

11-8-2011

November 8, 2011

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "November 8, 2011" (2011). *Minutes*. 229.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/229

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 November 2011 (Vol. XXXV, No. 6)

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 Andrew Methven at 2:00pm. (Booth Library Conference Room)

Present: A. Adom, J. Coit, S. Knight-Davis, T. Leonce, A. Methven, M. Mulvaney, K. Padmaraju, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, L. Taylor, D. Viertel, A. White. Student Senate Representative: A. Gonzalez.

Excused: M.-L. Li, A. Rosenstein, J. Waller

Guests: Norm Garrett (Business), John Henderson (Director of CATS), Cheryl Noll (Business), Jeff Cross (Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs), Diane Jackman (Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies), Godson Obia (Acting Dean of the College of Sciences), Dan Nadler (Vice President for Student Affairs), Carol Miller (Director of the Textbook Rental Service), Stephen A. Canfield (Foreign Languages, Chair), Christie Roskowski (Business), Stacey Ruholl (Kinesiology and Sports Studies, Council on Academic Affairs, Textbook Rental Advisory Committee), Christopher Mitchell (Theatre, CAA), Blair Lord (Provost), Jeanne Snyder (Associate Dean Lumpkin College of Business and Applied Sciences), Kaylia Eskew (Student Senate), Will Hine (Dean of the School of Continuing Education), Larry White (Business, CAA)

II. Approval of the Minutes of 25 October

Mulvaney (Viertel) moved to approve the minutes. The motion was approved unanimously. Abstain: Leonce

III. Announcements

Faculty Forum – 8 November 2011, 4:00-5:30 pm; Roberson Auditorium in Lumpkin Hall

Noel-Levitz Consultant visit – November 30, 3:30-4:30; Booth Library 4440

IV. Communications

Memo of 15 May from School of Business Faculty re: Position Paper on EIU Textbook Rental Service

Memo of 12 September from LCBAS Administrative Council re: Support of Position Paper on EIU Textbook Rental Service

Memo of 26 September from CGS re: Position Paper on EIU Textbook Rental Service

Memo of 24 October from CAA re: Resolution Regarding Textbook Rental

Memo of 24 October from President Perry re: Goals Conference (Draft Vision Statement, fourth draft; Phase V - Goals Conference)

Memo of 1 November from Anu Sharma re: Textbook Rental Service

Memo of 4 November from Karla Sanders re: Noel-Levitz consultant visit (Agenda)

Memo of 4 November from Christiane Eydtt-Beebe re: Textbook Rental Service

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee: Chair Methven reported on the Goals Conference held as part of the Strategic Planning Process. Methven stated that attendees divided themselves into groups based on the six themes identified previously in the process. Each group came up with goals based on their themes and the whole group narrowed the list down to primary goals. Jackman stated the conference presented an interesting way to look at things, that all the groups had good ideas, and that she didn't see any big surprises out of the Academic Excellence group, whose message is fundamentally the same as that of the Provost. Senator Sterling stated that the Steering Committee doesn't have an all day session planned to review the goals. We generated 40 goals, 16 of which have action plans, and while there is some overlap, and some conflict, the interesting thing will be how we can take this and craft it into something coherent as opposed to making a list. Methven stated that VPBA Weber is on our agenda for the 6th of December to discuss the Strategic Planning process. The first reading of the final plan will be in January. Vice-Chair Mulvaney stated that although he wasn't able to make the conference, he received communication from

chair of his subcommittee asking for a meeting to flesh out and structure the goals generated. Sterling stated his subcommittee would make a third action plan, which means the Steering Committee will even have more action plans to select from.

2. Nominations Committee: no report

3. Elections Committee: no report

4. Faculty — Student Relations Committee: no report

5. Faculty — Staff Relations Committee: Mulvaney stated that the next meetings of Staff Senate are the November 9 and December 14, and that he will go to those and report at subsequent Senate meetings.

6. Awards Committee: no report.

7. Faculty Forum Committee: forum.

8. Other Reports

a. Provost's Report: Lord stated that the College of Sciences Dean search is underway. A major power outage is scheduled for Tuesday before Thanksgiving for the whole campus, hopefully most people won't be around. The outage is necessary to put a new switchyard at the Renewable Energy Center. When we first powered it up it had a major explosion in one of the components, and the outage will allow us to finish the repair and re-energize the system. Senator Adom asked when the campus will switch to the new plant Lord stated that the REC has been providing steam to the campus since the summer, the old coal boiler is on standby but has not been powered up, and they've had occasionally to flip back and forth between the wood system and the natural gas boiler at the REC. There is some hope that before the turn of the calendar year the coal scrubbing equipment on campus would get torn down. That's going to be coming down sometime during the academic year. At the end of the academic year they will formally decommission the old coal plant. 100% of steam on campus is now coming from the REC. Senator White asked if the power grid right next to that going to stay there. Lord stated that Ameren has plans to remove it, but nothing specific.

