

1-21-2003

January 21, 2003

Faculty Senate

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 21, 2003" (2003). *Minutes*. 181.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/181](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/181)

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).

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR January 21, 2003 (Vol. XXXI, No. 18)**

The 2000-2001 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 Coleman Hall 3556 and on the third-level bulletin board in Booth Library. Note: These Minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of all utterances made at the Senate meeting.

**I. Call to order by Anne Zahlan at 2:05 p.m.** (Conference Room, Booth Library)

Present: R. Benedict, D. Brandt, G. Canivez, D. Carpenter, D. Carwell, L. Clay Mendez, J. Dilworth, F. Fraker, B. Lawrence, M. Monippallil, W. Ogbomo, S. Scher, M. Toosi, J. Wolski, A. Zahlan. Guests: J. Chambers, R. Deedrick, B. Donnelly, D. Fernandez, B. Lord, A. Sartore, D. Schaefer.

**II. Approval of the Minutes of January 14, 2003.**

Motion (Clay Mendez/Fraker) to approve Minutes of January 14, 2003, with the following additions: Under V.A.1., Zahlan reported that she had written what she hoped would be a persuasive memo to Dean Lanham re: the placement of the Distinguished Faculty Award plaque in Booth Library. Under VI.C., during the discussion Zahlan said, I know there's a difference of opinion about whether the [meetings of] the Council of Chairs comes under the *Open Meetings Act*; but even if it doesn't, it would be perceived as collegial at least [for the Council of Chairs] to make their Minutes available. Also under VI.C., Scher said, Surely the *Open Meetings Act* specifies when, where--I mean, twenty-five chairs can't just get together and say, "Oh, we're just getting together for coffee. This is not a meeting." ...I don't know the law, but I'm sure there are rules that say that's not, you know--. Ninety-five percent of the Board of Trustees can't say, "We're going to meet in Galena, just as friends to get together, and say it's not an open meeting." They can't do that.

Yes: Benedict, Carpenter, Carwell, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Fraker, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. No: Brandt. Abstain: Lawrence. **Passed.**

**III. Announcements:** Zahlan noted that the *DEN* article about the Senate meeting of 21 January 2003 incorrectly attributed Carpenter's comments to David Radavich, and a correction will appear in the 22 January 2003 *DEN*.

**Communications:**

- A. E-mail message (15 January) from Mike Hoadley re: Senate Appointment to CTC
- B. E-mail message (19 January) from Melinda Mueller re: Report to Senate on TRS
- C. E-mail message (21 January) from Bonnie Irwin re: Grade Appeal Procedures
- D. E-mail message (18 January) from Jim McKirahan re: Parking for Adjuncts, forwarded (21 January) by Senator Toosi
- E. E-mail message (21 January) from Gail Richard re: Report to Senate on EIU Athletics
- F. Notes (9 January) from the President's Council

**V. Old Business:**

A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive Committee: Chair Zahlan has contacted Senator Dale Righter about meeting with the Faculty Senate this semester. Zahlan has spoken with Gary Aylesworth re: the Council of Chairs, and he said the Council has bylaws. Zahlan has invited Keith Andrew, of the Council of Chairs, to the 4 February 2003 Senate meeting. Zahlan will be attending the 24 January 2003 CUPB meeting. The Board of Trustees will meet on Monday, 27 January 2003, and Zahlan will present a report at that meeting re: Faculty Senate's endeavors.

2. Student-Faculty Relations Committee: No report.

3. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report.

4. Elections Committee: Senator Brandt handed out copies of questions issued to candidates for various offices last year, and he will be requesting that the Senate approve those for this year. Scher suggested that questions be formulated for candidates seeking positions on the Enrollment

Management Advisory Committee, Council on University Planning and Budget, Sanctions and Termination Hearing Committee, and Admissions Appeal Review Committee. Brandt requested that such proposed questions be sent to him, and he will bring those before the Senate for approval. Elections will take place March 25 and 26, 2003.

5. Nominations Committee: No report.

6. Other Reports: Senator Ogbomo reminded Senators there appeared an announcement in the 21 January 2003 *University Newsletter*, from the VPBA, about campus visitations by Budget-Director candidates. Senator Scher reminded Senators that the Distinguished Faculty Award nomination form is accessible via the Faculty Senate' s homepage.

