

11-18-2014

November 18, 2014

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "November 18, 2014" (2014). *Minutes*. 1029.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1029

This Minutes 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

18 November 2014 meeting

(The 2014-2015 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. (J. Oliver)

I. Call to Order by Chair Sterling at 2:04 pm (Booth Library, Room 4440)

Present: Jeff Ashley, Jim Conwell, Minh Dao, Stefan Eckert, Mike Mulvaney, Jon Oliver, Jemmie Robertson, Amy Rosenstein, Steve Scher, Grant Sterling, David Viertel

Guests: B. Lord (AA), G. Hild (CAH), S. Ahmad (Student Sen), D. Hernandez (DEN staff), S. Bennett (Staff Senate)

II. Approval of Minutes of 04 November 2014

Minutes from 04 November 2014 Senate meeting were approved.

Motion made by Senator Robertson and seconded by Senator Eckert.

(Abstained = Senators Viertel & Rosenstein)

III. Communications – reviewed & discussed by Chair Sterling

a. 11/06/14 CAA Minutes

b. CSU Resolution from ISU

- ISU passed a resolution similar to EIU Fac Sen. CSU board has reversed decision = re-recognizes the CSU faculty senate.

c. Budget address e-mail from VP McCann

- VP McCann provided link to budgets (this year, last year). Comparisons now possible. I emailed you a hyperlink.

- Ashley – were the rules of TRM changed from this year to last year for distribution to departments?

- Lord – no, distribution has always been left to colleges. From continuing ed to colleges is the same.

- Conwell – chairs are saying that deans may have changed distribution policy. TRM reduction adds to the 20% across the board reduction. This is coming as a 'shock'

Lord – distribution of net proceeds from previous year have not changed from last year to this year. Net proceeds from courses were distributed the same way. Up to deans to distribute the proceeds. I am unaware from 4 deans if any made changes to the procedures. I can check on that.

Conwell – not aware of any depts. that received increased funds. Most experienced a significant cut.

Lord – as enrollment has declined, TRM proceeds have also declined. Any questions on changes in TRM funding should go to colleges. I will inquire to the deans.

Ashley – could have been an oversight. Because we taught online sections but they are telling us we did not.

Lord – TRM is online, but not only online. Dean Ornes knew what was or was not TRM.

Conwell – so no policy changes from 2013-2014?

Lord – no, not in 2013-2014, but maybe individual decisions by Deans and chairs have changed(?)

Conwell – I would like to know, through Budget Transparency committee, what the TRM \$ changes have been from last year compared to this year.

Lord – I will get you that data. I will approach the chairs to find out but it will take longer.

Sterling – it would be interesting to know about any changes at the college and department level.

Rosenstein – from Special Education – there have been differences in our department, but we are in different colleges.

IV. Presentation to the Senate: Senator Scher: Constitution and By-Laws Revisions

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive = no business requiring action/vote
2. Nominations = Rosenstein – two openings on Lib Advisory Board. 1 year term position and a 3 year term (1st year – alternate, 2 years as regular member). Stephen Lucas volunteered to fill the 1-year position. Kristin Brown volunteered to fill the 2 year position. Motion to approve both candidates (Rosenstein, 2nd by Viertel). Discussion? – none. All in Favor? Motion approved.
3. Elections = no business requiring action/vote
4. Faculty-Student relations = no business requiring action/vote
5. Faculty-Staff relations = no business requiring action/vote
6. Awards = no business requiring action/vote
7. Faculty Forum = no business requiring action/vote
8. Budget Transparency = no business requiring action/vote
9. Constitution/Bylaws = Discussion of proposals – Steve Scher

Scher – two weeks ago we skipped over a few items of discussion.

