

2-19-2002

February 19, 2002

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 19, 2002" (2002). *Minutes*. 212.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/212

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 FEBRUARY 19, 2002 (Vol. XXXI, No. 19)

The Faculty Senate agenda is posted weekly on the Web, at 1162 Life Science Building, and at 2504 Buzzard Hall.

I. Call to order by Reed Benedict at 2:03 p.m. (Conference Room, 2540 Buzzard Building)

Present: R. Benedict, J. Best, D. Brandt, G. Canivez, D. Carpenter, L. Clay Mendez, J. Dilworth, M. Monippallil, J. Pommier, S. Scher, J. Tidwell, B. Young, A. Zahlan. **Absent:** D. Carwell. **Excused:** R. Fischer. **Guests:** J. Fetty, D. Fernandez, W. Davidson, B. Lord, R. Lanham.

II. Approval of the minutes of February 12, 2002.

Motion (Dilworth/Canivez) to approve the minutes of February 12, 2002.

Yes: Benedict, Best, Brandt, Canivez, Carpenter, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Monippallil, Pommier, Scher, Young, Zahlan. **Passed.**

III. Communications

- A. Email from Ray Watkins pertaining to network problems and academics.
- B. Email from Dean Hitch with an update of the LCBAS Dean Search schedule.
- C. Email from Cynthia James from ISU regarding an Illinois House resolution pertaining to tuition and fees.
- D. Email from Dean Lanham informing us that we can begin meeting in Booth Library beginning February 26.
- E. Email from Debbie Bosler regarding the furniture installation policy.
- F. Letter from President Hencken in response to Senator Zahlan's concerns about his cabinet. Zahlan: The thing that stressed me was the word "cabinet". I wouldn't have reacted as I did if I had understood. I would ask the executive committee to clarify whether this body has any input into University policy. I was also wondering about how the members were selected. Best: Sharing of information is important. We have plenty of apparatus on place to run the institution. It would be useful to know if the city and EIU were planning different things for the same space. The composition came from the offices the individuals held. Zahlan: There were women on the city council. Why weren't they selected? Clay Mendez: I was concerned that there was no representation of academic bodies. Benedict: The superintendents of Mattoon and Charleston schools were present. Pommier: Were the police involved? It is a big issue because students feel they are being profiled. Carpenter: Isn't there an external relations committee already? This strikes me as self-promotion more than anything else. W. Davidson: The students are going to try to get a student on this group. We are half the population of the city. Zahlan: It was the name "cabinet" that bothered me. Monippallil: Is there a need for both the Mayor and Pro-tem Mayor of Charleston and Mattoon? Clay Mendez: How about the student newspaper? Dilworth: My suggestion is we don't need a President's Cabinet. With an open door policy, there is no need for this. Pommier: If we get input from this committee that is going to help decide how the University is run, they will be acting from biased data. Tidwell: We are overreacting as long as this is something informal. As far as the composition, it is just accidental this year. Last year, the Mayor of Mattoon was a woman. Scher: I think it is quite admirable that he is trying to formalize this a little more than just walking around and running into people at Kiwanis. Carpenter: I don't think it is much to do about nothing. It is redundant with external relations. It is not just the President reaching out. He is representing the University.

IV. New Business

A. Presentation from Roy Lanham about Free Trade coffee: R. Lanham: I am representing a group of students that support the Free Trade organization. Coffee is the second most traded commodity in the world. Growers average receiving \$0.25 per pound. I am only going to talk about Fair Trade coffee. It guarantees growers \$1.26 a pound. It encourages sustainable methods, provides farmers access to affordable credit, and creates direct links to farmers and their cooperatives. It creates a link between farmers and consumers. Our group of students experienced a group of fair trade farmers. When you have your cup of coffee, you can feel you are making a difference. The students wanted to make an initiative to have the campus switch to Fair Trade coffee and then go beyond that to have local cafes and restaurants

serve it. They initialized this by distributing a pound of coffee to each department on campus. Then they wanted to come and talk to Faculty Senate, but they all had classes today. That's why I'm here. They would like to come back at a future date to ask you to create a resolution to serve only Fair Trade coffee on campus. I am excited because they are trying to apply what they have learned in the classroom to the real world. Clay Mendez: You mentioned \$1.26 per pound and before it was \$0.25 per pound. How did you come up with such an inflated price? I'm in support of protecting the environment, but how did you come up with such an inflated price? R. Lanham: I didn't come up with the price. What the processors do is go down to the growers and ask what they need to survive. Zahlan: There are so many issues like this. There are many farmers that are being driven off their land. These issues are pertinent to our country too. Scher: These people are in business. Your comment was that they encourage shade grown coffee. Is that encourage or is it shade grown? R. Lanham: I must be shade grown to be acceptable. Young: It is useful to have this type of discussion. D. Fernandez: Are you planning to give this talk to the Student Senate? R. Lanham: There are two students in this organization on Student Senate to talk about this.

