

8-25-2015

August 25, 2015

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "August 25, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1088.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1088

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 Session Minutes
August 25th, 2015; 2:00 – 2:45 pm
Booth Library Conference Room

Meeting was called to order at 2:03 pm

I. Attendance and Welcome

PRESENT: Bruns, Eckert, Hugo, Ludlow, Oliver, Robertson (Chair), Rosenstein, Scher, Simpson (UGS representative), Sterling, Stowell, Waller, Wharram, Young

ABSENT: Quesada

GUESTS: Blair Lord; Harold Ornes; Cassie Buchman; James Conwell; David K. Smith

Chair Robertson thanked former chair Sterling for his service to Faculty Senate and to UPI this summer.

INTRODUCTIONS

II. Approval of Minutes from April 21st, 2015 and July 28th, 2015

A. Minutes of 4/21/15

Move to approve: Eckert / second: Bruns; vote by show of hand: yes 8/no 0/abstain 6

Motion passed

B. Minutes of 7/28/15

Move to approve: Sterling / second: Oliver; vote by show of hand: yes 7/no 0/abstain 7

Motion passed.

Chair Robertson indicated that, due to time constraints, we would be moving through the agenda out of order.

III. Other old business

1. Update on HR 275: Presidential Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics

Robertson: At our spring meeting, 04/21/15, Sterling brought this to our attention. I wanted to propose a motion but didn't feel I had enough information at that time. I did research on the Congressional website and found the actual bill. This handout is a copy of the front and back of the first page of the bill. One particular passage is important to our discussion; Section 1(2) (p. 2, lines 5-8): It is the sense of Congress that "recent events pose grave threats to the financial stability of athletic programs at institutions of higher education and create pressure on institutions of higher education to consider eliminating non-revenue Olympic sports or" and this is what I thought was really relevant to us "increasing general fund, student fee, and donor subsidies to athletics at a time when such resources are needed for priority academic programs." I thought that pretty much hit the nail on the head with some of the fiscal issues we are experiencing here. And what I wanted to do was have a brief dialog about your feelings about this—if there were ideas about how we could approach this. This is a bipartisan commission; it was originally proposed by a democratic congressman, Rush, from here in Illinois. It has bipartisan support. It was sent to Committee on January 12th. I wonder if this bill will have a significant amount of lobbying force against it and might die in committee. That's my concern; without people being vocal in support of it, it might never get out of committee. My personal opinion is that I'd like to support it and I'd like your advice as to how to proceed.

Bruns: Are there any other faculty bodies at any other institutions that have come out in support of this?

Robertson: I don't know. I do recall we had a communication in Spring, maybe for the April 21 meeting, a memo from the Council on Intercollegiate Athletics, which is a council of representatives from any number of higher ed institutions around the country that address matters of athletics. That's what I know.

Sterling: That's my memory as well. What I put on the agenda at that time was something that had been directed to us. We had been contacted directly about this.

Eckert: I have a copy of HR 275 (from that Spring meeting); we received the bill at that meeting.

PROCEDURAL ASIDE:

Robertson: We had a request to allow the *DEN* reporter to record the meeting for the *Daily Eastern News*.

Buchman: I just want to be sure that what I write is accurate. I have a recorder. I'll just use the recording to make sure that I get everything right.

Robertson: Do we need an official motion on that? Does anyone have any reservations about that? My only reservation is that someone might be hesitant to be very direct about something just because they are being recorded on tape by someone technically outside the body of the Senate.

Ludlow: It's going in the Minutes.

Robertson: Yes, it's still going in the minutes.

General agreement around the table that people don't have a problem with this.

Robertson: Should we call for a vote or just say that this is OK?

Nodding around the table.

Robertson: I would say as a policy that it's fine for today but maybe ask in the future. I think it is important for us to know that we are being recorded. So thank you for asking today, and be sure to ask in the future.

Buchman: OK.

Oliver: I just have a question: can we ask the reporter to keep the recording for reference in case there are any questions? So we can see that our conversation is being accurately reported? I just want to be confident that what I am saying, if it shows up in the paper, is being accurately reported. So you could keep it for accuracy's sake, OK?

Buchman: OK. I just want to be sure that what I write is accurate.