B. Planning for Faculty Forum (Academic Freedom and Other Concerns): Senators reviewed the planned format for the forum.

C. Grade-Appeal Procedures: Pending motion (Scher/Fraker) returned to--i.e., The Faculty Senate recommends to the Provost that a student--appointed by the Student Vice President of Academic Affairs or the Chairperson of the Graduate Student Advisory Committee, in consultation with the department chair--be included as a voting member on departmental grade-appeals committees. Scher: ...A similar motion was approved by CAA on Thursday [16 January 2003], so that' s just for people' s information; I don' t think it affects, one way or another necessarily, whether or not we should also consider it. The final decision rests with the President' s Council....Carwell: Everyone that I have talked to in my department thinks that it' s a bad idea to put students in a position to determine another student' s grade--philosophically. Realistically, we' ve had--in the last twelve years--the grade-appeal committee in my department [meet] one time; so realistically it isn' t really a problem. There was a logistical problem that the chair pointed out: that the idea is that you would get someone--speaking for Political Science--someone other than a Political Science student to sit on this committee, the idea being that you would not have any problems or conflicts of interest. The chair pointed out that actually it would probably be better the other way: that the chair knows--and people in Political Science, in the department--knows the students that are majors in that department, and therefore would be more comfortable with one of those students because you know them, as opposed to one from outside the department that would come in, where you' re in a position where you don' t know the person, no one in the department knows this person, and you just have to take whoever the student government appointed to put on that committee....

Scher: Our motion doesn' t say anything about whether it would or would not come from the department of the grade appeal.... I guess I should ask you, David [Carwell], more about the philosophical basis that people' s objections are coming from. For me, philosophically, I think it' s wrong not to include a student as a voting member. Again, it' s not about students judging the quality of another student' s work; that' s not what I think the intentions of grade appeals are, according to the IGP; it' s about fairness of treatment.... So, to me philosophically, coming from a discipline that is sort of grounded in the notion that different people have different construals of things, how things happen, and people from different perspectives can see things differently (that' s sort of the central tenet of my area of Psychology), it seems that getting these different points of view--and especially given that this is about the differences in students' perspectives, versus faculty perceptions, not having another student' s perception, to have an actual decision-making voice on this body, seems to me to be inappropriate and philosophically unjustified.

Carwell: To answer that, the whole idea is, as it is now, students are already there; all you' re talking about is voting on whether you' re going to deliver this grade or deliver that grade. As for any information, any point of view or anything, no one that I know of is in favor of excluding that, which is why you already have students on the appeal [committees]. The student doesn' t just get to vote on whether another student should be awarded this grade, or whether [he/she] should be awarded that grade. That' s the only point it' s certainly not to keep students off of it.... That was basically the philosophical argument--that students should not be in a position to be voting on another student' s grade.Toosi: I think [we should] practice what is the reality. If a student feels [he/she] has been discriminated against, for any reason, we need to give [him/her] a right to defend [himself/herself]. If the Student Senate, at this time, says this resolution is going to help them defend any student who [believes he/she has been discriminated against], let them have it. In the future, if they feel that what they have in this resolution is not good enough, they will come up with a new resolution. That' s their business. ...If you are giving the right grade to a student, you have nothing to

lose; you can defend yourself for a hundred years of arguments.... If they think you have discriminated [against] them, then that's their right to defend their rights.

Deedrick: I'd like to clarify exactly what was passed at CAA last Thursday: ...The proposal that was originally submitted to the CAA by myself said that the Student VPAA, which is my position, would select the student voting member in consultation with the department chair. It was amended at the CAA to say that the person would be selected by the department chair and the Student Vice President of Academic Affairs; so that way, if you already had a department such as Biology, Music and English...that do have student members, the English student member, or however the department decides to do that, is already on the committee. Music--they like to keep it...so that the student is from their department, so that's fine. The whole idea about the resolution was to have a student voting member on there. ...The other part of it was that currently there...is sort of a loophole in the current IGP that said that if you were the teacher that accusations are being brought against, and it just so happened you did serve on the department's grade-appeal committee, you could still serve on the department's grade-appeal committee if a student was coming against you. We covered up that loophole and said, if you are the student, or the professor who is being accused of any wrong-doing in relation to that, then you must recuse yourself from that particular [case].

Donnelly: ...Dr. Carwell said he would be more comfortable with [a student serving on the grade-appeal committee] who is in Political Science, or that college or whatever; but then you have to think of the effects that I, an Economics student [may experience]. I may want to vote against my three professors in my department, and then I have to rely on them to be unbiased...because I voted against them? That's one reason I was for saying that the person [voting student on the grade-appeal committee] should be from a different department--maybe the same college, but at least from a different department. Also, you [Carwell] said if a student is sitting on it [grade-appeal committee], then [his/her] opinion would be heard; but I disagree with that because, if you have no vote philosophically, or whatever you want to say, do you really need to listen to that student? No. If they don't have power, then who cares what they have to say; you probably won't take the time to try to sway them, and you probably won't listen to them try to sway you, so they have no vote. If they have a vote, then maybe [they will be taken seriously]. Benedict: The grade-appeals process is a fact-finding mission, as I see it in reading from the IGP: "An appeal shall not be used for review of the judgement of the instructor assessing the quality of a student's work." ...We clearly take the grade-appeal process at the university very seriously, and I believe the one student's vote simply validates that seriousness. It not only tells students that we believe it is, but it shows that, in giving them that one vote, we do view fact-finding as very important; and it adds weight and validity to the entire process.