V. Old Business

A. Committees

1. **Executive Committee:** Benedict: No report.
2. **Nominations:** Canivez: I have an updated list of open positions. CFR is the only group that has contacted me about a correction.
3. **Elections:** Benedict: Continuing to proceed as planned.
4. **Student-Faculty Relations:** Benedict: No report.
5. **Faculty-Staff Relations:** Young: No report.
6. **Search Committees:**
 - a. **University President Search Committee:** Clay Mendez: We will be narrowing down the number of candidates and then inviting them to campus. Scher: When will notice of that be? Clay Mendez: Soon after our meeting at which we decide which candidates to invite. Zahlan: When will background checks be done? Clay Mendez: We have already done those checks.
 - b. **AVPAA for Technology:** Tidwell: We have about thirty-five candidates and we will first narrow that down to about ten and do reference checks on those ten. We will select three or four to invite to campus interviews.
 - c. **Deans:** B. Lord: COS and LCBAS searches are in the middle of interviews. The COEPS search is on the same schedule as the AVPAA for Technology search.

B. Spring Forum: Benedict distributed a list of proposed recommendations regarding faculty development to the Senate members. Benedict: This is a list that several of us created based on previous discussions.

Motion (Pommier/Dilworth): Accept the list of recommendations.

Zahlan: The director should come from the faculty. Clay Mendez: Make the director a rotating position with about a five-year appointment. Zahlan: Do we want a person or not? Best: So a professor should stop their teaching and research to do this job? That could be the best way of doing it, but what if no one wants to do it? I want to be developed, not develop the rest of you. Monippallil: I am somewhat curious about this proposal. We have not decided what activities this office is to conduct. We are spending money on a person and setting up an office and then deciding what they will be doing. If the Faculty Senate wants to create a faculty development structure, they need to find out what the needs are. If there is no consensus on what is needed, then there is no need for an office. The relatively small turnout for the forum indicates that it is not of great interest. Young: We need to do more research on this issue and contact people at other institutions that are doing faculty development. What we need are resources to do the research. Benedict: We did a survey two years ago and it seemed that the majority of faculty wanted faculty development. Best: In going back to Senator Monippallil's point about consensus on activities, the consensus is not important. There is a need. We are not going to find specific programs that help the majority of faculty, but each little thing that helps a few faculty members is important. We should go ahead and try programs. If they don't work, abandon them and try something else. Zahlan: We should set up a council on faculty development similar to the Council on Faculty Research. Dilworth: I don't accept that failure to attend a 2-4 p.m. meeting on a given day as an indication of lack of interest. Clay Mendez: Faculty development should be bottom-up, not top-down. I think that faculty development is going on now. I think we need a way to channel all of this individual effort into a united effort. Opportunities are there

and I can only imagine what there would be with an outlet. Scher: A faculty development office could publicize those and make it more efficient. The faculty development office could also find things. Benedict: We are looking at programs separately. We didn't look at what would be good for particular faculty. Zahlan: The council that is created should decide the structure of the office, just like the technology committee decided the structure for technology. Canivez: It seems that it would make sense to parallel the process for technology. Carpenter: We just gave back \$2.3M. How realistic is it to create a new administrative office? B. Lord: This is an issue that has been of interest to me. When I arrived here, I was struck by the fact that Faculty Development was in the College of Continuing Education. I wanted to do something, but decided to wait until I got a sense of the campus. I don't have a lot of resources at this time, but some things can be repositioned. I think this discussion is appropriate and I will react to any recommendations that are made. Canivez: I think that a committee that looks into this would find where money needs to go just like technology. Dilworth: There is currently a Committee on Faculty Development. They recently evaluated proposals for mini-grants. There was no meeting. They just sent emails to each other. Canivez: This is a different structure with a different role. Scher: Do we take some concrete action now? Benedict: I want to wait until everyone that has been a part of the discussion is here. Motion to table discussion (Carpenter/Canivez).

B. Proposed BOT Policy change regarding tuition and fees for online courses: B. Lord: This effects one category of courses, technology delivered courses offered by Continuing Education. A group is looking at pricing of these courses. Most institutions have a unified pricing of these courses regardless of where students are when they sign up. This proposal is to make the price uniform at Eastern. The wording of the proposal is to not tie it to existing rates. The language is to allow the President to adjust the rate if the audience will pay more. We don't get a lot of revenue from out of state students anyway. Scher: Suppose an out-of-state student is an on-campus student. You are providing an incentive for them to take an online course rather than a classroom course. B. Lord: We are not going to be a large player in online course offering. We will have a niche, but it will be modest. Zahlan: Have you looked at a difference in price between enrolled and not enrolled students. B. Lord: This will be one price for everyone.

The quorum was lost at this point.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Brandt, Recorder