setup is available. Brownson stated there is a hard copy in the library.

Best stated that this information is what Andy, Robin and I used for the Budget Transparency Committee report, and it's a pretty interesting exercise.

Raju noted that figures may not match dollar for dollar between the dashboard and the VPBA web source because expenses may be booked in different fiscal years. Weber stated that organizational service accounts have been excluded from the dashboard. He noted that if you look at fiscal 2009 expenditures in the bond area and look at fiscal 2010 you'll see a big jump because of the renewable energy center.

VII. Adjournment at 4:14

Future Agenda items:

Continuing Education, Article 13 bylaws

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Coit
March 27, 2010

Proposed bylaws re: Article XIII referenda

II. C. 13. Article XIII referenda.

- A. Upon receipt of a referendum petition, the Executive Committee shall verify that the signatures on the petition are valid.
- B. The Chair shall inform the Faculty Senate of the results of verification in writing. The verification report shall note the total number of signatures on the petition, the number of signatures verified, and the total number of signatures necessary to trigger a referendum. The report shall also list the methods used to verify petition signatures.
- C. If the petition does not contain sufficient verified signatures to trigger a referendum, the petition and all signature pages shall be returned to the author(s) of the petition. If the petition contains a sufficient number of valid signatures to trigger a referendum, the Chair shall retain one copy of the petition language, and all signature pages. The Senate asserts that petition signature pages are exempted from inspection or copying by Section 7 of the Illinois Freedom of Information Act.
- D. The Senate shall distribute a copy of the language of any successful petition to all Faculty eligible to vote in Faculty Elections. The author(s) of any successful petition must attend the Senate session immediately following verification to discuss the petition with, and answer questions from, Senators and any other attendees.