Clay Mendez: I would go along with the notion that a student, as a member of the committee, would validate it; but I want to say this: I hope it doesn't take a student to defend a student who has been discriminated against by a professor. I would be the first professor to stand up, for that student who has been discriminated against, against my own colleagues, if that were the case. So, again, validation of the process is fine; but as far as requiring a student to defend another student, I don't think we have that requirement in our community because I think our professors are all very cognizant of the significance and the importance of our students in our world. Scher: I agree with you, Luis, and I certainly think it's true that all of our colleagues, or virtually all the ones I know, in a clear case of discrimination, would defend the student against their colleagues. I don't think there is any doubt in my mind that we would do that. I think the problem comes because some things are ambiguous.... It may very well be [within some circumstances] that a student would perceive or interpret [an] ambiguous situation as discrimination, whereas a faculty member wouldn't. ...The power that having a student with a vote gets is able to add that interpretation as a real decision-making voice; it's not just a matter of hearing information and discussing it. It's actually really having, I think, a decision-making process. It really is about power; I mean, it's about whether or not we're going to give a real voice to the students in a decision that is a fundamental--you know, I mean, it's about, it's a judgement--sort of by a jury. Another thing I should point out is, if you read the grade-appeals policy, the action of the grade-appeal committee does not force the faculty member to change the grade. In fact, that's quite explicit. The faculty member...always makes the final decision about the grade. ...So, no matter what the grade-appeal committee does, the faculty member still has the option to retain the original grade, and then there's the option to appeal to the provost; it's ambiguous, I think, about whether the provost can change the grade....

Sartore: ...If somebody doesn't think that I am able to serve on this committee [grade-appeal committee], then I wonder why I'm at this institution, a liberal-arts institution that expects me to become a

productive citizen and use deductive reasoning but doesn't allow me to. Carwell: ...As we've talked about before, it's [a grade appeal] rarely going to be something that's sort of cut and dried--that they are, you know, discriminating against me. It is going to be a judgement call.... When all the information is put out there, is it the professor that makes the judgement on the grade, or is it going to be a student? Monippallil: It appears to me that, except at the lowest level of knowledge, when a grade is assigned there is ambiguity built in to it. It's not really peculiar to the grade-appeal situation that there is built-in ambiguity in assigning the final grade. If we take the position that the faculty members on the grade-appeal committee are unable to reach determination, even in an ambiguous situation, but adding a student would suddenly add clarity to it--because the student brings such a level of clarity to the process--that is going to be determinative, that is a position I find very difficult to understand or to accept. If the position is ambiguous, my question is: Is the student, who has not taken the course and who has no knowledge of what is actually going on, is that student going to be suddenly invested with that level of clarity, and that level of attainment--in terms of determination regarding the quality of the...conduct of a fellow faculty member? Now, it has been said it's a matter of validation; it's a matter of power. If it is really a matter of validation or power, my reading of it is that this is merely tokenism. Having one voting member on that committee of three or five people will not make any major changes. So, what are we engaged in? We are engaged in tokenism, not adding anymore validity to the process. ...Class prejudice is not a disease that is peculiar to the faculty. If the faculty members themselves are subject to class prejudice, I submit to you the students are also subject to class prejudice....

Benedict: I agree, Matthew, that one student is not likely to swing a vote; I would disagree that it is not validating the process, and I do think it's possible that the faculty members could be split and the student could, in fact, be the deciding vote--not likely, but it could happen. This does validate the process. We tell the students they're important; we tell the students we want to hear their voice[s], but we take a vote away, invalidating their position to be on that committee. I believe they should be on that committee; I believe they should vote to help determine the outcome of the process. Clay Mendez: I think that sometimes we place too much emphasis on the outcome of a vote. I think part of the beauty of voting is to be able to express one's view, whether one wins or not; it's being empowered into a process, and to think afterwards--whether we won or lost--we were part of it; we were a voting part of it. So, in that sense I would say who better than our students to have a voting part in the process, whether or not it makes a big difference. ...Dilworth: I get perturbed when we talk about faculty giving grades. I do not give grades; students earn grades. ...Carwell: ...Unlike Sanctions and Termination, or Judicial Board, or all of these that have large student representation and should have, we're talking about determining a student's grade, which is fundamentally different. That is what faculty is supposed to do, and I think determining a student's grade is fundamentally different from the other rules and regulations at this university.

