

9-29-2015

September 29, 2015

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "September 29, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1085.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1085

This Article 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
September 29th, 2015, 2:00 – 3:15 pm
Booth Library Conference Room

Please note: these minutes do not comprise an exact transcript of the meeting.

I. Attendance and Welcome

PRESENT: Teshome Abebe, Stefan Eckert, Nichole Hugo, Jeannie Ludlow, James Ochwa-Echel, Tony Oliver, Jemmie Robertson, Amy Rosenstein, Grant Sterling, Jeff Stowell, Jason Waller, CC Wharram, Bailey Young, Jody Abell (student member), Stephen Simpson (student member)

GUESTS: Suzann Bennett, Jon Blitz, James Conwell, Pete Grant, John Henderson, Mahyar Izadi, Renee King, Blair Lord

II. Approval of Minutes from September 15th, 2015

Abebe moved/Stowell seconded; vote: 12 yes/0 no/1 abstain; motion passed.

III. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee:

a. Update on CIUS Meeting, 9/19/15

Robertson attended part of the day; other universities' Faculty Senators presented on their institutions' academic/economic decisions:

Illinois State reports no salary increases for this year

Western reports \$22.5-23 million in Reserves. A likely scenario: they will pay all Unit B people through the year and make cuts next year. They are also thinking about other scenarios for possible 15% and 30% reductions in appropriated funds. WIU enrollment is down.

NEIU reports that enrollment is flat and retention is challenging. They are not automatically hiring replacement faculty. NEIU also reports \$50 million in Reserves; these are rumored to be capital reserves.

SIU-E reports all-time record student enrollment; up 3% this year and up 8% from two years ago.

Q: Rosenstein—at EIU, do we have assurance that faculty will be paid in the spring if there is no budget from the state?
Robertson—not to our knowledge.

Provost Lord—we will honor our collective bargaining agreements. But we are a state-supported institution, which may be at odds with our collectively-bargained contracts.

Rosenstein—RE: CMS and our contracted benefits, do we have any plan or understanding regarding how our coverage will continue?

Robertson—references Illinois State email about CMS and the status of health insurance: at ISU, the email said that when the funds run out at CMS, our health insurance will continue but on a reimbursement-only basis (similar to the way our dental insurance works now).

Provost Lord—we have had no communications about this. The state's outflow is already greater than the income.

Rosenstein—what are we talking about here? October? Some people have ongoing medical needs and need to be able to plan accordingly.

Provost Lord—I refer you to the benefits office.

Rosenstein—it's important to make people aware that this is a possibility, and it is not just an EIU crisis.

Ochwa-Echel—we got an email from the Union about this.

Rosenstein—some people benefit from the Union but aren't members and may not be paying attention to those communications.

Robertson—SIUE student enrollment is at all-time high. They seem to have optimized their search engine (*laughter*).

b. Update on Address to the EIU Board of Trustees

Robertson—sent Senators comments to Board of Trustees; hope you've read the comments. Explains a *JG-TC* misquote mistaking "resend" for "rescind"; Robertson followed up with reporter and sent text of comments. If anyone has any questions about his comments, please ask him.

Q: Young—they were excellent; did you get any response at all?

Robertson—no questions or comments from the Board. I did make some comparisons regarding athletics and budget concerns, and my talk happened to follow directly after a report from athletics. Positive moment yesterday—the President’s moving oversight of athletics into his division.

2. Nominations Committee

Rosenstein—we have a number of committees that the nominations committee works with. Some requests are not getting to the right place. We need to work with Elections Committee and Committee on Committees to ensure these positions are filled. If there is a University board that needs a representative, the nominations committee will identify someone to fill that vacancy. We need committee heads to contact us if there are vacancies. We welcome those requests. There are a few positions we are looking for people for.

3. Elections Committee

Stowell—we have three vacancies: Academic Program Elimination Committee needs one representative from LCBAS; and the Sanctions and Terminations Hearing Committee needs one representative from CAH and one from LCBAS. Stowell will contact ITS to schedule a special election.

Robertson—timeline?

Stowell—the sooner the better.

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee

no report

5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

no report

6. Awards Committee

Hugo—no meeting yet. Form is now a fillable form for online submissions. Hope to have nominations ready for review in Oct.

7. Faculty Forum Committee

no report

8. Budget Transparency Committee

Sterling—no report; meeting very soon. We want to give clarity to the university about the status of the University reserves. I would like to be able to present to the Senate a report that explains how much is in the reserves and how and where those moneys are allocated.

9. Constitution and By-Laws Review Committee

Sterling—we have started looking at By-Laws. Most of the Constitutional amendments were approved by the President. We’ll be putting the newly revised Constitution on the website.

10. Committee on Committees

Eckert—meeting next week; plenty of committees have never replied to requests for information. Perhaps we need to designate these committees as not responsive.