Bruns: OK, now I have a question about that. If we're going to do something like that, we should be checking ourselves to see if the reporting is accurate.

Oliver: Yes, sure.

Bruns: Then why should she have to do that?

Oliver: I don't know, maybe I'm just stirring the pot. I want just to be sure the reporting is accurate. I just want to make sure that if something shows up here (in the paper), it is accurate.

Bruns: For Cassie to record this so she can refer back to it, so she can be accurate is one thing. For us to be relying on the *DEN* reporter to say, "Oh, we want to check the recording for such-and-such a date because we're not sure," that's putting an onus on them that I don't think is fair. I think that is our responsibility.

Robertson: Perhaps we could resolve any differences with the minutes that are taken.

Oliver: I just wanted to be sure, if I am quoted in the paper, its accurate.

Bruns: Yes, that's a very valid point. I just don't think she should have to do that.

Sterling: She might just record the meeting and then, whatever the paper says, record over it for the next meeting.

Bruns: I know what'll happen to me is I'll look at the paper and say, "I never said that," and then I'll listen to the recording and I'll say, "well, yes I did." (*laughter*)

Robertson: Back to the resolution . . .

Rosenstein: While the bill identifies issues we are concerned about, issues that are problematic for institutions and individual athletes, I'm always curious about Commissions in general—where they will come from, who will be part of the commission, who would be assigned to the commission, what the function of that commission would be. They might make recommendations for resolutions, but will they have any authority, and would those recommendations involve any sanctions of any kind. Would there be limits placed on that. So this kind of opens, as any document does, creating a commission, is fraught with who decides within a commission, who is on it. So that's my only concern. I would support this, but I think it would be wise if our House of Representatives either defined the assignments or delegation to this Commission. Who they are, what their responsibilities are, and whether they are paid for

their services out of taxpayers' money. But in the end, I think institutions should be more aware and ethical. This is another layer of oversight, but at a higher level.

Robertson: Those are all valid points. What really grabbed my attention was the commonality concerning the budget aspect that we are experiencing. Something I've heard repeatedly from faculty colleagues is the concern about overspending on athletics and ethics in athletics. We might be more effective in addressing, in the broader sense in the academic community, our support for the bill.

Sterling: The institutions themselves have done a horrible job of monitoring these things. The only organization that oversees them, the NCAA, doesn't have a mandate to preserve the academic integrity of the institution.

Scher: They have no motivation.

Sterling: Right. They periodically pay lip service to the idea that student athletes need an education, but they're not set up to do anything like this. That's not their main concern. We would have to have some sort of Commission independent of the NCAA and of athletic directs and athletic programs and so on. I'd like to see the institutions themselves have this commitment on their own, but they don't.

Wharram: I'm just looking at HR 275 itself and the membership of the Commission includes (reads from the bill; see Section 4 at <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/114/hr275/text>). So these are people who would be paid as part of their job. I just thought I'd throw that in.

Scher: I'm also reading from the text. The Commission members will serve without pay. They might get compensation for travel but no compensation for service on the commission.

Robertson: I appreciate we have different viewpoints on some of those items. Could we move toward consensus of somewhere we'd like to go, perhaps drafting a resolution in support of this? Or responding to the body that contacted us in the Spring?

Eckert: So basically, they sent a resolution to us. COIA sent a request for Senate to vote on a resolution. I would be in favor of signing on to the resolution. From the spring meeting, the communication was "COIA request for Senate vote" and it's very concise. It's about one page.

Robertson: Perhaps I could add that (Spring request) to communications for next week's meeting, and we could follow up on that next week. So we could all share that same call for next week. So is that OK if we shelve it 'til then?

Rosenstein: It would also be good if we ask our own athletic program to respond to each of these items, with their policies and procedures. I'm curious. We know we have to report our students' academic progress each semester. But I don't know what happens to an athlete who is injured; if they are forced to give up their sport because of an injury, are they forced to leave campus because of financial aid? I don't know those things. I wonder where as an institution we stand on these points. Even if we write a resolution to support this commission, what are we doing here on our campus because that's really where it matters?

Robertson: I agree we need to have a dialog on our campus. The IAB report does have a fair amount of detail, and some of our questions might be answered there.