Carpenter: Would you [Scher/Fraker] consider amending the motion so that it is in accord with what CAA passed last week? Scher: ...If more people are likely to vote for it with the change, I'd be happy to make the change. Fraker: My inclination is to make the change so there appears to be a united front.

Amended motion: The Faculty Senate recommends to the Provost that a student--appointed by the department chair and either the Student Vice President of Academic Affairs or the Chairperson of the Graduate Student Advisory Committee--be included as a voting member on departmental grade-appeals committees. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Canivez, Carpenter, Clay Mendez, Fraker, Lawrence, Scher, Toosi, Wolski. No: Carwell, Dilworth, Monippallil. Abstain: Ogbomo, Zahlan. **Passed.**

D. Pending motion (Toosi/Carpenter) returned to: i.e., The Faculty Senate recommends EIU administrators be employed for eleven months instead of twelve, on eleven-month contracts instead of twelve-month contracts.

Toosi handed out a statement of two reasons he made the motion: "1: During the Fall and Spring semesters, the entire university is in full operational capacity, with the upper limits of students, faculty, civil service, and administrators. However, only about 45 to 50% of students and faculty are on campus and working during the summer. Like any private industry or business, which would reduce working time of staff during low-production times, universities should and could reduce administrative costs during their low-productive time and should not be any different from private industry. // 2. According to our interim president, "given our very challenging financial situation, a situation being described by those in Springfield as the most challenging in 50 years," the university needs to cut its overhead costs and reinforce the infrastructure. The proposal is based on the expectation that administrators will scatter their one-month leave over the holidays (Christmas, spring break, etc.) and/or over the summer." Toosi: A third reason [for

the motion] is psychological. I have spoken to a few administrators...at Eastern who have taken unpaid leave, and they really enjoyed it. ...One of the great, positive effects upon administrators--if they take a few days [off], distribute those [to add up to] one month during the year, not just shut down the university for one month and go home, distribute that one month of unpaid leave during the year, and it can be managed very easily--will be the psychological effects. The fourth reason I have is to reduce the paperwork.... I am a strong believer that...the more that you sit in your office, the more that you think about things, the more paper you will waste....

Ogbomo: While the motion looks nice on paper, my question is: Are we really going to achieve this goal by doing this? If it's not going to change much, I think it will be a waste of time to just create a motion that is not going to change what is going on. ...Making this statement is going to create bad blood, us against them, and sometimes I feel terrible when departmental chairs make...statements, like "Faculty are no longer realistic about what is going on." ...What I am saying is that we are discussing this because of hard times.... I don't want us to create an environment where we are looking at administrators as aliens.... This is a counter-productive motion. If there is going to be any restructuring, it is going to have to come from the administration, and then the faculty union is there to negotiate.... But to think that the Faculty Senate can mandate the change is a waste of time. Clay Mendez: I think that our university deserves the best administrators that we can get. Having served on two presidential-search committees, and a provost-search committee, I know that at the upper levels there's competition that takes salary into consideration; so if we start reducing that salary base that we're going to offer upper-level administrators, we're going to run out of those top-notch administrators that might otherwise be willing to come. ...Even though I share your [Toosi's] concern, and I would love to do something about these issues and our economic exigencies, I'm not sure that this [motion] is the right way of doing it.

Dilworth: ...Unless we're willing to say faculty really only need to be here eight months, because we got a week in November and three weeks in December-January, so take out that pay, I don't think we can ask administrators to go back to eleven. ...Monippallil: I agree with Luis and Wilson that this [motion] is really impractical because I don't think we'll be able to attract faculty members to become chairs, or apply for administrative positions, if it is going to mean an eleven-month contract. I don't know of any universities that offer only eleven-month contracts to chairs (I do know that there are directors and others who are on ten- or eleven-month contracts); but from chairs onward, all of them are on a twelve-month basis. So it really is an impractical proposal. Also, we need to keep in mind that, during the summer when we think there isn't really much activity that is going on, that is not entirely accurate.... About two months before the end of the fiscal year..., there is a considerable amount of activity that really takes place at the college level and the department level, regarding reallocation of any remaining resources. Similarly, in the beginning of a new fiscal year..., there are again quite a few activities that the chairs have to engage in. ...I don't think this is a viable time for this recommendation; and I believe, whatever resources we think we could save, in the end nothing will be saved. Keep in mind that the chairs can renegotiate their contracts on an annual basis; it's not like the faculty, so a chair can say, "You want me to go on an eleven-month contract? Sure, I will go on an eleven-month contract, or even an eight-month contract, but give me my twelve-month salary...."