b. Budget Transparency Committee: no report

c. Other

B. Other Old Business

Senator Stowell reported on the work of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Online Education. He stated that the committee has divided into subcommittees to answer questions under the following themes: EIU's audience for online education; maintenance of quality of instruction for online education; technical and ethical issues; and other institutions' delivery models and systems of faculty compensation

Stowell stated that this semester the committee is in a data-gathering phase. The committee plans to send an email to faculty asking for questions we should be addressing before we report, and as the questions come in we'll assign them separate teams. We'll have a document that answers the questions, and that discusses how other schools are doing this. Methven asked what's ultimate timeline for the committee's work. Stowell stated that we hope to have everything done by Mid-march, then come up with ideas for implementation. Methven asked if these will be sent to the provost. Stowell stated they will be sent to the relevant committees.

[The committee's website may be found at: <http://castle.eiu.edu/psych/online/index.php>]

VI. New Business

A. Carol Miller and Dan Nadler, Electronic Materials for Teaching and Learning

Noll (Business) stated that we as a collective group created the white paper because we need to have a conversation about the model textbook rental uses and had used for a lot of years. This is not a criticism, but it is just time to make sure that we as a University are meeting the needs of our students and faculty in response to what is happening in the publishing industry. We need to prepare for that rather than be reactive.

Stowell asked if existing structure of the Textbook Rental Service is a cost to the University. Nadler stated that TRS has to operate on its own funding. It does not receive money directly from the University or from Springfield. It is service we've had since EIU opened in 1899. Miller stated that the students are billed \$9.95 per credit hour, we operate on \$8.95 per credit hour with \$1 for the new building. We do sell books that are being replaced, we do try to replace books as soon as possible, when new requests come in if there's an issue I work with the faculty member on cost or length of adoption to make it work financially.

Canfield stated, having read whitepaper a couple of times, that issues may differ significantly based on the discipline issues. I can only use Foreign Languages as an example, we have gotten very good service over the years out of textbook rental, a couple of years ago we wanted to add Italian and the instructor

wanted to use a program that's online only. We had a couple of lengthy discussions with Miller, and her attitude was there was always some way to make it work. In talking with the supplier we came up with a way to get access to the program in a way that was consistent with the fees students pay. The way we work it is I negotiate it every year and Carol pays for it. In our other language programs, our textbook publishers don't give access to the online stuff unless students pay extra, its equivalent to paying for a workbook when students pay for a key for access to the software it comes with an 18-month accessibility so that if they flunk it once they can retake. The models for us in a discipline, we have one program that's entirely online if the other ones that come online are similar it's not an issue for us, the cost for us is within the fees collected by TRS for that. Don't know how other disciplines, what they've encountered. I'm just appalled that an electronic key to an online program costs as much as a paper workbook. White asked if some of your classes have a normal textbook, but also pay a fee for online access, and how much is the fee, and who pays. Canfield stated that the student pays the fee, but no that different than paying for their own paper notebook. It is in the range of the \$75 allowed for auxiliary materials.

Sterling stated that the last paragraph of the original white paper says that TRS needs to reinvent its purpose. There are two issues: one is the degree that TRS is open to the kind of arrangement Steve describes that are in the parameters of the normal fees. And as far as that part of the conversation is concerned, certainly TRS needs to be open to those sorts of relationships. The other is that people are suggesting is that the industry is changing so rapidly that we are going to need access to texts that are far more costly than the normal fees, and to say that TRS needs to adapt itself to this is misleading. It can't adopt texts that are more expensive than student fees. The University could decide that the TRS model should change by raising fees or giving TRS University money. Should they be open within that fee structure, yes, should TRS change itself so it is no longer bound by the fee structure, it can't, it's not within their authority.

Rostkowski asked if it was common to disciplines outside business, that the cost of books is increasing, and your publishers are talking about the day there will not be a hard copy. There are high schools in Illinois who are going to iPads and not using books. When we talked about being proactive that's the concern we had looking to the future. As a practical matter, in the negotiation you are as small department, this semester we had a very difficult time with faculty negotiating with salespeople who are clearly interested in selling online materials. To ask faculty to negotiate, is that part of their job? Is this not a problem in other areas?