Scher: It appears that Northwestern University Faculty Senate passed a resolution on June 3rd supporting HR 275. It's not 100% clear to me, but they are calling it the COIA resolution

IV. Robertson: Let's move forward to Communication H regarding Senator Dao, who resigned over the summer. It's important that we find another faculty colleague who can join us. I also want to update you; we have another new member who might not be able to serve. We are communicating with him about whether he'll be able. So we definitely have one opening, and we may have two. So what I want to ask is the process for filling this vacancy. We go back to the election during which Senator Dao was elected and find the next person in line at that point. If there's no one in line from that election, then we move forward to the next election.

Ludlow: Correct. There is no one from the election during which Dao was elected who had a minimum of 10 votes and is either not serving or has not retired. I looked at the By-Laws today. It seems that

we should make a list of alternates that are ranked according to the number of votes they got rather than according to the semester during which they were elected—is that correct?

Sterling: We haven't changed anything in the By-Laws, just the Constitution. There is nothing in the Constitution about membership. From the By-Laws: "The first alternate from the election in which candidates vacating the positions were elected shall continue to serve as long as a vacancy exists. Further vacancies shall be similarly filled."

Robertson: Would you all interpret that to mean that, if we can't find an alternate from that election, we go to the next election for an alternate?

Sterling: F says, "In the event that a vacancy without alternate exists in any major committee, the Senate shall appoint a member of the faculty to fill that vacancy, and this appointee shall be eligible to serve until a newly elected member's term shall begin." So I think what we're supposed to do is appoint somebody to take over until the Fall election and elect somebody in the Fall.

Robertson: Communication K regarding the vacancy on CAA—would we make an appointment in a similar fashion?

Sterling: I think so. That's the way I read it.

Robertson: We need to appoint at least one Senator, maybe two, and one member to CAA.

Ludlow: For Faculty Senate, I did put together a list of alternates from the elections where Dao was elected forward. The next person on the list is James Ochwa-Echel, who resigned from Senate last Spring. The next person after that would be Jean Okrasinski, from the earliest election following Dao's election where there are people with enough votes to be alternates.

Robertson: Thoughts on how to proceed? I am willing to approach James Ochwa-Echel and ask if he is willing to serve.

Ludlow: I don't know. Is there a reason not to ask someone who had been on Senate and then resigned? I couldn't see one in the By-Laws.

Sterling: Was he a replacement?

Ludlow: He was elected in a regular, Spring election.

Robertson: Would anyone like to make a motion that we approach him about serving until the Fall special election?

Move to invite James Ochwa-Echel to serve: Oliver / second: Eckert; vote: yes 14/no 0/abstain 0
Motion passed.

Robertson: In the matter of CAA—should we ask Jean Okrasinski.

Ludlow: That was for Senate. I don't have the CAA alternate list put together. I will get that to you as soon as I can.

Robertson: So we will take that up next week.

V. Robertson: If you don't mind if I take one more thing out of order: if we could go down to item V New Business, in terms of fall meeting dates. I appreciate your being willing to meet today; it's not our usual meeting date. I told CAA we'd try to hold our meetings on the first and third Tuesdays, and this is neither. I felt we should meet before the Forum this afternoon. What I wanted to ask about was about Sept. 29, which is technically a fifth Tuesday. Unless perhaps some urgent business presents itself next month that requires our attention. I would support not meeting on the 29th. I appreciate all your service and don't want to meet just for the sake of meeting. Would there be any objections to not meeting on Sept. 29?

General head-shaking around the table.

Robertson: The other slight wrinkle is that this room (Booth library 4440) is needed at 4 pm on the 29th. If we were to meet on that date, we would need to adjourn by 3:30. We could work that out, but I wanted to let you know.

Bruns: I don't have an objection. But with what's going on with our—well, we don't know what's going on yet with the budget—it might be a good idea if we keep that meeting open until, perhaps, the 15th. If we decide on the 15th, we could cancel the meeting on the 29th then.

Robertson: OK, these are our dates.

VI. Robertson: two last, quick things. Under communications, I am going to create item M, which would be manner of distribution of communications to the faculty. I certainly want people to be able to access them, to be transparent for all the faculty. But I thought it might be better received by all faculty if there is a drive link they can open to find all the communications. So rather than opening and email and seeing fifteen attachments, they can open the drive link. It might be a more streamlined way to do it. The one we sent out this week was a Google Drive link. Another way to do it is to place a folder on Senate page with attachments for the upcoming meeting, and we could link to that page in the email.

