

1-13-2015

January 13, 2015

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 13, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1027.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1027

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

13 January 2015 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 2:00pm (Booth Library, Room 4440)

Present: J. Ashley, T. Burns, M. Dao, S. Eckert, J. Ludlow, M. Mulvaney, J. Ochwa-Echel, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, A. Rosenstein, S. Scher, G. Sterling, S. Stowell, D. Viertel, S. Ahmad (Student VP).

Guests: Provost Lord (AA), Jim Davis (IAB), Dan Nadler (Student Affairs), Ryan Seigel (FAC), Glenn Hild (CAH), Stephanie Markham (DEN), Sally Renauld (JOU)

II. Approval of Minutes of 02 December 2014

Ludlow – proposed correction for 02 Dec 2014 minutes

Minutes from 02 December 2014 Senate meeting were approved. Motion made by Senator Bruns and seconded by Senator Ludlow. Senators Viertel and Stowell abstained.

III. Communications

- a. CAA Minutes from 12/4/14 and 12/11/14
- b. Elections Results (text comments and faculty report .doc)
- c. E-mail from Dean Jackman, Re: vacancies
- d. CAA Year 2 GenEd and Learning Goals summary
- e. Illinois Faculty Senate Amendment procedures (compiled by Sen. Eckert)

IV. Presentation to the Senate: Jim Davis – Intercollegiate Athletic Board (IAB)

Davis – I am Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) at EIU. The FAR is appointed by President, mandated by the NCAA. I send an annual summary of athletics activities to Faculty Senate each year (IAB report). I will review what my duties are and what has been accomplished by EIU athletics. I have provided a handout with highlights for you. IAB is charged with overseeing academic integrity and student-athlete well-being. We review student-athlete GPA (back page of handout). We review missed class time. According to NCAA and OVC guidelines, I calculate what percentage of class is being missed by sport each semester. We also review APR of each team. We also conduct senior exit surveys with student athletes – through an online instrument and random verbal exit interviews. We also review the athletics budget periodically each academic year.

Ashley – quite a few people are going to ask about the budget and recent overspending by EIU athletics.

Davis – athletic spending (overspending) is approved by the President.

Scher – were you aware of the overspending?

Davis – no, we see a snapshot of the budget during the academic year

Ashley – your main emphasis is academics and compliance.

Davis – correct - yes, those are what my duties are as FAR

Rosenstein – are the budgets that the IAB receive posted anywhere?

Davis – we don't post budgets, and we don't have a website. The Faculty Senate chair receives a copy of the budget

Ochwa-Echel - if you don't approve the budget, why do you review the budget?

Davis – the IAB gets a chance to review it – for a question and answer for the Board. IAB has no power to approve.

Ochwa-Echel - do you see if it is balanced?

Davis – yes – we see current balances of budget documents. Our priorities lie in the other two key areas already mentioned.

Dao – so the term 'review' might be misleading?

Renauld – but there are explanations given by EIU athletics personnel about the budget during IAB meetings.

Dao – what is APR?

Davis – provided detailed explanation of the NCAA APR formula

Oliver – a copy of the annual IAB report is found at the Faculty Senate website

Dao – but what about the finalized annual athletics budget?

Davis – EIU athletics finalizes their budget for each fiscal year when we are not meeting so we don't see that

Ashley – is football generally the lowest annual GPA?

Davis – yes, that is typical. Not abnormal across the industry.

Ashley – so what benefit do we have for being Division 1?

Oliver – quality of opponent to compete against is one benefit

Bruns – a few questions about student-athlete well-being. The online survey – what percentage of respondents do you get?

Davis – typically 70+%. We analyzed this process this year. The online report allows for greater management of the data.

Scher – but you could type in the data? Or you could bring teams into the computer lab to complete survey by hand?

Davis – yes, this is the way it was conducted in the past. But it went online a few years ago and we continue to closely analyze this process.

Scher – is there a higher failure rate for some teams?

Davis – Maybe. I visited all teams this year to encourage their participation.

Scher – it would be helpful to know more about the 70% who are responding – race, gender, sport, etc. the data might still be biased even with a high response rate.

Davis – I think we touch upon that with the follow-up verbal interviews with exiting senior student-athletes. We make sure we get all sports covered in those interviews. Add the sample size for most sports is less than 10 seniors, except football.

Bruns – what does ‘student-athlete’ well-being mean?

Davis – we analyze variables such as travel, food, sport environment, equipment, lodging, sports medicine, etc

Bruns – in terms of hazing, do you ever interview students other than seniors?

Davis – no, we have talked about this with the IAB and with other FARs. We have kept it to seniors up to this point.

Bruns – could you create a subset of undergraduate students and ask them questions about topics such as hazing?

Davis – we have discussed this as well, but have not don’t this yet.

Dao – survey results are notorious for bias – especially the non-response rate bias. Those that hate you or love you usually don’t complete the survey. The number of questions might also be a deterrent. An 80 question survey – is that too many? Is it too long? Some questions may or may not be critical. And what’s in it for the student-athlete to complete it?