- Article 1 on 'Membership'. Current article specifies that membership is all tenured/tenure-track faculty and department chairs – Unit A only. We propose to drop the tenured/tenure track restriction and open membership to all faculty (Unit A or Unit B)
- Ashley – this is the only proposal that I have a problem with. It's good to have Unit B involved, but they don't have service requirements while Unit A do.
- Scher – that is true, but is the no-service requirement relevant for service on the Faculty Senate?
- Ashley – it would take away opportunity for Unit A based on expectations and contract provisions
- Scher – to me, its not who or who not can serve, but who does or does not have a voice on the Senate. But Unit B could have a voice and a vote. This adjustment would help to better define 'faculty'.
- Conwell – I don't mind Unit B faculty voting. But they are annually contracted. If need arises to have 'sharp voices' on the Faculty Senate, Unit B senators might have to worry about their job from year to year if they use 'sharp voices'.
- Mulvaney – what have other peer institutions done with faculty senate membership provisions? I see positives and concerns with both sides. How have other institutions managed this scenario?
- Ashley – it would probably be more useful comparing us with institutions with union contracts in place.
- Scher – refers to Western Illinois University and SIUE guidelines for comparison. Some similarities and differences
- Rosenstein – there is a difference between 'vote' and 'serve' in regards to Faculty Senate and elections.
- Ashley – do we have different categories of Unit B faculty on EIU campus?

- Lord – no, not really. Unit B with 1, 2, or 3 year terms and then true ‘adjuncts’.
- Viertel – it mentions in the revised constitution - why the provision for ‘full-time’ only vs ‘full-time & part-time’?
- Scher – because the instructor of 1 course does not have the same investment or role at the university as the full-time instructor
- Oliver – difficult to find 5 candidates each year for Faculty Senate. To provide a greater voice, what about extending their voting rights? Also-concerned about level of investment by Unit Bs?
- Scher – difficult to gauge ‘investment’ and ‘incentive’— I have a Unit B colleague who has been here 25+ years
- Dao – at department level, does it vary what Unit B members can vote on?
- Sterling – yes, some departments have clearly defined bylaws on what Unit B can/cannot do. It varies greatly.
- Scher – some variance on campus in terms of expectations and/or actual Unit B service on the department level
- Dao – is it spelled out in the DACs?
- Sterling – not usually articulated in the DACs – in bylaws – but some departments don’t have bylaws
- Viertel – I have seen disagreements between ASPs and other Unit Bs – confusion on what is articulated in the Contract – question over who has the authority & rights to do what
- Scher – is it possible to be a unit b assistant professor at EIU?
- Sterling – yes, it is...
- Lord – only by legacy at this point
- Conwell – how does a Unit B receive a 1 year, 2 year, or 3 year contract?
- Lord – based on contract stipulations stated in the contract – a points system has been established
- Conwell – I am worried about retaliation against Unit B colleague – more comfortable with a 3-year unit B faculty serving on the Faculty Senate. I don’t mind them voting at all.
- Sterling – generally speaking a Unit B faculty who is nervous about their job won’t run for senate. Very few Unit B faculty are likely to run for senate.
- Rosenstein – would the result of this be that an Unit B faculty can run for any elected committees on campus?
- Scher – yes, any Faculty Senate committees on campus
- Viertel – so CAA?
- Sterling – yes, currently Unit Bs are eligible for all appointed committees but not elected committees. Faculty Chairs are eligible for all elected committees, but not appointed committees. Specific contractual stipulations also apply in certain situations.
- Rosenstein – so this would open the door for Unit Bs to run for other elected committees?
- Robertson – I would be in favor of extending a voice and service opportunities to our Unit B colleagues. A middle ground might be to create elected positions for Unit B positions.
- Oliver – do we establish some type of ratio of representation between Unit A and Unit B colleagues?
- Robertson – to create some type of ‘middle ground’. The result of this process could also alleviate awkward petition signature moments.
- Dao – and also annual evaluations of Unit Bs are completed by department chairs, not DPCs.
- Mike – looks like peer institutions have opened up positions to Unit B, and as Senator Oliver mentioned we also have had a challenge finding Unit A candidates for elected positions. This could be a valuable step to take.
- Ashley – and like Grant mentioned there may not be a ton of candidates stepping up to fill university council/committee positions.
- Dao – do we have visiting faculty at EIU? Are they classified as Unit A or B?
- Lord – very few. And they are neither A or B. They are not expected to serve on committees.
- Ashley – I motion to approve the proposal to adjust ‘faculty senate membership’
- Viertel – I second the motion
- Sterling – we are moving on changes proposed today
- Sterling – all in favor? = approved.
- Mulvaney – what about visiting other committees and councils to gain feedback on this proposal?
- Scher – we approve here, and then we need to collect feedback from other faculty councils/committees, faculty will vote on the changes, and then we will seek final approval at the presidential level.
- Sterling – note - we are required to have a general faculty meeting to discuss the proposal
- Scher – next is the proposal related to Council on Faculty Research (CFR). Section 5.d.1&2. – we have talked to CFR about what they think is appropriate language to describe their role. They have sent the language to us. I see 1 large problem with it. It relates to what CFR’s role is – Section 5.a. (re: the contract)
- Sterling – I don’t think the language in Section 5.a. is a problem because as I interpret it – CFR will look at the contract first and then recommend administrative procedures that are in-line with the contract. As I read it, CFR is not determining what contractual procedures are, or what procedures they like or not.
- Ashley – does CFR determine sabbaticals? Or anything in regard to research stipulations in the contract?
- Sterling - no

