

1-19-2016

January 19, 2016

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 19, 2016" (2016). *Minutes*. 1079.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1079

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 Agenda
January 19th, 2016, 2:00 – 3:50 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

I. Attendance and Welcome

2:00 PM

- In Attendance = Senators T. Abebe, D. Brandt, N. Hugo, J. Ludlow, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, A. Rosenstein, S. Scher, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, J. Waller, C. Wharram, J. Smith (Stud. Rep.), S. Simpson (Student Gov.), B. Lawrence (SP16 replacement for B. Young)
- Welcome from Chair J. Robertson
- Guests: J. Blitz (UPI) C. Buchman (DEN), A. Haynes (DEN), D. Jackman (CEPS), B. Lord (A.A.)
- Introduction by Barbara Lawrence – possible replacement for Bailey Young, who has a teaching assignment conflict, this semester (temporary)
- Barbara Lawrence – introduced herself, has served on Faculty Senate in the past, willing to serve if needed

II. Approval of Minutes from December 1st, 2015

- Motion to approve? – Stowell, Abebe (2nd)
- All in favor – all but Brandt, Rosenstein (both abstained)

III. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee

Updates from December Executive Committee meeting with Pres Glassman – was planning to attend to update Senate on upcoming administration decisions he was going to make. Was unable to join today. Needed to fundraise in California with Tarble family this week. Will attend Fac Sen meeting in near future – probably the next meeting - to discuss ongoing developments in Springfield and on campus. Executive Committee will attempt to meet with him upon his return from California before the next Fac Sen meeting.

Robertson – refers to recent DEN article with comments from Pres. Glassman & EIU budget documents that were made in CUPB last Friday:

- Large ‘deficit’ in lower right hand column reflects lack of appropriated dollars from the state.
- If appropriate dollars are received, the current EIU administration would have operated ‘within budget’
- If appropriate dollars are not received, it will have significant impact on EIU operations in the near future

Scher – mentioned Chicago State’s pending inability to make payroll, predicted by March 2016

Stowell – reminds group regarding differences in funding reductions (6.5 reduction in EIU budget vs 2.5 reduction in appropriated funds)

Robertson – reading capital fax from President Glassman from Friday – Illinois Governor will not fund MAP grants until universities reform their budgeting processes, Chicago state will run out of operating funding soon. If funding is not received soon, possible additional layoffs may follow in the near future. No specifics provided, but in the near future EIU may find itself in a similar position, which might cause additional layoffs. President Glassman is preparing a statement to address these issues that will go out in the near future. He wants to avoid significant layoffs and furloughs if at all possible. EIU students are the ongoing priority. He will stay in close touch with the situation in Springfield before making any additional cuts.

Ludlow – the Executive Committee shared the Committee on Committees report with the President in

December. He promised a commitment from his leadership team to support and answer questions we had.

Robertson – Director of Admissions and VP Martin will be departing within a month. Internal search for the Admissions Director, not sure about the VP position search.

2. Nominations Committee

- Rosenstein – no report

3. Elections Committee

Rosenstein – retirement has caused a UPC vacancy. UPC chair hoping to find replacement by February.

Stowell – once we know who retired, we can review past election results to identify a viable replacement for UPC vacancy. For Faculty Senate semester vacancy, no other candidates from Young’s election year is available to fill this semester. We are down to taking volunteers. We have a volunteer – Lawrence.

Scher – Motions that Barbara Lawrence fills Young position during the Spring 2016 semester. Seconded by Ludlow. Unanimous vote in support.

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee
 - Waller – no report.

