

3-24-2015

March 24, 2015

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 24, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1022.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1022](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1022)

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](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

24 March 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, J. Conwell, M. Dao, S. Eckert, J. Ludlow, M. Mulvaney, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, A. Rosenstein, S. Scher, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, D. Viertel, S. Ahmad (Student VP).

Guests: J. Allison (ENG), G. Aylesworth (PHIL), S. Bennett (Staff Senate), M. Gronnvoll (CMN), M. Izadi (LCBAS), B. Lord (AA), R. Jones (CMN), D. Reid (HST), S. Ruholl (KSS)

II. Approval of Minutes from 10 March 2015 Senate Meeting

- Revisions – Jeff Ashley – correction needed - concerns – made by Throneburg, not Ashley
- Minutes from 10 March 2015 Senate meeting were approved.
- Motion made by Senator Ludlow, and seconded by Senator Eckert. All in favor? – 9/11
- Abstentions = 1/11 - Senator Scher

III. Communications – comments by G. Sterling

- a. CAA Minutes from 3/12/15
- b. E-mail from John Allison, Re: Robert's Rules
- c. Letter from CAA General Education Committee representatives, Re: Article XIII
- d. Email from Bob Wiseman – regarding poor response from faculty to open Spring Elections positions – lets plan to discuss this at the 07 April 2015 senate meeting
- e. 2017-2018 academic calendar received from B. Lord

IV. Presentations to the Senate: None scheduled. Discussion of proposed Constitution Amendments.

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive = no report

2. Nominations = no report – Rosenstein – waiting for results of Elections before we proceed

3. Elections = Ludlow – we extended deadline to Friday. We have received 2 more applications. Still have 8 positions with no candidates. To Scher – confirms timeline issues with possible meeting with faculty regarding proposed Constitutional changes.

Scher – confirms the timeline issue

Sterling – we will probably have to administer these 2 items separately

Ludlow-should we move forward with the election at this point? Andy Anderson in ITS has online system ready for the election.

Sterling – what is the sentiment of the Senate? My concern is if we push date back any further, it will negatively impact appointed committee  
Ludlow- and when is the UPI election?  
Sterling – near the beginning of April – ballots will be distributed this week  
Viertel – I think we should move forward with the elections, and then move separately with the Constitution. This is a motion. – Election next week, Constitutional Amendments will follow.  
Rosenstein – I second the motion.  
Sterling – vote – 12/13 – yes, opposed – 1/13 (Scher)  
Rosenstein – makes a comment about other possible candidates that are completing petitions  
Sterling - our goal is to have contested elections. But we can't force people to run for positions.  
Ludlow – as of yesterday at 6 pm, we have zero contested positions  
Sterling – any other business related to elections?  
Scher – do we want to discuss amendments now?  
Sterling – let's put it off for now

4. Faculty-Student relations = no report

5. Faculty-Staff relations = no report

6. Awards = Roberston – we want to make a motion for Dr. William Addison for DFA  
Scher – 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion. Vote – unanimous – 13/13. William Addison will be 2015 DFA recipient.

7. Faculty Forum = no report – Sterling - maybe 'Constitutional Revisions' as next forum?

8. Budget transparency = Ashley – next meeting coming soon. Let us know if you have issues for us to bring forward

9. Constitution and Bylaws Review = Scher

Scher – reviews the procedure for amendments to Constitution – 2/3 vote of Faculty Senate needed – already happened two weeks ago. Faculty vote follows. Reviews timeline of the process. Does this include using email or does it need to be a physical copy?

Ashley – I think we addressed this a few years ago. Electronic is the new standard of communication and can be used for this process.

Scher – continues review of existing voting process. A meeting needs to be called. Amendments need to be distributed. We need to organize voting process following this.

Scher – question on communicating with President and EIU Board – it seems prudent to communicate with them BEFORE the vote takes place. When is their next meeting? How should we proceed with this process?

Lord – April 24<sup>th</sup>

Scher – and current President is in his last month of service to EIU. Not sure about communicating with the incoming president.

Conwell - can Executive Committee preview this with current president during next executive committee meeting?

Oliver – next FAC SEN EXEC Committee meeting is next Tuesday – Mar 31st

Scher – when is Pres Perry's last day of work?