- Lord – a recent example that relates – we had to develop a policy for Open-Access Legislation – Dr. Cross in my office identified a concern with the policy that contradicts some of the UPI contract provisions. Appropriate changes were made. So I think that is what CFR is trying to express here in this section. EIU administration will refer to the contract to make sure new policies don't contradict it.
- Ashley – I am ok with how it is worded and the Union can grieve if they feel that the contract is being violated.
- Scher – I would possibly like to see wording added that expresses that CFR supports and encourages faculty research.
- Scher – but do we want to keep the new Section 5.a. 'as is' for now?
- Ashley – suggestion – use a few additional flexible words, like 'when appropriate' at the beginning
- Scher – makes the changes suggested
- Ashley – move to approve
- Robertson – 2nd the motion
- Scher – all in favor? = approved
- Scher – now the revised Section 4 – focus of discussion has been on the word 'serving' rather than 'seated'
- Conwell – only debate is what is a 'seated' vs 'unseated' senator?
- Ashley – suggestion - move some of your rationale into Section 4 to provide greater clarification on this
- Scher – makes the suggested wording adjustments in Section 4
- Scher – all in favor? (approved)
- Scher – Section 7 – what adjustments need to be made here?
- Sterling – we need more flexibility for last minute actions not listed on the agenda
- Viertel – so we regularly break the existing rule?
- Sterling – yes, almost every meeting. Two different types of cases. If you can write language to differentiate the two, that's fine. If not, I would prefer having the language that allows us to cover more routine business as needed
- Scher – in Section 8 there is also a provision that votes against final action on an issue. Tabling the issue until next meeting. This might satisfy this situation.
- Rosenstein – I see both sides of the situation. On-going committee work seems to be different rather than a specific issue that needs to be on the next agenda?
- Sterling – as the constitution is written now, we can't take action on any topic not on the agenda.
- Scher – any action can be actionable, correct?
- Mulvaney – I like language of Section 7 because of its flexibility.
- Scher – all in favor of revised section 7? All in favor (=majority)
- Scher – Article IX – section 3 would be removed.
- Mulvaney – why not leave section 3?
- Scher – because it gives the President and the Board power to approve the Faculty Senate Constitution
- Mulvaney – but does it send a message that contradicts 'shared governance'?
- Ashley – when did the administration ever ask our approval for IGPs?
- Scher – this relates to us making amendments to our constitution – no approval by President or Board needed
- Dao – have we ever had amendments to the Constitution?
- Scher – I'm sure we have – I would need to check
- Viertel – just a few years back was a recent amendments – voting via email was a recent amendment 5 years ago
- Rosenstein – have we approached President or Board about this adjustment?
- Scher – no, but we need to take action first and see what the faculty response to it is.
- Rosenstein – I think it would be prudent to include them in this discussion
- Ashley – but it is not significant because it does not reduce their power
- Dao – a matter of principle or just based on concerns?
- Scher – not based on concerns in the current environment
- Dao – so has it ever been an issue before?
- Conwell – at Chicago State it has been
- Mulvaney – that is a concern that I might have as well. If we don't want to have their approval, it communicates a message – maybe a Chicago State type of a move.
- Scher – but we don't approve the Board's constitution. If we choose to include the wording, we should communicate this pending amendment to the President and Board
- Sterling – again, remember- all we are doing today is trying to finalize wording of amendments – faculty won't vote on these amendments until the Spring 2015 semester. What we do today is not necessarily binding or irreversible. My tendency is to decide on what we agree on - what we want the constitution to say – and then solicit comments from the next Executive Committee meeting with the President
- Rosenstein – I agree with Mike – shared governance goes both ways. Input from the President and Board of Trustees will maintain positive lines of communication.

