

Eastern Illinois University

## The Keep

---

Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

10-20-2015

### October 20, 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, "October 20, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1083.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1083](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1083)

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 of the meeting of October 20th  
Booth Library Conference Room

I. Attendance and Welcome

Members present: Teshome Abebe, Todd Bruns, Stefan Eckert, Nichole Hugo, Jeannie Ludlow, James Ochwa-Echel, Jemmie Robertson, Amy Rosenstein, Steven Scher, Grant Sterling, Jeff Stowell, Jason Waller, CC Wharram, Bailey Young

Guests present: Jon Blitz, Cassie Buchman, James Conwell, Dean Glenn Hild, Provost Blair Lord

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

II. Approval of Minutes from October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Abebe moved to approve; Sterling seconded. Motion passed. Vote: 12 yes/0 no/2 abstain

III. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee

no report

2. Nominations Committee

Rosenstein: committee needs to meet; we have a couple of vacancies for which we need to figure out what to do.

Robertson: Registrar's Advisory group is one?

Rosenstein: I believe so. We may need to appoint someone.

3. Elections Committee

Stowell: Our Fall Special election will be Nov. 2-6; ITS is ready to go.

We just need candidates for the LCBAS position. I've reached out to the Dean and believe we will have candidates. Oct. 26 at 4 pm is the deadline for petitions for candidates.

Conwell: Why is the voting not open for a full week? not Mon.-Sun.? I thought at the last meeting you said a full week.

Robertson: That may be my fault; this is a work week. We are expanding the voting period from two days.

Conwell: This is such an important vote that we want to be sure to give everyone the opportunity to vote. Is it perhaps that ITS can not shut the voting down over the weekend?

Waller: More days will probably lead to more participation.

Bruns: I tend to think the opposite. Too much time can lead to procrastination and then people miss the vote.

Stowell: Starting earlier than Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup> is going to make it tough on ITS. We have to set everything up and do a run-through before the voting.

Sterling: Especially if the petition deadline is Oct. 26.

Robertson: It seems, then, if we are going to add more days, it should be on the end of the period. How about we take a vote to extend the voting period until Mon., 11/9, at 5 pm.

Waller: We'll want to be sure to send reminders.

Robertson: Do we need a motion?

Sterling: We need a motion to change the voting period. We do not need to vote to keep it the same.

Motion to change the voting period to be Mon. 11/2 at 9 am to Mon. 11/9 at 5 pm.

Bruns moved; Waller seconded. Motion passed. Vote: 9 yes/2 no/3 abstain

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee

no report

5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

Ochwa-Echel: There was a discussion of the process of choosing the new logo. People felt there was not enough involvement from all stakeholders. A 3-person committee reviewed the reasons we needed a new logo and went ahead to approve it. A lot of questions were raised regarding transparency and whether this is a reflection of the approach of the new President. People wonder whether University stakeholders will have reduced input under the new President. Also, there were concerns about the use of an outside firm when we have the ability to make a logo internally; the outside firm will get a percentage of the royalties for the new logo. Staff Senate felt that these questions needed to be addressed.

Stowell: Did anyone have information on how long this decision had been in the pipeline?

Ochwa-Echel: No, that was not announced. They were raising questions about the process. And, in light of the layoffs, why would an outside firm be contracted instead of producing the logo internally?

Stowell: I assume the new logo will mean new uniforms, etc.

Waller: Do we know whom should we contact about this, if we want to share concerns?

Ochwa-Echel: They mentioned the Vice President for Marketing.

Scher: The impression I got from the *DEN* was that it seemed to come from athletics. Provost Lord?

Lord: I have no idea.

Sterling: Bob Martin is the one who announced it and presumably is the person we should ask, if we want information.

Rosenstein: This was a missed opportunity. At a time when morale on campus is low, shouldn't our athletics be about team spirit, school spirit? We had an opportunity to band together and have a logo that represents who we are and that makes sense for us as a university. At a time when our athletics program is not always being thought of in a very positive way, they could have made this a shared experience. They did not do that. It looks just like the Carolina Panthers—stop stealing.

Bruns: I was completely surprised by the change.

Sterling: We have talented art students. We could have had a contest among our art students: design a new logo. The campus could have voted on which logo we liked better.