Oliver – May 15<sup>th</sup>

Scher – offers more comments about this concern

Conwell – if board meets on April, can't this be approved at that time?

Sterling – I will contact the EIU Board about the proposal

Scher – we need to be proactive about the proposed changes and the autonomy we seek. But I am not sure that I am the best person to explain proposed changes to the Board.

Scher – if separate vote is needed, what is ITS's time table for this type of process?

Ludlow – reassures that based on the nature of this voting process, ITS can respond quickly

Scher – proposal – distribute amendments to EIU faculty by the end of this week, and then have the election/voting process on amendment changes by 2<sup>nd</sup> week of April.

Sterling – can you reserve a room for the faculty meeting for this?

Scher – yes, I can contact campus scheduling for the meeting – maybe 2<sup>nd</sup> week of April

Ludlow – a Tuesday in between Faculty Senate meetings would work well. What about March 31<sup>st</sup>? Would that be too fast?

Scher – maybe. Is that enough time for faculty to review the amendments? Or maybe April 7<sup>th</sup> after the Faculty Senate meeting?

Viertel – anything else schedule for the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting?

Sterling – no, not yet

Viertel - what about April 7<sup>th</sup> – host an abbreviated Faculty Senate meeting from 2-3 pm, and then host the Faculty Forum at 3 pm to focus on the proposed amendments?

Scher – how large of a space will be needed?

Ashley – a space like Charleston/Mattoon room would accommodate any crowd we can get.

Rosenstein – Buzzard Auditorium would work

Scher – yes, there are also other large spaces available across campus.

Rosenstein – thinking about set-up – if you do it in Union Fac Mgmt will have to set up chairs

Conwell – identifies other campus spaces that would work

Rosenstein – reviews proposed timeline and timeline requirements with Scher

Sterling – reminds the group of the agreement in terms of organization of the amendments and voting on the amendments

Scher – who writes and distributes the proposed amendments?

Sterling – I can compile and distribute.

Scher – ok –I will schedule the meeting.

Sterling – let's now discussion question regarding power of the Senate to call a referendum. We need to discuss and decide if we have the power or not. If we don't, do we want to revise the constitution? If we do, let's discuss it now.

Ashley – I researched what other Illinois faculty senates do with this issue. I contacted many institutions. 7 responded – their constitutions do not explicitly state that they can call a referendum, but their interpretation is that they do have the power to do so if needed. The motivation to do so in the past has mostly been in response to certain circumstances where faculty felt faculty senates were not doing their job by not calling requested referenda.

Scher – I agree with Jeff's interpretation and comments. Cites additional language in existing faculty senate constitution that seems to suggest that the Faculty Senate has the power to call a referendum. Offers additional comments/opinions about the topic in support of Ashley.

Viertel – to Scher – I read bits of the constitution differently than you. Recommendations vs actions – there is a difference. It's not explicitly written in the constitution that we have the power to take action. We can recommend, but I don't think the constitution suggests the power to act by this Faculty Senate. We are governed by the document.

Ashley – the 'framers' of the constitution (the document) are here with us.

Scher – nowhere in the constitution does it state that we cannot – 'forbidden'. But it seems to provide the senate with the implicit power to act when it is in the best interests of the faculty.

Stowell – I have been here 15 years. When was the last time a referendum was sent out? Has it happened.

Allison – there was a referendum about a proposed university college within the last 15 years. Allison – I was faculty senate chair when article 13 was authored. It came into being because the senate refused to move referendum forward. Some senators had previously tried to move forward a referendum on strategic planning, and 33% of faculty came forward with a petition asking the senate to provide a referendum, but they did not. (Reviews previous DEN editorial about the issue). Fortunately Senator Langford Walker from the School of Business responded by authoring Article 13. Offers additional historical background about Article 13.

G. Aylesworth – we assisted Senator Walker in authoring article 13. Provides additional historical background. What prompted article 13? – the senate’s refusal to move forward a referendum. The norm up until that time was for the senate to canvas the faculty for possible issues leading to referenda.

Allison – reviews a DEN article from 1994, a referendum pushed forward by Dr Walker (BUS) Allison – Article 13 was not to prevent the senate of moving forward a referendum, it was a remedy for when faculty senate was unresponsive. Faculty Senate operates according to Robert Rules of Order, which does not prevent bodies proposing referenda. Motions can also originate from communications and requests from constituents. Your body receives these types of communications and motions in consideration of a possible referendum.