Canfield stated I'd never ask faculty to negotiate, it's my job as administrator. Miller stated we like faculty to be involved in that, if it were turned over to TRS, it would be as if we were telling faculty members what materials to use. Noll stated that coming from a reference point where I have 48 faculty, it would be a full-time job if I negotiated book purchases. Its difficult to ask faculty to be in that position of the negotiator, sometimes when it doesn't turn out, you are three days before the semester with nothing agreed upon. This is one of the points, how do we work within the framework we had. We cannot stay within the fee structure, the books are expensive and change all the time, if we are successful negotiating with a publisher it's usually for a limited period of time and we don't get enough keys for online access.

Senator Viertel stated if more and more of these books are going to go online, and books won't be able to be paid for over several semesters, is that a matter of increasing fees for students? Mulvaney stated in my discipline certainly things are changing, a big change in our field is you can essentially purchase chapter by chapter. There are some changes occurring I'm sure TRS is having these conversations, can you share some general thoughts on ideas you guys have.

Miller we have been looking at these, this is not a new issue, the model of the publisher creating packages with different components included, they are going more and more to the online test banks, quizzes, etc. We look at every order as it comes in, we hope the ISBN we get represents what the faculty member wants. We have put CDs and DVDs in with the books. With online keys we distribute them to departments for them to distribute, we have some faculty members that use them and some that do not, and we are trying to get a better picture of how faculty use these. We are also trying to catalog these things separately so we can control costs and see usage. The packages we ordered for the fall semester, every order that was for a package, was ordered as received. If the ISBN represented a code for a semester's access, that's what we purchased. The Italian course is exclusively online and we were able to work something out. My door is always open.

Jackman asked if it is TRS policy for CDs to be left in the textbooks. Miller stated that this is the case the majority of the time. Jackman stated that is not my understanding. A major concern in my discipline is that CDs were not allowed to go to the students. Those supplemental materials help the students have a

better experience. This surprises me since I've been told this repeatedly. Miller stated if you have some course numbers I'd be happy to look. If distribution of the CDs is not feasible, if it's not protected or the book is very small, we don't distribute them. If it's feasible that's what been done for 15 years. Padmaraju stated in our department the CDs are taken out of the book. Miller stated if there are other arrangements I'll be happy to look into it. Jackman sounds like some departments have been able to negotiate, and we want a level playing field. Miller stated she was speaking about the CDs and DVDs that come with the book itself. Methven stated I'm teaching a new course with a new book and the CDs came in the textbook.

Roskowski noted this arrangement with Foreign Language, and stated all faculty don't have the benefit of knowing what's been done to make accommodations. Canfield stated that the program we use comes out of Emory University, called the Italian virtual classroom, when they started a few years ago, students paid a small fee for a workbook, now the workbook is online students print off. When this program came up I talked about how much for students access, they gave me a price, and she talked to me about money going in and money going out. Rostkowski noted that Emory is a not for profit institution.

Snyder stated that seems like there are a lot of uncertainties and misperceptions, and the question is what can we do after this, how can we have continued conversations. Our college would welcome the opportunity to meet with you and the TRS Advisory Council.

Stowell asked if anyone has looked at the long term cost of online materials, and what kind of subscription access we might get that would further reduce the cost. For my textbook, the online version is 1/3 the cost of printed text. If we can agree on some common ground, is it possible we could go to a publisher with a proposal, for a large scale contract that would benefit the whole university.

Garrett stated that the most recent textbook I adopted was very expensive, and TRS helped me get it. I had vouchers for one semester access, and there was a note saying you need to negotiate for three free semesters. I suppose I could have gone with the model where I ask students to pay, but unlike Steven they aren't paying right now, on top of the Turning Point devices. If this is a pattern, students will pay more for access than they will pay for textbook fees, then the idea that they are coming here and getting a good deal, this might not be as good as it seems if they have to pay an extra \$35. A lot of the books are coming whittled-down, some of the material that's actually essential is on the online part, you can't easily separate out because you'd actually be missing things.

Stowell asked in online courses if there's a cost to ship, who pays, TRS or SCE? Miller stated it was TRS. Stowell asked our enrollment in online courses continued to increase, is TRS seeing its costs increase? Miller stated they were.

Rostkowski regarding the supplemental material fees, that has never been entirely clear what those are, or who makes those decisions. When I talk to publishers they talk to me about how much TRS is willing to approve. The model textbook publishers are using, they may take out one chapter and give you a discount price because it's a custom book, and it raises the question of whether the author is getting the royalties. Because of the creative things we ask publishers to do to meet our model, I'm concerned we are getting into some serious ethical issues.

Canfield stated that he I agree it is unfair to have one group of students get online content for free and have the next group of students have to pay. We've asked publishers not to send online access keys, they give them to us anyway. I will never understand why, when the editions only change every few years, the cost of that key for the online work remains the same and remain the same as the print version. In one case the fee was \$25 higher than the print version. I think there is an ethical issue of the profits that are made off this stuff. I was going to comment on the same lines, where there are situations where it could be cheap or free, eventually the developers are going to call in the marker on this stuff.

