Minutes   Faculty Senate

10-29-2013

October 29, 2013

Faculty Senate

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

The 2013- 2014 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 Grant Sterling at 2:02pm (Booth Library, Room 4440)
Present: S. Knight-Davis, A. Methven, M. Dao, S. Scher, G. Sterling, J. Conwell, M. Mulvaney, J. Ochwa-Echel, J. Oliver, K. Padmaraju, J. Ludlow, J. Robertson, K. English.
Newly elected Senator Robertson was welcomed.

Guests: Bill Weber, Bill Witsman, Dean Jackman

II.   Approval of the Minutes of 15 October
Minutes from the October 15, 2013 meeting were approved. Motion made by Senator Methven and seconded by Senator Conwell. Abstentions – Senator Knight-Davis, Senator Padmaraju, Senator Robertson

III.   Announcements
No announcements were made.

IV.   Communications

a. E-mail from Janet Fopay: CAA 10/17/13 meeting canceled
b. E-mail from Janet Fopay: CAA 10/24/13 meeting canceled
c. E-mail re: University learning Goals
d. Updated list of Elected Council Members
e. E-mail from Chris Wixson, Re: UPC missing member

V.   Presentation to the Senate – Bill Weber, Imaging Software
Dr. Weber mentioned that Mr. Paul McCann would have been better able to explain in detail the process of getting the Electronic Document Management System (commonly referred to as the imaging software) but since he had other commitments, he couldn't come to the Senate. He would try to explain the whole process as well as he could. The whole purpose of acquiring the Banner Document Management System (BDMS) was to reduce costs amd move away from paper-based systems to electronic systems. He hoped that the Senate would agree with this purpose. Dr. Weber showed an image of the staff at the Human Resources office sorting through a room full of documents trying to find specific info that the auditors had requested. This is what the whole procurement is all about. We currently have several offices (about 10) that already use such a system which is called the on-base system which allows tags to be added to documents which allows for searching documents through various fields. On-base is a piece-meal system, so any office that wants to use it has to request for access and pay for it separately. Three offices on campus have really been pushing me to get better options than the on-base system, so that they can be better integrated with Banner. The on-base system has an integration option with Banner and some of

the offices did purchase the integration option but it did not work. ITS could not get the Application Enabler (the tool for integrating with Banner) to work. A year ago, Dr. Weber had asked Kathy Reid to get that to work. Meanwhile he also asked the Purchasing office to start the procurement process to find the best options. Presently, there are still not enough hooks available on the Application enabler to work well (cost of this is $35,000 per year). Meanwhile, based on the procurement process, a cheaper and more effective option was discovered called the Banner Document Management System (BDMS). The proposal was taken to the Board of Trustees with a total cost of $ 420,000.00. This amount is misleading; it is the maximum amount approved by the Board. For the campus-wide server and user licensing, roughly $ 100,000 needs to be paid up front. Maintenance fee is roughly $ 22,000 per year over 8 years. The rest of it is consulting and training, about $ 120,000. This may not be used completely and typically, the training costs have not been used in full. The advantages to BDMS are: it is a better product; it gives campus-wide licensing; and it is cheaper. Four products were explored during the procurement process that included the on-base system currently used by some offices. Moving from on-base to BDMS is a challenge with regard to transitional costs. But based on how we are using on-base, our IT people will be able to write a script to transition and it is going to be a manageable chore. The offices that are really pushing for BDMS are: Human Resources; Procurement office; Office of Financial Aid. The procurement area is leading the endeavor with BDMS as they want it since it will allow for triggering a Banner workflow, so all entities connected to any change can get the information without moving any paper between offices. The current Director of Financial aid comes from a school that used BDMS and much prefers the BDMS and feels that it will streamline the financial aid process. Considering these advantages, Dr. Weber felt that it was a sound business decision to get the BDMS.