Viertel – voices concern over where this referendum issue originated from? What prompted this? It’s been a non-issue, but now it is? Mentions the EIU athletics issue (possible overspending) and of the communication submitted regarding the CAA General Learning Goals. We discussed it but there did not seem to be much worry/concerns about it.

Ashley – there were a number of concerns with CAA data and presentation elements, but I think what they are doing is good. Not sure about major and syllabi policies.

Viertel – maybe there were no controversies over the CAA initiative, maybe some concerns. But now a referendum request is submitted about this? I wish the author would have presented it to the Faculty Senate to discuss it in more details.

Ashley – but let’s not muddy the waters of the issue on the table – Faculty Senate having the power to push forward a referendum

Allison – I sent the referendum about EIU Athletics, not sure on the CAA referendum.

Viertel – my mind is not made up on this, but after this discussion we need to clarify the language in the faculty senate constitution

Ashley – I agree with you on that

Stowell – we should poll EIU faculty – we represent them. I don’t see a problem with that. With respect to others’ concerns about the process: When I vote as a citizen – there is usually an explanation about the referendum (context) – the ‘why’ if I vote in either direction. There needs to be context to any referendum for faculty members before they vote. The ‘why’.

Ashley – there needs to be ‘background’ to each referendum

Ludlow – this lead to my question – what is the difference between referendum and poll?

Mulvaney – the nuances of language is my concern – thanks to Ashley for researching this issue at other institutions. A referendum is an ‘actionable’ item – immediate action will follow. A ‘poll’ is different. It measures interest of constituents. Fac Sen could poll the faculty to see what most important issues to faculty are. Maybe a survey? – could provide useful information. A referendum is pretty powerful – an ‘actionable’ item. I still think that a certain % of faculty need to be behind it before acting on it. Restates previous comments from Dr. Allison. Key question - Can Faculty Senate internally do this?

Ashley – Faculty Senates at other universities are authoring and pushing referendum forward

Mulvaney – I would be in support of surveying and polling the faculty where data collected might lead to a referendum

Ashley – that is advisory only, and a referendum does not necessarily trigger immediate action

Ludlow – if we want information, polling might be better than elections  
Scher – response rate from polls is poor (10%). Comments about potential results from survey. Comments about non-binding referendum – common at U.of.I.Champaign  
Sterling – you are not alone in your opinion about referendum vs polls – many organizations view it the same way – two different things. What blurs the situation here is that we don't take any action. We are an advisory body. We don't have the sharp distinctions that exist elsewhere. Like tax rates - tax boards and tax referenda which results in a tax increase. Those are actionable results. If we vote on a referendum, it still is an advisory recommendation.  
Stowell – I can state that in a recent faculty poll (NCA accreditation) we had a 50% response rate. The 3 referendum submitted to Faculty Senate are much closer to a 'poll' than 'referendum'.

Allison – I would prefer that the senate issue the referenda in such a way that faculty members can vote 'yes' or 'no'.

Conwell – we (Fac Sen) are not binding, but depending upon what we are voting on, it can be binding. Reviews the vote of no confidence by a Faculty Senate for a past EIU president (Reeves). Was it a poll or referendum? Makes no difference. It was not binding but the EIU Board and president took notice. That originated from the Senate.

Allison – in past years, faculty senate members were aware of criticism of past president Jorns. A number of senators called a special meeting (allowable by Constitution). Those in attendance voted 'confidence' in the president. Then, when they were asked to ratify that vote with the faculty, they refused. But Article 13 was in place, so a sufficient # of votes was accumulated to have a referendum.

Aylesworth – 2 issues you have been discussing today are absolutely connected: Referenda and Faculty Senate elections. Elections for Faculty Senate used to be hotly contested – competing slates. Participation was high, very engaged, and referenda were common. Interest in the Senate was very high at that time. Very competitive to get voted onto the Faculty Senate. Candidates organized slates – ie competing parties disseminating arguments. It was healthy and exciting. Regular canvassing of the faculty on important issues. Interest in the Faculty Senate today has slackened lately – Senate not as active and involved at a high level as in years past.

Dao – if that was the case and faculty members don't feel like faculty senate today is doing their job, wouldn't that motivate faculty to run for the senate. A reason to run?