Rosenstein: Thinking politically, this would have been a great distraction from all the negativity.

Bruns: We should invite Bob Martin to come and talk with us.

Robertson: I will invite him.

#### 6. Awards Committee

Hugo: Nominations have been received. Now, we will meet as a committee to determine the winner.

Robertson: Did you receive many nominations?

Hugo: Enough to have a competition.

#### 7. Faculty Forum Committee

Bruns: We are planning a Faculty Forum on Shared Governance. It will be next Wed., 10/28, 1 pm, Effingham Room of Union. Topic is Shared Governance.

Robertson: Please send an all-faculty email announcement tomorrow.

Abebe: In the past, Faculty Senate has sponsored events that turned out to be more complaint sessions than productive and informative events. We need to organize this well, to think about expected outcomes of the event and how we share information. This is a university, and we all have responsibility regarding the kinds of statements we make. Has this been taken into account in the planning of this forum?

Bruns: Senator Ludlow shared with us some documents about Shared Governance: a 2011 report on Shared Governance produced by a Presidential Task Force on campus; and Rob Miller's "Review of Shared Governance" (found on the EIU website). We plan for these documents to provide some structure for the discussion.

Stowell: Could those documents be distributed with the announcement for the discussion?

Bruns: Yes.

Also, I would entertain suggestions for future Faculty Forums. Please send me emails with any suggestions for future topics for Faculty Forums.

#### 8. Budget Transparency Committee

Sterling: The email to Paul McCann has not been sent; it will be sent in the next week.

#### 9. Constitution and By-Laws Review Committee

Scher: No report at this time.

Robertson: We have had some conversation about the future direction of the Bylaws. Also, could we have a finalized copy of the Constitution?

Scher: I sent that once; I will send to Ludlow again, for uploading to the webpage.

#### 10. Committee on Committees

Eckert: The committee met; we cleared a lot of little dead ends. We sent a lot of emails and got some interesting replies. We are still waiting to hear from some committees, like the Student Publication Advisory Committee. David Viertel sent several emails, and I am following up on those.

By searching for committee memberships on the web, I found traces of other people seeking this information, in the past. Hopefully, in two more weeks, all will be clear.

Ludlow: At the beginning of the semester, I had an email conversation with Sally Renaud in Journalism about the Student Publication Advisory Committee. My understanding is that the committee is fully staffed and functioning.

Provost Lord: That is correct. That committee meets regularly.

Rosenstein: We did assign someone to that committee. There was some confusion as to the name—

Eckert:

#### 11. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

Rosenstein: We are working as a group; each of us has a task. We have a plan and will meet soon.

#### IV. Communications

##### a. Replacement of Eckert for Spring, 2015

Robertson: Next semester, Sen. Eckert will be teaching overseas; we need to replace him on an interim basis. Discussion of process follows.

Bruns: How about we send an email request for volunteers? If no one volunteers right away, we can also announce it at the forum next week.

##### b. Email from Registrar, Amy Lynch, Requesting Faculty Senate Appointment to Registration Advisory Committee Wharram volunteers; approved by acclamation.

##### c. Proposed Resolution concerning Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> Vote (title amended to reflect vote in item 3.III, above)

Sterling: I proposed this resolution, which you have. I think it would be problematic to put the Provost and the Faculty through this process and then, at the end of it, have no clear outcome.

Young: I second the resolution.

Resolution passed; vote: 13 yes/0 no/1 abstain

Stowell: How will this resolution be implemented?

Sterling: My hope is that having this statement in the record of the Senate, in our minutes, will make a statement. In addition, we should send a reminder email every work day of the vote, reminding people to vote and giving them the link. Individually, we should all do all we can, too, to encourage our colleagues to vote.

Scher: What percentage of the faculty would make the outcome meaningful?

Sterling: I think percentage of the faculty voting reflects our ability to be confident in the outcome. 30% is better than 20%; 40% is better than 30%. 60% would be ideal.

Scher: Have we ever had 60% of faculty to vote on anything?

Sterling: I don't remember the percentage on the no-confidence vote for President Rives. I'd like to see a better turnout than we've ever had on a Faculty Senate election.

Robertson: Some people have approached me, saying they don't feel they can make an informed decision, come to an informed opinion. People have asked how they could get more information on this vote. I didn't know what to tell them.