Rosenstein – a question on the survey – looking at results in the IAB report – Winter 2014. N = 10. Only 10?

Davis – only 10 were exhausting their eligibility at the end of the semester.

Rosenstein – and a low response rate in Spring 2014 as well in the IAB report

Scher – accumulating all the results into an annual report might provide more accurate/generalizable results

Davis – we keep results into seasonal groups for the purposes of administering the verbal exit interviews

Scher – ultimately, you probably should put all the results together into one summary of results each year

Davis – although considered/discussed in the past, for IAB purposes, I don’t see the benefit of combining all the online and verbal interview results into one annual report

Rosenstein – when you use your data, do you look across teams if an issue exists?

Davis – if there is an issue, I can call 9th Street Hall (Testing Services) to find out more about the results – with whatever it is (i.e. - hazing?)

Davis – anytime there is an issue I follow up on it.

Ludlow – comment to Dao - sometimes lack of answering also means there are not strong feelings about the issues/questions being asked.

Ludlow - suggestion to Davis - It might be useful to have a panel (consisting of some females) available for students who have something to share about a controversial issue.

Davis – I want to brag a little about student-athlete accomplishments in the classroom, in competition, and in the community – they are impressive (see handout). Our student-athletes are doing some great things here at EIU.

Ashley – the bigger concern is the budget. But it sounds like we will deal with that during Dan Nadler’s visit in the Feb.

Sterling – how good are faculty with reporting on academic progress of student athletes during each semester?

Davis – not very good. The online system now used has been better than pen-paper campus mail system in the past.

Scher – sometimes you (EIU Athletics) sends them out but there have not been any grades yet.

Davis – I have talked with Cindy Miller about this. We are working to improve the system and timing of it.

Dao – student-athletes may have resources that regular students don’t have. Upper division stats tutors?

Davis – true – and we do our best to promote academic integrity. There are things tutors can and cannot do with student-athletes. We sit down with tutors at the start of each academic year to clarify this. The academic center in Lantz has also been a very nice addition. We encourage student-athletes to also take advantage of other student resources on campus.

Sterling – why does IAB no longer have faculty members selected and approved by Faculty Senate?

Davis – this changed occurred under Gail Richard’s watch – during her last semester as FAR for EIU Athletics. In 2009 we had our most recent NCAA re-certification. Because of the existing process at the time, we had no appointed females on the Board. The NCAA raised the ‘red flag’ about the selection process. Gail visited with Andrew Methven (member of FAC.SEN executive committee at the time) about changing the policy. Reviewing Faculty Senate minutes, IAB was removed from your list of nominated committees to fill positions for with the ‘blessing’ of Faculty Senate in 2011. So I have followed similar protocol that you follow to recruit possible candidates to fill IAB vacant positions. We stay in balance in terms of

academic college and gender equity, and we review applicants with Dr Dan Nadler. We finalize 3 names, and vote on the names at the IAB. In summary, I feel the modified process approved by Faculty Senate in 2011 has been very successful. So the NCAA requires gender equity and campus equity on the IAB.

Stowell – I was on Faculty Senate at the time and we felt good at the time to delegate the process to IAB.

Scher – comment to Sterling - it was probably me who recently brought this issue up to Faculty Senate.

Scher – comment to Davis - based on the process that you have described, I am still concerned that when a board (IAB) appoints all of it's own members, a self-perpetuating philosophy will be reinforced.

Bruns – it would be nice if Faculty Senate still played a role in the process – maybe 'advise & consent' - Possibly a way to resolve initial concerns? (Bruns - shared related anecdote/experience from his time at U. of Wisconsin)

Viertel – we also need to consider if there is a problem here? There was a problem before (up to 2011). It seems to be working as it is functioning now. Does it need to be fixed today?

Bruns – but Steve has a point about a committee appointing its own members. Revise and consent might solve this.

Scher – the other option is figuring out what the board needs (makeup), and having the Faculty Senate fill the need.

Davis – the problem developed because that did not happen in the past. We risk returning back to the same issue/problem of the past if we change this.

Scher – but it can be put it in the bylaws?

Davis – it is in the bylaws of the IAB. It would not be fair to change something that we have worked very hard on to fix.

I thoroughly believe in consistent oversight of the IAB. We are also now trying to stay in compliance with the NCAA.

Rosenstein – part of the concern is what if you leave and are replaced with a FAR who is less responsible and conscious of these issues? To ensure long-term checks & balances in the process, would it make sense for a member of the Faculty Senate nominations committee to be part of the selection process of IAB candidates with you & Dr Nadler?

Davis – if that makes you (Faculty Senate) feel better, I have no reservations about your proposal.

Stowell – back to the individual conversation in 2011, do candidates have to have specific qualifications to serve on IAB?

Davis - no

Stowell – then the next question is can we trust the NCAA with the oversight of one of our (Faculty Senate) committees?