Aylesworth – responds to Dao's statement – clarifies that he is not criticizing any one specifically serving on the senate today, but notices a difference between today and past.

Dao – this is the 2<sup>nd</sup> time serving on the senate. Towards the end of my first term, there became a problem in soliciting discussable issues from faculty. A declining interest in the faculty.

Dao – offers comments about referenda vs poll. Whether it be a referendum vs a poll, if the issue is a critical issue, the people (faculty) will show up at the polls. It is a matter of semantics.

Ashley – makes a motion – based on what other institutions are doing, past practice of the Faculty Senate, Roberts rules, intent of Amendment 13 – senate does have the ability/authority to author/initiate a poll or referenda for EIU Faculty

Conwell – I '2<sup>nd</sup>' the motion

Viertel – to Shirmeen Ahmad (Student Senate) – what does the Student Senate do in terms of poll vs referendum?

Shirmeen – responds to Viertel – provides background information on Student Senate procedures

Ludlow – to Ashley – requests clarity on the motion

Ashley – we are just establishing 'yes' or 'no' on language between referendum or poll

Rosenstein – asks question and comments about the issue – suggests that nothing is stopping current faculty senators from asking faculty peers about key issues. Discusses emailing faculty.

Scher – if we want to do a poll, we should do a poll and not send something out to entire faculty and get the predictable 10% response. A real poll is a random selection of people and requests responses to the poll. Then we would have valid information. Additional comments on the way we solicit responses to poll questions.

Dao – mentions/refers to non-response bias

Ashley – it still comes down the same right we are discussing

Scher – offers additional comments – distinguishes between the answer you want to get vs what the faculty want through a poll. I want to know what the faculty thinks.

Viertel – discusses ‘direct’ vs ‘representative’ democracy. I thought we were a representative democracy – but this seems direct.

Ashley – offers comments – nothing binding, so it is not ‘direct’

Reid – refers to SIU constitution – which seems to clarify relationship between faculty and faculty senate. Offers comments about poll vs referendum. Poll the faculty to find out the most important issues in 2015. Sequencing in this process is important. Refers to CAA LG process.

Ashley – two different issues - the CAA proposed referendum may not even come to vote

Conwell – I did not even think about the CAA situation with this issue

Viertel – requests clarifications on the current language of the motion on the table

Oliver – conducts roll call. Yes = 12, No = 1 (Viertel)

Sterling – ok – separate issue - do we wish to amend language of current Article 13 – explicitly affirming what we just voted on.

Conwell – yes, so we don’t have to bring this issue before Senate again

Sterling – ok – any such amendment of article 13 should appear on the same ballot of any other amendments. We need language, but do we want to figure out the language at the table here today? Can we agree to something now (edited article 13) that will be included in the elections?

Viertel – can we hear what the amended article 13 reads like as of right now? What we already approved at a previous meeting

Sterling – it was not amended at the last meeting

Scher – confirms that article 13 has not been previously amended

Stowell – in terms of the language of article 13, it would be important to include a ‘time’ component, as well as the ‘context’ with each referendum (why?)

Allison – discusses earlier uses of Article 13, sponsors were required to attend a meeting to explain to EIU faculty ‘why’ they were advancing a referendum

Stowell – that should already be in the language of the Article

Viertel – yes, ‘time’ and ‘language’ currently exists

Ashley – provides additional suggested language for Article 13

Sterling – also - if we want to distinguish the difference between poll and referendum, we should consider adding specifications on types of questions and time periods. And maybe we need some volunteers on drafting language for the edited article 13. Or can we craft it now?

Conwell – discusses a few possible routes to take with the amended language

Stowell – confirms that ‘context’ from referendum author is already required (the ‘why’)

Scher – I am currently working on an edited Amendment 13

Ashley – we need to be specific in terms of ‘waiting period’ and ‘notice’ for timely discussion

Ludlow – and what about a required referendum meeting in the summer? Unique situations like this need to be accounted for.

Ashley – concern - we never have summer quorum with Faculty Senate

Ludlow – but a situation/issue might be important enough to add a specific requirement

Ashley – but the focus should be on Fall & Spring because senators aren’t around in summer

Allison – provides background information about referenda in past summer sessions. (past president Jorns situation). Situation was dealt with through referendum in the Fall semester.