Waller: The *DEN* might be the appropriate forum for this.

Stowell: To date, that's been the only source of information, other than Faculty Senate minutes.

Bruns: I think that's why Sen. Eckert proposed the Faculty Forum in the first place. Of course, we have shifted its focus now.

Abebe: The Senate is not the originator of this petition; the originators of the petition should be responsible for educating the community about the issues.

Scher: But there should be opportunities to learn from the opposite side, too. Will the ballot have a "no opinion" button, a third option? Otherwise people who don't have an opinion will not vote.

Rosenstein: I am sorry I missed the 10/6/15 meeting, when this was raised. Can someone tell me, what is the intent behind this petition? Are there specific concerns about which people have no confidence? Is it "no confidence in governance"? "no confidence in communicating with faculty"? What was the intent of the vote? We need to think about the basic pieces of this kind of thing. There are particulars within a job description—so are we looking at "no confidence in some particular aspect of the job description"? It's a broad strike. At the end of every semester, faculty get student evaluations, and we can use those to help us see what we can improve. But sometimes you get that one student who just circles one or six on everything, and it doesn't matter what the questions are. So the question is, then, if we do a vote of no confidence, what is it going to say? Is it going to say, "I have no confidence in this person doing this job"?

Ludlow: Yes. That is what it is going to say.

Rosenstein: That's really what it will say? Because to me that is such a broad strike that it says nothing, except an opinion and a person's emotions on a given day. They are being asked to respond to the general climate of what's happening to them. I don't understand. What's it going to say when it shows up on the ballot?

Ludlow: We have no power in constructing the ballot. This did not come from Faculty Senate. It came from the makers of the petition. They bring a petition to us. We are required by our Constitution to make that petition into a referendum. We have no control over what it says. What was brought to us was "Yes, I have confidence" and "No, I have no confidence," and that's it. So that's what we put on the referendum. We didn't make this. Other people made it and we are required to put it out there to the faculty.

Young: So this is my question: are we constrained in the form, or can we say "no opinion" or "abstain"? Some people might want to have that leeway.

Eckert: Is it possible to vote and leave that question blank?

Ludlow: Yes, it is possible. Sometimes, people leave one question or one position un-voted-on. But here's the problem with that: in all colleges except Lumpkin, the no confidence vote will be the only thing on the ballot. A person would need to log in, not cast a vote, and log back out again. And I honestly don't know if that would get tabulated.

Sterling: I don't know if there would be substantial numbers of people taking the time to log in to vote that they have no opinion; there may be some, but not many. Most people would just not vote.

Rosenstein: So what is the outcome of this referendum? If you vote on a tax increase, you hope to see a new building at the school or something. What is the outcome of a no confidence vote? What is the point?

Ludlow: It goes to the President, and he is supposed to take that as a recommendation for future decision-making.

Scher: It is a communication to the President and he takes it under advisement. It is an expression of the will of the faculty.

Scher: Returning to Sen. Young's question about whether we can change some things: all the Constitution says <reading from Constitution>.

Ludlow: Which they did, last meeting. It's in the minutes.

Scher: That's all it says. There is no guidance in Constitution about what the referendum should say. We are just a channel for the referendum to be conducted. So can we add an option? I don't know. I think the actual referendum said yes or no.

Wharram: A third option would make sense.

Sterling: I wouldn't be comfortable with the Senate doing very much. The whole point is supposed to be that the petition process guarantees that you get your question out to the faculty. I would hesitate to have the Senate then say, "Oh, you really should have asked this question instead of that question."

Robertson: Unless we want to move to add a third option, I think we should present the referendum unchanged.

Wharram: I think it would makes sense to do so, but I don't think we can.

Ludlow: I don't think we should.

Robertson: The intended purpose was explained at the last session, so I think we should move forward.

#### d. CAA Minutes from 9/24/2015, 10/1/2015, 10/8/2015, 10/15/2015

Robertson: Any questions?

<none>

#### V. Provost's Report: Blair Lord

Lord: You had asked me to give an update on the Redden Fund process. I completed my review of the applications, which had been ranked by Chairs and Deans, on 9/10/15 and forwarded the applications to the Foundation, who processes them. My assistant is there today answering some questions the Foundation had. We should get results soon. It has usually taken about two weeks; this time it has been 6.