Sterling: Yes, I've done that.

Robertson: OK. Do we see a preference for how we want to handle that?

Rosenstein: I think the Senate page would lead to improved access because it's all in one place. My only concern is whether any of the communications that go to the Senate are not for the public, not for everybody to see? Does anyone ever say, "Please share my concerns with the Senate, but I don't want everybody to see what I've said?" If that's a possibility, we need to warn people about that.

Robertson: Very good point.

Rosenstein: That's true about any of these drives.

Sterling: As Chair, if I received something, I shared it with the public as part of Senate communications. A couple of times, it wasn't obvious to me whether the person was sharing it with just me or with the whole Senate. Then I would ask them, is this meant as a communication for the Senate? And yes, anything that is sent to the Chair that looks like a message to Faculty Senate, then it is public.

Scher: If it's communication with the Senate, it may or may not be under the public meetings act. But anything for the Senate is out in the open. It's here for anybody who walks into this meeting.

Hugo: I think transparency is really important right now.

Sterling: And of course, at that level, it doesn't matter whether you put them on the website or send them through email as communications.

Ludlow: I did ask for feedback. Of those who responded, only one person said they prefer attachments over the drive.

Robertson: Yes. I had a faculty colleague say, "Oh, I get those emails for Faculty Senate with all those attachments and delete." So I'd just like to prevent that, if we can. And maybe people who are inclined to not participate because of a cluttered inbox wouldn't participate anyway. But I'd hate to push people away by cluttering up their inboxes. Thanks for input.

VII. Robertson: Regarding item L on Communications. I was contacted by Andy McNitt from Political Science about the Commitment to Excellence Scholarships, the fund drive that they started. It went live in April. Andy asked if we could use our FacSen general send-all list to send out another call for this annual fund drive. I responded that I would bring it up to you all for discussion. My personal opinion was that it might not be the most opportune time to ask the faculty to donate. I don't want to stand in the way of raising money for scholarships. My feeling is that it is a timing issue, with the recent memorandum of agreement and the fact that this call for donations would go into the inboxes of people who, while their contracts have been extended through the Fall, their positions will end. So I had concerns about the timing. But I feel like this is an important initiative. I was concerned about using the FacSen list at this time. I'd like your thoughts. I don't want to be obstructionist.

Rosenstein: Wouldn't the Foundation office have an email list of everyone that they could send it to? This is a Foundation issue.

Scher: Yes. The Foundation Office and University Advancement should do this, or the Administration has an all-faculty send list. I think our list should be reserved for Faculty Senate business.

Robertson: Any other opinions about this?

Young: Well, I'm on that committee with Andy. I understand your concern about timing. On the other hand, the Faculty Senate doesn't have to endorse or urge people to give money, just send the message.

Rosenstein: I guess my concern is that there is another body whose function is to send messages like this. Serving on the nominations committee last semester, I felt like I was sending emails all the time,

and at some point there's a saturation point and people stop reading. I want us to focus on what we are doing as a body. Not sending messages from other groups that aren't really specific to our goals.

Robertson: Can we revisit this next week because we are out of time?

VIII. One final item: it is very important that we get our committees up and running as quickly as possible. I would be very happy to refresh people's memories regarding our committees and who served on what last year. What we'd like is volunteers. Please volunteer via email to Jeannie Ludlow, Jeff Stowell, or me. Let us know in the next week if there is a committee you would be interested in serving on. It would be great if we could get them up and running in the next week or so.

Scher: Yes, if you could send out a list, please.

Robertson: Sure. I'll be happy to do that.

Wharram: How many people per committee?

Robertson: Usually two to three.

Robertson: I'll send out the list of Senate Committees from last year and an explanation of what each committee does. Next week, Provost Lord will speak with us and UPI President Jon Blitz, and on the 15th, President Glassman will come. I had a conversation with him last week. It was a very honest and open conversation. I will report on that next week.

Robertson: Would anyone like to make a motion to adjourn, so we can get to the Faculty Forum?

Motion to adjourn: Rosenstein/second: Sterling

Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 2:48 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted,
Jeannie Ludlow, Acting Recorder