- Scher – them having the final say on our constitution is the problem. They can reject as it stands right now.
- Ashley – change the language to the ‘President and the Board’ will be ‘consulted’ rather than final approval up to the President and the Board.
- Rosenstein – I hope that the new president makes concerted efforts to be ‘one of us’ like Pres. Perry has done during his tenure. He has supported shared governance. He has honored that relationship.
- Ashley – this would not change the relationship between faculty senate and the president at all, and hopefully not the board either.
- Dao – if we change it the way we have suggested, it could be interpreted as confrontational. It is a substantial change. It could create an issue where an issue does not exist.
- Eckert – how do other faculty senates make changes like this?
- Dao – the proposal is drastic. We need to consider a middle ground that won’t be misinterpreted.
- Scher – we are going to communicate with them during the next few months on the language of the amendment
- Sterling – we could include a consultation prior to the Faculty Senate taking a 2/3 vote.
- Sterling – I suggest that we hold off on this particular provision for two weeks – during the two weeks we can consider other language options and research how other Fac. Sen constitutions state this type of provision in their document. Send suggestions to me, Steve, or circulate yourselves. We will finish constitution next time.

10. Committee on Committees = no business requiring action/vote

11. Other Reports = no business requiring action/vote

- a. Provost’s Report = Board of Trustees meeting recently. President gave an update on his annual report. I have a meeting with provosts in Springfield. I will provide TRM memo to faculty.
Ashley – what about the tax extension? Have they asked EIU about holding back money to give back if the state income tax expires? No-we have gotten limited information from Springfield on this issue. It’s a huge question mark. Sterling – the IBHE believes this year’s budget won’t be slashed, but maybe next years.(?)
- b. Other – Sterling - CAA has made revisions to the Learning Goals and how they will be reflected in the curriculum. As of right now, CAA is requiring that all Gen Ed courses will provide critical thinking, and a learning goal appropriate in each section of Gen Eds. Ex – Social Science Gen Ed = citizenship. Departments could decide on a course-by-course basis for additional learning goals integration. They have suggested that they might come to us to present on this initiative – maybe Jan 27th meeting. This proposal might require significant revision in some courses.
- c. Scher – I attended the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee last week. Committee is large – 26 seats. It appears to be a method of communication of what is happening in enrollment, not a committee that collects advice on how to better manage enrollment. Scheduled to meet twice per week.
Conwell – who are the members of the enrollment working group?
Lord – L. Coffey, M. Hudson, Waltman, Dearth, Mook, Sanders, Davenport, Lynch, etc.
Conwell – to Scher – any report on how admissions stats are so far this year?
Scher – as of Nov 13th – admissions are up 5%, admits are down 1%, transfer admits down, deposits are down
Conwell – this year did we have a surprising number of deposits that decided not to end up attending (?)
Lord – yes, that was the unexpected result after a strong number of deposits

B. Other Old Business: None

VI. **New Business**

A. Future Agenda: Senator Sterling

- December 2 – as of now – open – no formal topic/presentation has been finalized
- Tentative Spring Meeting Dates: January 13, January 27, February 10, February 24, March 10, March 24, April 7, April 21 (Election of Officers)

B. Other New Business –

VII. **Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 3:54 pm by Chair Sterling.**

Submitted by Senator J. Oliver