Davis – again – if a member of the Faculty Senate nominations committee would like to participate in the process, we would support that adjustment to IAB bylaws.

Bruns – I like the compromise because it allows your process to stay in place and allows for Faculty Senate advisement in the process.

Rosenstein – I would like to formally recommend that a member of Faculty Senate participate in the process.

Davis – agreed – IAB will meet the first week of February. I will put that on our agenda for the February meeting.

Bruns – in terms of process, how does FAC SEN determine who that is or will be?

Sterling – we can pick each year

Scher – by default, probably someone from the nominations committee

Davis – and we will keep our timing the same as is. We usually meet the first Thursday in May when this process takes place

Viertel – maybe we should also stipulate that the person who does serve is not a candidate for IAB consideration?

Sterling – agreed.

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive = Sterling – no much to report from December meeting with the President.

Ludlow – from my notes - Provost Lord will look into the retired faculty ID card. Need to enhance sense of 'faculty appreciation' on campus. Athletics overspending was discussed.

2. Nominations = Rosenstein - Faculty Development Adv. Comm. (FDAC) = 2 Vacancies – 1 COS, 1 LCBAS. Need to acquire nominations list for Spring 2012 to see who might be available. Viertel and Stowell will search for potential list – both served on the committee at that time. Both positions are only for Spring 2015 semester.

Sterling – I would also suggest making the call for nominees immediate rather than waiting. Contact Deans as well.

Rosenstein – I'll send email to Viertel and Stowell, and to Deans.

3. Elections = Ludlow – Fall 2014 Special Election Results and appointments. Circulate an updated version of FA 2014 Election results. *Note - McNitt received 18 total write-in votes for Position 12.

Sterling – CEPS Dean Jackman is empowered to appoint for Position 13 – Kathleen Phillips is her appointee.

Sterling – Position 7 – Dean Jackman recommended we approve highest vote getter- Tadlock-Marlo

Motion to Approve Tadlock-Marlo – Senator Eckert, Stowell (2nd)

Sterling – vote taken – unanimously approved
Motion for Position 7 – Senator Ashley, Rosenstein (2nd)
Sterling – vote taken – unanimously approved
Rosenstein – 1 question – Position 2 – Does Stephanie Woodley contact the chair of the committee or should she wait to be contacted by the chair?
Ashley – the committee does not always meet
Mulvaney – in the past, we would send a congratulatory letter from us. Then the committee would be responsible for reaching out to the new committee members
Ludlow – maybe sending a copy of the letter to the committee chair would be a good idea?
Mulvaney – the challenge might be finding out who the committee chair is
Scher – maybe something for the Committee on Committees to analyze?
Bruns – maybe an ‘ad-hoc’ semester project for a small group of us to work on. I am willing to help.
Oliver – now that Ludlow has mastered the elections process, should the Elections chair be a 2 year position?
Ludlow – NO!!!

4. Faculty-Student relations = no report

5. Faculty-Staff relations = met Dec 10th. Proposal of using volunteers to help clean up campus via service projects. Campus gardener is now working alone – used to have graduate assistant. Suggestion – have a ‘Panther’ Day to beautify campus and help campus gardener. State Smoking Law – effective July 1. Question - Can staff & students smoke in their cars while parked on campus?
Sterling – suggestion to talk with staff in New Student programs – maybe they have campus service projects for students to do?

6. Awards = Robertson - question – next award for this committee? –
Sterling – Distinguished Faculty Award

7. Faculty Forum = Bruns - will meet in the near future. Duncan-Lane was working on event proposal, but apparently did not make it past our committee. Who else can serve on the committee? Senator Stowell?
Stowell – maybe. I need to confirm which committees I have already committed to.

8. Budget transparency = no report

9. Constitution and Bylaws Review = Scher- Senator Eckert provided attachment with campus policies on making amendment changes to Constitution. Similar processes exist across state campuses. Something for us to review as we make final proposals/changes to our Constitution. Approval of constitution changes usually require BOT approval – same as EIU. We will be discussing this at future meetings.

Sterling – note- BOT mandates that a CUPB be created – that is the only committee mentioned in BOT bylaws.

10. Committee on Committees = no report

11. Other Reports:

a. Provost’s Report – Presidential Search ongoing. Visits to campus by 4 finalists have been announced. Please be involved and provide feedback to the committee. Next BOT meeting has been rescheduled because of search process. Successful ‘Prowl’ event last Saturday with new students - Grant spoke – effective, humorous way to communicate an important message. And Thank you for encourage faculty to participate in early student reporting – to help identify those students who need our help immediately.

b. Other – none

B. Other Old Business: none

VI. **New Business**

A. Future Agenda: Spring 2015 Meeting Dates:

January 27 (CAA)

February 24 (Minority Recruitment and Enrollment)

March 24 (?)

April 21 (Election of Officers)

February 10 (VP Nadler: Intercollegiate Athletics Funding)

March 10 (?)

April 7 (?)

B. Other New Business –

VII. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.