Ashley – so maybe limit the language in Article 13 for fall and spring?

Rosenstein – concern - what about administrative action that occurred in the summer? Being pushed through during the summer when Faculty are not around?

Sterling – we can still take action during the summer

Viertel – yes, we can still meet in the summer to respond to that type of situation and have our voice heard on the issue

Allison – do senate members think it a good addition to the constitution that requires a poll being conducted at the beginning of each academic year to determine issues for faculty senate to address? This would ensure the procedure be perpetual.

10. Committee on Committees = no report

11. Other Reports:

a. Provost's Report: Lord – a few items. Proposed academic calendar – provided to Sterling. Two weeks ago President Perry, Paul McCann and I provided testimony in Springfield with House Appropriation Committee and Senate Appropriation Committee. The sense of the room was concern for funding support for Higher Education. President Perry was received graciously. No enthusiasm for proposed budget by current Governor Rauner. We will be losing Dean Augustine to Council of Graduate Studies in Washington, D.C. I will be developing process to identify an interim Dean as soon as possible – put out a call, solicit recommendations. We hope to do a full national search in the Fall. Big shoes to fill.

Ashley – follow up with EIU3 proposal – any additional discussion?

Lord – I have not received a formal request.

Stowell – I will be meeting with Council of Chairs with COS. Probably/hopefully future presentations in the future.

Scher – noticing empty classrooms throughout the summer, why not have 3, 15-week academic sessions throughout the year? I have additional ideas and logistics.

Lord – financial aid rules might prohibit a move to this because no financial aid is provided during summer term. A few institutions have tried this.

Scher – I don't have the background knowledge to solve those issues, but it seems like a possible way to increase enrollment, as well as enhance faculty salary potential during the summer, but not necessarily increase cost of benefits. All of the issues would have to be resolved.

Lord – some collective bargaining issues would also be involved

Stowell – I attended a school that has changed to a tri-semester schedule to accommodate exploding numbers of enrolling students, but they forced students to attend 2 semesters. That's how they got more students through the system.

Dao – to Scher – make a proposal and bring it to the senate

Sterling – back to Scher to review draft of amended Article 13

Scher – reviews rough draft of amended Article 13 – receives feedback from senators. Asks editing questions to the Senate. Reminds senators that no edits made to section 3.

Conwell – please read it through in its entirety again.

Scher – re-reads entire draft of amended Article 13 – asks for more feedback/opinion

Allison – when using the phrase 'faculty at-large', does this include Unit A and Unit B?

Scher – that will depend on voting of other proposed Article amendments

Ludlow – those 'eligible' to vote

Scher – we should make the edits now because of the possible change of the electorate



Ludlow – but should they be included as electorate even if they end up not being able to serve on Faculty Senate?

Sterling – currently the constitution only recognizes Unit A. So if the upcoming vote does not support Unit B's participation in Faculty Senate, they won't be included in the electorate  
Ludlow – yes, but is that what we want in the future? - seems like we need to proactively make the amendments now

Scher – if we don't change the electorate, and an issue arises that impacts both Unit A and Unit B faculty, Unit B could be at an obvious disadvantage. And Unit B may become a significant portion of the faculty in the long-term future.

Sterling – what is the sentiment of the senate? Should we vote on this language now or in the Fall?

Conwell – vote on it now, and it can be amended in the Fall if necessary. We need to finalize changes to the Constitution now, and then move on to the bylaw changes.

Scher – yes, and changes to bylaws is easier than changes to the constitution

Sterling – why don't we vote on this proposal as a change to the constitution, and we can consider possible bylaw changes in the future, which might include a statement of intent to conduct general informational surveys each year in the future

Conwell – and edits will only be needed if one of the amendments fail

Scher – reviews language of amended Article 13 one more time before vote

Conwell – motion – accept phrasing of amended Article 13. Ashley – I 2nd the motion

Oliver – roll call vote – yes = 11, no = 0

Sterling – let's make this the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment to be voted on

b. Other - no

B. Other Old Business:

VI. New Business

A. Future Agenda: Spring 2015 Meeting Dates:

April 7 (Faculty Dev? Shortened Senate meeting (2-3 pm): Faculty Senate forum – discuss amendments)

April 21 (Election of Officers, CAA follow-up?)

B. Other New Business – none

VII. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 3:48 pm.