Senator Rosenstein enquired if it was a done deal. Dr. Weber replied that it wasn't but that if it is not done soon, then the whole procurement process will have to be started all over again. Senator Rosenstein enquired if the $100,000 was a one-time fee. Dr. Weber agreed that it was and it would allow for a campus-wide license. Senator Padmaraju enquired if training was to be done like for D2L, training the trainers. Dr. Weber agreed that typically, that is the way EIU makes use of the training options. Senator Conwell asked if they had looked at other universities that have used the system as there had been problems before with the interface. Dr. Weber mentioned that since BDMS already has Banner and us being a Banner campus, he felt confident that the integration would be seamless. Senator Dao enquired if $ 22,000 fee was an annual fee and if we paid for the 8 years in advance. He further asked if the $ 420,000 amount included only one year's fee or for all the 8 years. Dr. Weber clarified that the $ 420,000 included eight years of the fees and that we will be paying $ 22,000 annually. He added that there was a $10,000 set aside as a contingency fund that is normal for all business transactions. Senator Dao enquired about the transitional costs. Dr. Weber mentioned that currently he had no idea but in the total amount, there had been an amount for the cost of the transition. For a brief time, there would be overlap between the current and the new system. Senator Dao also enquired if there were any office currently using the BDMS to which Dr. Weber said that none were. Senator Ludlow enquired if it was safe to assume that we would be staying with banner for

another 8 years. Mr. Bill Witsman mentioned that $190,000 is as price increases each year for the Annual maintenance and that the contract was for the Banner system. The deal was to have 6% increases in maintenance costs each year which is a pretty good deal for software technologies. Senator Methven asked for clarification with regard to the $35,000 being paid for the on-base system and asked for how many years has Eastern been paying for that. Dr. Weber replied that the amount varied from year to year, last year it had been $35,000 and this year it was $37,000. Mr. Bill Witsman added that Eastern had paid $15,000 for the Application Enabler.

Senator Scher enquired if the kind of job shown on the image shared would be the kind of job that would be good for student workers. Dr. Weber replied that there was a concern about data breach and so this was not an option, especially considering the data breach that we have had in the past. Senator Scher further enquired if other universities using the system had been looked into. Dr. Weber mentioned that the committees that went through the procurement process would have looked into them and he had not been directly involved with the process. Senator Oliver enquired if on-base had been developed before BDMS and why did Eastern choose that route. Dr. Weber re-plied that on-based had been procured by individual offices and was started piece-meal. Senator Mulvaney asked if the license would allow more entities on campus use the system such as Faculty travel etc. Dr. Weber replied that the Business office is very hopeful of expanding its use and so was the office of Financial aid. For example, scanning a document to trigger a Banner work flow. These offices have been having trouble with storage. Senator Scher enquired if there were guidelines for scanning and checking. Dr. Weber replied that recently the State had come up with guidelines for electronic documentation. Senator Rosentein asked how this system was different from cloud based system where we can do this for free. Dr. Weber explained that searching is not possible with such systems and this product has a built in OCR and handwriting recognition. Senator Sterling enquired if this proposal had gone through CUPB. Dr. Weber concluded his report by clarifying that since this was a standard technology purchase, it didn't need to.

VI. **Old Business**
A. Committee Reports
    1. Executive Committee – report on monthly meeting: Senator Sterling reported that they had a very short meeting and had nothing to report out.
    2. Nominations Committee - No report.
3. Elections Committee – A motion was made by Senator Methven and seconded by Senator Conwell. Abstentions – Senator Ludlow and Rosenstein. Senator Oliver mentioned that there was still a vacancy on the UPC and that he had checked with the UPC chair to see if this was a crucial position, who said it was. In Spring 2013, Gary Fritz had been a write-in candidate with 8 votes and this time he got 7 votes and he is stuill interested. Concerns were brought up last time as there was no one who had received sufficient number of votes. Senator Scher mentioned that there at least two bodies who would have to approve UPC appointments. If something were to come up and this person was appointed in an unconventional manner, there could be problems.