Robertson—or, perhaps, inactive.

IV. Communications

a. Faculty Senate Chair Address to the EIU Board of Trustees, September 18th, 2015

(see III.1.b, above)

b. COIA Letter, COIA Draft Resolution, Proposal for Ad-Hoc Committee on Athletics

Robertson: No changes have been made to this draft resolution; how would we like to proceed? This is boilerplate language.

Waller—I’m comfortable voting on this

Robertson—making a motion?

Ochwa-Echel—does the move of oversight of athletics from Student Affairs to the President's office have any affect on this?

Sterling moved/Eckert seconded; vote: 13 yes/0 no/0 abstain; motion passed.

b.i. Ad Hoc Committee on extracurricular athletic issues and IAB report

Robertson—conversation about overspending has negative affect on student athletes. I want to have a dialog about how to help them have a more positive student athletic experience. Perhaps we can proceed by maintaining positive dialog?

Stowell—there are other concerns for our students besides just the budget; I think it's a good idea to have this committee

Rosenstein—agree; it benefits our students for us to know where the money is going and what kinds of services are reaching our students. Also, what services are beneficial to our students? We need to know what obstacles our students are facing and how we help them. Student athletes need to know their rights about what services are available to them. References a U of I situation a few years ago when a student athlete went on social media saying he didn't know what services were available to help him. "My recommendation is to have a student athlete on the committee."

(AT THIS POINT, Rosenstein left the meeting.)

Robertson—other discussion?

Oliver—IAB has subcommittees for budgetary control and student athlete health and wellness. Would Faculty Senate's committee be duplicating the work of these committees? This committee could collaborate with these, but we are already overextended in service. Perhaps we could act more collaboratively?

Young—is it time to invite IAB to Faculty Senate?

Oliver—we have in the past. This ad hoc committee's charge is their charge. It could give the impression that we aren't satisfied with their work, so we are going to override their work.

Stowell—I'm not seeing the ad hoc committee as duplicating so much as constructing questions we can ask of the IAB committees.

Eckert—agrees; I've read the IAB report, and I have questions. When the IAB representative came to Faculty Senate last year, there was an unwillingness to address questions. It was more of a show-and-tell than an exchange. I was concerned to learn that student athletes don't feel they have a real say in their athletic experiences. Students evaluate courses every semester, but athletes are not asked for feedback on a regular and ongoing basis. One possible improvement could be anonymous evaluations the student athletes fill out regularly.

Oliver—perhaps Davis (IAB rep) felt on the hot seat, not treated as a colleague.

Robertson—I appreciate the different perspectives. We don't want to create another layer of bureaucracy, but perhaps an ad hoc committee could ask good questions and inspire IAB's work and then disband.

Oliver—student athlete morale may be low because of faculty.

Robertson—perhaps we should add language to the committee description: "foster positive perceptions of student athletes among faculty"? My experience with student athletes has been positive.

Young—mine, too. (General agreement around the table)

Wharram—the IAB report says that students appreciate EIU's academics; I didn't see anything in the IAB report about the classroom. The dissatisfaction coming through there was with athletics, not academics.

Robertson—"foster positive interactions between student athletes and faculty"?

Wharram—"foster faculty awareness of student athletes' experiences"?

Ochwa-Echel—I think we already do a lot to maintain awareness among the faculty. We don't want to open the door for faculty concern by suggesting that a problem exists that isn't there.

Robertson—do we have a motion for the creation of this ad hoc committee?

Sterling moved/Young seconded; vote: 10 yes/2 no/0 abstain; motion passed.

Abebe—we need to be careful as we communicate about this committee, sensitive to the larger audience for our comments. We want to be helpful.

Young—this is meant to be helpful and positive

vote: SEE SHEET

c. Email from Andrew McNitt concerning Commitment to Excellence Scholarships

Robertson: Prof. McNitt will speak with us next week

c.i. Email from Pete Sterling regarding Concept for Converting CATS to REAL

Pete Grant (CATS multimedia services)—draft you have in front of you:

conceptualizes the research education and applied learning center
what will happen to CATS multimedia team when I am gone

Stowell—are there other schools you know of implementing similar programs with success?

Grant—see p. 9 in report; Hawaii; MSU Denver; others. This idea comes from myself and two other faculty. We are just one part of a group of units on campus that have been offering applied learning opportunities to our students.

Robertson—refresh our institutional memory: CATS was originally championed by Faculty Senate?

Grant—I believe so. I think Jim Tidwell was a primary voice.

Provost Lord—CATS predates me, too. There had been one computing center providing all computer needs on campus. Faculty felt the need for a unit in Academic Affairs that would specifically help faculty integrate technology in the classroom. There was a committee that worked to develop what is now CATS, drawing from assets from across campus (ITS, Library, etc.).

Oliver—Mr. Henderson, what are your initial thoughts on the proposal?

Henderson—we are digesting it.