Carwell: I'm in favor of it [the motion] being made. The fact is, as Wilson and others have pointed out, we're certainly not going to pass anything to mandate anything [regarding] administrative salaries; but if the university truly is in as dire financial straits as it claims, the fact is the real expense at this university is salaries. It's not us versus them, but you have faculty salaries and administrative salaries. Shouldn't administrative salaries at least be looked at as a possibility? ...The idea that somehow that twelve-month, administrative salaries are sacrosanct, and should not even be discussed because it's going to lead to the destruction of the university, I think is absurd. There's certainly no problem dealing with faculty salaries.... Toosi: ...Let me make it clear that [in the motion] I didn't say chairs at all. ...I have mentioned that chairs are the ones carrying the heavy loads. I never proposed, at this time or in the future, that the chairs should go to eleven months[Further consideration of the motion was postponed at Chair Zahlan's request.]

## **VI. New Business:**

A. Lord: ...As I think most of you are aware, last year, early in the year, I did ask a subgroup of the Enrollment Management Committee to look at this issue of...the right size for Eastern. I finally did get a report, over the holiday period.... Very briefly, the committee looked at...how many people could we theoretically jam into the classroom spaces we have; in other words, there's a typical capacity based on

classroom space, and they came up with a number.... They looked at dormitory capacities, and what percentage of students live in dormitories.... They surveyed department chairs, asked them how many majors do [they] think [they] could accommodate, how many people [could they] accommodate in [their] service mission[s], and came up with a number from that. They they...had a consensus talk on all this [information]; and they came up with a number finally...about 10,400 to 10,700 as a capacity for the campus. It's a little lower than the high-water mark of...five or six years ago.... Currently, we're just a smidge over 10,200.... Now translate that into how many people should we be admitting.... For the purposes of this coming year's class, I'm talking with Admissions for a number in the vicinity of 1,850 [freshmen].... The admissions-application rate is coming in way ahead of last year; it started ahead and stayed ahead.... So we're talking about closing off the admissions process soon.... Our total applications from freshmen is now over 7,000; last year we had 7,605 [at the end of the admissions period]....

[Provost Lord handed out his "Provost's View of Technology," December 2002.] As I think I mentioned to you several times previously, our next, tenth-year visit [by the North Central Accrediting Association] will be in the spring of 2005.... Prior to the visit, the more important part of the process is for us to create a self-study, a sort of systematic opportunity for us to take their criteria (which there are five...); but we have to develop a self-study based on those criteria.... I'm imagining here we'll have a steering committee; we'll have five significant work-groups (and they will probably have subgroups...). [The steering committee will be co-chaired by an administrator and a faculty member.] I've talked to Bob Augustine...and Jill Owen, so I think we have people who have wide respect and skills in doing group processes. My purpose in mentioning it to you now is to tell you we've got to get going, second of all to invite people who are interested in participating in any one of the criterion teams to make their interest known.... We'll start selecting the names; it will require us to sort of parse through names and pick people who know a little of this and a little of that, so that we get appropriate skill representation on each of the teams. The process right now is to sort of assemble the super-structure.... The real timeline is that this is done next year.... One way or another, anyone who volunteers will get used, and a lot of people who don't volunteer will get used....

B. Brandt: ...At the November 11 [Senate] meeting, a resolution was passed by the Senate, requesting that a faculty member serve as chair of the presidential-search committee, or as co-chair; included [in the resolution] was to ask for an additional faculty member on the presidential-search committee. Several members of the community have read that that Bill Addison should be replaced on that committee because of the wording, and next week I'm going to make a motion to amend that resolution to clarify that. Zahlan: I've told everyone that was certainly not our intention; but when I looked back at it, I had to agree that it could be read that way, so we can just tweek the wording a little bit and make that clearer.... I think we all agreed at the time that it's very reasonable that chairs have representation on that committee, but at the same time we thought that search committees in the past have had a heavier faculty representation....

**VII. Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

**Future Agenda Items:**

Evaluation of Electronic Writing Portfolios; Athletic Programs; International Programs; Faculty Development; University Foundation; Administrative Search Procedures; Computer-Privacy Policy; Shared Governance Concerns; Evaluation of Chairs; Temperature Control in Classrooms and Offices; Facilities-Naming Procedures; Faculty Representation on Board of Trustees; Increased Workload and Overload; Distance Education; Timing of Commencement; Planning for University Events.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Carpenter