Robertson: I'm concerned because some of the projects might be nearing their dates.

Lord: Yes. That's why we are looking into this.

Scher: Do you know if there is any flexibility in the application process? Explanation of the problem: a course he'd like to apply for Redden Funds for, but the information comes out in January for a summer outcome. There is no way to apply for Redden Funds for the course because of the timing. Is there any flexibility?

Lord: The application process may be donor-driven. I'll look into it.

Lord: My 2<sup>nd</sup> item is the student registration process for Spring. Students are concerned. Please share with them: unequivocally, Eastern is open for Spring. The State is making things difficult for us, but we are open for business.

Wharram: I just had a conversation after class; students are under the impression that this budget problem is unique to EIU. Let your colleagues and students know that this is a state-wide problem, not just an EIU problem.

Lord: Shirmeen Ahmad, President of Student Government, sent out an email blast today, reassuring students that we will be open. The alumni board wants to be a voice in this, as well. Also, please let your students know that many people are advocating for us on the state level.

Scher: Getting the word out on this is important. I had a conversation about this today, too. A student was afraid she might need to transfer before graduating, next December.

Lord: Please share this widely with students. It's important that we share with them that we will continue to be here for them.

Rosenstein: I think it's time for a "Santa letter" campaign. Who's in?

Ludlow: I'll do it.

Lord issues a gentle reminder of our ethics law—be careful not to advocate politically in the classroom.

Sterling: We can advocate, just not for candidates or parties.

Lord: Questions?

Scher: I just received an email about Dean Ornes' retirement. Could you comment on that?

Lord: Was the email from Dean Ornes? <general agreement that the email had been forwarded from him through the chairs> Dean Ornes announced to the academic leadership team this morning that he would be retiring effective 10/31/15.

Scher: Since that was just this morning, you probably haven't given a lot of thought to what will happen next?

Lord: I've given it a lot of thought, yes. I don't have any answers yet.

Robertson: Given the referendum and the Forum next week, people might be interested in your views regarding Shared Governance. Would you be willing to share your perspective on Shared Governance with us?

Lord: I don't want to get in a point-by-point argument, here. I am a believer in Shared Governance. I show up here every meeting. I listen and consider what I've heard. The outcome may not always feel like Shared Governance for all involved, but I do believe in Shared Governance.

Stowell: Have you gotten any feedback on Open House?

Lord: Our numbers were down a bit. The number of applications is down about 200 from last year. Feedback is all very positive. One difference is that last year, we had about forty "on-site admissions" at High Schools. We are behind on that process from last year; those generated a lot of applications last year. If Faculty Senate is interested in hearing from Mr. Dearth about his operations, he would be very happy to talk with you. Admissions doesn't look like it used to; it's a very different operation this year, in terms of intentionality. For example, we are contacting high school juniors this year, in addition to seniors.

Scher volunteers to be the Faculty Senate representative on the Enrollment Management Committee again this year.

Motion to approve Scher's appointment: Rosenstein; seconded by Hugo. Motion passes, unanimously.

Bruns: Please invite Mr. Dearth to address Faculty Senate.

Robertson: I'll invite him for our next meeting, if possible, and then VP Martin for the meeting following that. Or should we invite them to the same meeting?

Scher: I think two separate meetings.

Wharram: I am a little surprised about Dean Ornes' retirement; he gave not even two weeks' notice. Is it typical to give less than two weeks' notice?

Lord: This is unusual. His letter is dated exactly two weeks before his last day.

Wharram: Maybe there are personal contingencies?

Lord: I'm going to allow him to answer those questions. I asked him to stay through the end of the semester to help ease the transition, but he did not feel he was able to do so.

## VI. Bylaws Revisions

Robertson: We will move the Bylaw revision to our next meeting agenda.

Sterling: It would be a good idea if we could attach the proposed revision as a communication for our next meeting. The most significant change is to Section 12, filling of vacancies. Our proposed revision clarifies processes and procedures for that.

Robertson: I will include those in the communications for the next meeting.

## VII. Adjournment at 3:15 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted,  
Jeannie Ludlow, Acting Recorder