Provost Lord—obviously we are looking at every unit on campus re: budget and savings. As we move forward, we need to have conversations about how to provide services across campus. All ideas are good and welcome ideas. Pete's document will be one of those ideas that we will consider.

Robertson—are there students we could interact with re: their experiences with the center?

Grant—yes. I'm also reaching out to alums, who speak positively of their Media Center experiences.

Robertson—Scott Wilkinson (Music/Business), recent alumnus, speaks highly of his experiences.

Stowell—what kind of new academic programs might fit well with your proposal?

Grant—I'm not sure I could answer that. My colleagues who are faculty could probably answer that better.

Stowell—If a student wanted to have a job like yours, what major would that student take?

Grant—good question. We do different things. It would depend on the student's individual focus.

King—do you work with students from technology?

Grant—yes.

Robertson—we don't have a music recording degree program here. We have the facilities for such a program, but not the degree plan. Using an incubator like this might open a path to this kind of program.

Grant—our students are particularly interested in media. We need to develop more specific multimedia programs (videography or graphic arts), esp. at graduate level.

Robertson—thank you.

c.ii. Email and Documents from Renee King regarding Faculty Support Positions

King—I am gravely concerned about the elimination of faculty support positions across campus. I'd like to see Faculty Senate engaging with our leaders to maintain/bring back the faculty support positions that we need to do our jobs well and support our students. it might mean reorganizing, rethinking. I am gravely concerned about a year or two from now, when Pete Grant is gone, when Lisa Dallas is gone. We're already feeling the loss of Kim Ervin's position. Instead of moving forward, we are moving backward. Faculty Support positions have been targeted. I do not want to be the only one on campus raising the alert about this. I'd like Faculty Senate to step up on this. I'm concerned about what will happen to our students. As a faculty member, I can make adjustments to use less technology. I've worked with Lisa to make sure online materials are set for my students for the near future. But I think we will have to go back to the chalkboard. I don't have all the answers. I have put in concerns in the report. Henderson knows I've worked closely with CATS. I am trying to elicit some support.

Ochwa-Echel—is this about what Grant has already presented?

King—absolutely, and more. Academic support positions, instructional support positions, these folks work with faculty to make sure we can offer the best classes possible. We (LCBAS) are the only division on campus that will no longer have instructional support. It's pretty difficult to get some faculty to use email. We need support because there are some faculty members who do not even email. We are moving toward technology and are in a technological world. If we don't have tech support, students are going to go elsewhere.

Ochwa-Echel—Q for the provost: it seems the suggestion made here is that associate administration positions be looked at to help fund these needs.

Provost Lord—all positions have been looked at. Some are already gone. Associate deans are almost all faculty members. Everything is being looked at. I stand with King in wanting this support for faculty. Henderson also

wants this support. In Academic Affairs, I don't have a position for which I don't have multiple letters asking for that position to continue. At the same time, I'm being told I have to have a smaller budget.

Oliver—in a time when enrollments are lower, what will be the impact of these cuts on online delivery? Have these individuals been instrumental in developing online education?

King—yes. There are programs that are going online. And if we don't have the support for that move to online, it will be up to the faculty member to say, "I'm not going to be able to do that, to teach that." If faculty don't have the support and can't teach online courses, we may have to hire adjuncts to teach MA-level courses.

Robertson—thank you for your comments.

V. Provost's report

Provost Lord—regarding President Glassman's state of the university address: as someone who is charged with executing his vision, there was nothing unexpected. We are trying to accommodate the charges re: budget in Academic Affairs. We are looking at low-hanging fruit. He wants to see dozens in the programs, not ones and twos and threes. He laid out quite an agenda for himself and his VPs. We're working on it.

For any of these concerns, we're not talking about going from what we had to absolutely nothing.

Oliver—so we are thinking in terms of reduction, not elimination? Did any of these reductions have a trickle-down effect, giving Academic Affairs any kind of relief?

Provost Lord—it will be a while before we can see any long-term benefits of these changes. We'll need to see how all the changes influence one another.

Abebe—the President talked yesterday about ratios and cost-centers. In an institution like this that relies on state funding, we don't choose our student demographics and we don't get to choose how much we charge. How do you feel, as Provost, about thinking in terms of "cost centers"?

Provost Lord—everything can be called a cost center. I don't really think about it in those ways. I think about budget commitments and revenue expectations.

Abebe—people are feeling targeted. I don't believe that's the way it happened. The institution needed to come up with a certain amount of savings, and decisions were made. If we are forced to come up with more savings, it might be good to think about institutional reorganization, with an eye toward economies of scale.

Provost Lord—contract issues and state regulations must be part of the process. Everything has to be on the table for evaluation. Reorganization is not a simple process. We will need to spend time and energy on it. The state will dictate our next steps.

VI. Adjournment, 3:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeannie Ludlow, Acting Recorder