Senator Padmaraju raised similar concerns. Senator Mulvaney clarified that we would have justification based on Senate bye-laws. Senator Methven clarified that based on Senate bye-laws, Gary Fritz could be approved. Senator Rosenstein made a motion to approve Fritz for the UPC and this was seconded by Senator Bruns.

Dean Jackman enquired about open positions and asked what happened to the positions that were not filled. She also asked if the CFR appointment, Becky Cook was from her or was it a Senate appointment. She wanted to know as wanted to appoint her again for another term.

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee – No report
5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee – No report
6. Awards Committee – Senator Dao reported that the awards committee had met. He appreciated the efforst of Senator Ludlow and Senator Mulvaney in this process and said that the task was enjoyable and went smoothly. There had been 5 applicants for the Mendez award, all of them outstanding candidates. For this year, the awardee selected by the committee was Dr. Andrew Methven. Senator Dao added that the nominators for other candidates must definitely consider nominations again next year. Senator Scher reported that the Louis Clay Mendez award had been created by a motion made by him in the Senate a long time back and he had hoped that there would be some money associated with the award. He requested the Senate to consider ways to make that happen, and make an endowment a possibility for this award. Senator Mulvaney made the motion to approve the award for Dr. Methven and the motion was seconded by Senator Bruns. The motion carried with all in favor with one abstention (Senator Methven). The senate congratulated Senator Methven for the award. Senator Dao reminded Dr. Methven that Martha Heckler would need a short bio from him.
7. Faculty Forum Committee – Senator Rosenstein announced that there was a change for the Faculty Forum date and it had been moved to Dec. 3rd. The topic still remained – Diversity.
8. Budget Transparency Committee – No report
9. Bye-laws Committee – Senator Scher announced that the committee would start meeting from the next day.
10. Other Reports
   a. Provost's Report - The Provost started his report mentioning that Dean Lanham and he had gone to NIU to attend the final sessions on open access to research. In the keynote address, Senator Bitiz gave a rationale for open access saying that publishers had taken the wrong direction with faculty research. Provost Lord announced that he would be putting together a task force to look into this and he thanked Senator Sterling for forwarding the names of interested faculty. He said that there were various models available and the taskforce will need to look at what would be the most feasible for Eastern. He looked forward to the discussions.

   He mentioned the upcoming Board meeting but said that the issues discussed there had little impact on Academic Affairs. He said that the Admissions search

was well under way but the Registrar search committee had not yet been put together but will be soon.

Senator Oliver asked the Provost how the BDMS would help academic affairs. Provost Lord replied that BDMS was more of a business affairs solution and some of the offices have learned from each other and have made good use of it. He could see some uses for it in Advising but not in the curriculum management.

Senator Scher enquired as to the difference between Registrar and Records office history. Provost Lord mentioned that Eastern used to have a Registrar in McAfee and the Records office in Old Main. Sue Harvey had started in one of these areas, soon her counterpart left and she assumed responsibility of the Registrar and eventually the offices were consolidated into one space. He appreciated Sue Harvey for leading the efforts in downsizing through attrition as records had become electronic at Eastern.

Senator Sterling enquired about electronic portfolios for faculty. Provost Lord mentioned that for several years, questions have been raised about the portfolio going electronic. Initially it was thought that this was a contractual issue and after enquiry, it was discovered that it was not. A committee has been looking into this for a year now; no decisions have been made. The people who are trying it out are using the D2L platform for that. Senator Bruns asked if this testing was to see if it was feasible and in the foreseeable future would it be an option. He expressed concerns about how some sensitive information could be destroyed if we went completely electronic. Provost Lord mentioned that these issues were part of the conversation. The four who were trying out had made no commitments to going electronic and he wasn't sure if they would finally decide to go that way.

b. Other Old Business - None

VII. **New Business**
A. Report on Imaging Software by Dr. Weber – Reported above.
B. Future Agenda:
Fall 2013 Meeting Dates – November 12; December 3 (Bill Weber—Program Analysis): followed by Forum on Diversity.

VIII. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40pm.