Methven stated that for his new class this semester, there's an online site which is better than the textbook and its free, but if I chose it and not issue a textbook the students would still pay the fee. He stated that Carol was helpful, because the textbook was \$175-200, but I could just as easily not use a textbook. That may be an unusual situation that I've lucked into. Is there some way to give waivers to students. Jackman stated that we'd like that for student teaching, since students pay fees but do not get textbook. Nadler stated that the fees presume that over time you get the value for those services. In one semester a student could use \$200 of books, the next semester \$60, and textbooks have been going up 20% annually. We've been fortunate to hold down costs as much as we can. With mandatory fees, over a period of time you derive the maximum benefit.

Padmaraju asked for the courses there are no textbook, could we request additional resources that are not books? Can a faculty member request to subscriptions for websites for those students? Miller: I don't have an answer for that right now, on an individual basis, we'd want to know what the material was, how

much it would cost and how students would access it. When I get questions about student not having textbooks, the fee is an average over time, there will be semesters where students will receive \$600-800 per semester and pay \$150. For supplementary materials we have to look on an individual basis. Students do have the opportunity to come back to TRS and check out books they are related to courses, for projects, internships, and theses.

Leonce stated that when we were deciding on a textbook for our principles courses we had to negotiate it with our publishers, and we have to cater to the needs of the book reps. I am wondering if there have been any other institutions with similar problems, and have we had conversations with them, how we can organize to have more power and have more say in terms of how the whole structure has been set up. Miller stated that there very few rental systems, and in a sales system if students purchase the new book they will get access, if they buy used or share they will not get access. I have contacted my colleagues at other rental institutions, none have issues with these, they are sold through the bookstore, they do not purchase access ahead of time, and publishers are not allowing faculty to purchase with extended usage. One tried to purchase online access and 50% of faculty did not use it. As far as banding together, I don't have the answer. Sterling stated that at other universities, faculty have the attitude, I don't have to pay, I don't care what students get charged, and don't exert any pressure on publishers, that actually bothers me even more.

Mulvaney asked if there is any potential for TRS to work with CATS, if there's any way that the two can address the limitations TRS alone is facing. Henderson we are looking at Learning Management Systems that do have textbooks in them. There are some points we are going to have to sit down and work together, we are just at the point of reviewing the Requests for Proposals for our LMSs. Nadler stated that would open an opportunity, there are copyright issues in that arena as other arenas, it not just about the textbook being in hard copy, but we need a holistic conversation about teaching and learning, what materials we really need. There so much more involved than the book itself. Publishers are supposed to tell us the price each of item would if they are unbundled their packages. Publishers haven't been willing to do this, they won't break down the cost. I don't know who was first, but bundling is here. Publishers know how to make money. I'm shocked by the examples about the online costing the same as printing.

Stowell stated that there seems to be some feelings here relating to lack of information, a desire for willingness to explore new information, keep students in our focus, how can we best serve them. I hope that that willingness and desire to make accommodation, allow us to proceed through alternative ways

Methven asked what is the best way to move this discussion forward. Snyder suggested TRS coming to individual council meetings in Colleges, and meeting with Deans.

Obia asked if Miller could see any impediments to preparing documents or guidelines, to document to all departments how to make accommodations? Chemistry and Physics made special arrangements but many people in the Administrative Council did not know what you did. Could you explain these arrangements to the campus. The case by case method is wonderful for the few departments that want to push the envelope. Miller stated we have our IGP in place, that has a lot of the information. The wording has been updated to incorporate some of these. Along with the faculty information from the website, I could combine those and add some more information. Obia no one cares to read IGPs, and stated that TRS should link up with CATS. We need it where we can access it, can make improvements. There's a different question about how do we adapt, but this document might erode some of the misinformation.

Roskowski suggested subcommittee of Senate could articulate what these issue are. Nadler stated that the TRS Advisory Committee incorporates faculty, staff, and students, and is one vehicle available. Henderson stated that the issues are similar to those in the the LMS search, and stated that CATS might have its resource sharing committee work with you, they need a project this year. For the LMS we invited other faculty on the committee to make it a campus-wide thing. Nadler stated that there might be differences in schools and colleges and disciplines, and becoming better informed might be a better place to start. Obia stated that it would be nice if Miller would come to our administrative council meetings. Methven stated the Senate Executive Committee would talk, and report back at a future senate meeting on directions to proceed..

B. Future Agenda – November 29, 2011 – Les Hyder, IBHE Faculty Advisory Council

VII. Adjournment at 3:43pm

Future Agenda items:

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Coit
November 28, 2011