5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee
 - Was chaired by James Ochwa-Echel during the Fall 2015 semester, so we need a new chair of the committee. Other members of the committee include Senators Hugo and Waller.
 - Waller – should we add a third member of the committee?
 - Robertson – yes, good idea to add a third member and would Hugo or Waller be interested in chairing?
 - Ludlow – I am not on a standing committee right now, just an ad-hoc?
 - Robertson – to Lawrence – would you be willing to serve on the committees that Bailey Young was serving on? - the Faculty Forum committee and the Awards committee?
 - Lawrence –was he chairing either?
 - Robertson – no, Bruns chairs Faculty Forum committee, Hugo chairs Faculty Awards committee
 - Lawrence – I will gladly serve on the awards committee
 - Ludlow – I will join the Faculty-Staff Relations committee, replacing Senator James Ochwa-Echel. When does it meet? Does anyone know? (no response). Ok – I will look it up. James was attending these meetings.
 - Robertson – to clear up a possible mistake I made in the Fall, I believe that I only asked Senator Ochwa-Echel to fill in for the Fall semester. Should I approach him again to serve this Spring?
 - Rosenstein – James may be on sabbatical this semester.
 - Sterling – no objections to him serving, but let's first confirm which senator is serving in which position
 - Robertson – Agreed. Chair for Faculty-Staff relations Committee?
 - Waller – I can serve as chair of faculty-staff relations committee.
 - Robertson – confirms that Hugo can continue to serve as the chair of Awards committee

6. Awards Committee
 - No report

7. Faculty Forum Committee
 - Roberston – Bruns in the Faculty Forum committee is chair. Senator Young was leading the effort to invite political reps to speak about the budget impasse. He just hosted a meeting with several parties to discuss/plan that type of event. I will follow up with him and with this committee.

8. Budget Transparency Committee
 - Sterling – received requested info from VP McCann about EIU budget docs. He previously discussed the information at CUPB. I will forward to all senators for review. Senate can advise committee on how to proceed.

9. Constitution and By-Laws Review Committee
 - Scher – no report.
 - Robertson – suggestion to meet in the near future to move forward on the bylaw revisions.

10. Ad Hoc Committee on Committees
 - Roberston – Eckert was chair, now travelling abroad this semester. Do we need a chair replacement?
 - Stowell – I will continue the effort here. We need to make decisions in several areas to take the 'next step' with some of the committees. Mergers? Disbanding? Decisions in line with EIU IGPs. We need a plan/recommendation for the future.
 - Roberston – Senator Brandt – would you be willing to step in for Senator Eckert on this committee?
 - Brandt – yes, I would.
 - Stowell – I would be happy to serve as chair since I have been involved with the committee for awhile

11. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics
 - Wharram – we did meet in Dec (8th). We reviewed IAB report for the past few years. We developed a series of questions that we would like to pursue/address and with whom
 - Rosenstein – there are a few other administrative issues/steps that we need to complete to finalize the committee, such as student-athlete representation.
 - Robertson – Stephen or JaLisa – would you be willing to help us find a student-athlete representative for this committee?

- Stephen – I think President of Student Government might have a athletics rep already identified
- JaLisa – we will look into it to identify a candidate.
- Oliver – recommendation to approach the EIU FAR (author of the report) with questions first, then the IAB as a whole.
- Wharram – that is what we were initially planning to do.

IV. Communications

1. Revised Resolution Concerning CUPB

- Abebe – we have considered your comments and suggestions carefully, and decided to approach the resolution a little differently. This new approach avoids minutia of formulas and other logistical concerns, as well as other stated concerns regarding the previous resolution. It also avoids unnecessary, but factual, statements including in the previous version of the resolution. We also hope for Pres. Glassman’s support and suggestions. The essence of this resolution is not to reformulate according to only Faculty Senate’s desire but to provide flexibility for the President if he chooses to reformulate and enhance the overall effectiveness of CUPB. That is the spirit behind this resolution. Questions?
- Robertson – Thank you for your efforts in revising/enhancing the resolution. FYI – as I mentioned in a communication with you, the Executive Committee of CUPB was not pleased with the initial resolution. The CUPB executive committee has authority to reconstitute the committee, and the President has the authority to disband and then reconstitute the committee. It was also suggested to faculty senate by CUPB to address these issues/concerns regarding existing structure of CUPB directly with CUPB.
- Stowell – I like the increased flexibility of the new resolution.
- Waller – I am concerned that the resolution is too weakly worded. It could be easily ignored. What happened to the formula? Why did it get dropped?
- Abebe – the Provost reminded us last time that CUPB is the only council approved by the EIU Board of Trustees. Given that institutional prerogative might not include members that we suggest, we wanted to enhance flexibility for the president if he decides to reconstitute. Also, some of you did not like the formula.
- Waller – how do you envision this resolution being implemented?
- Abebe – all we can do is forward it to the president. He could decline our proposal to change CUPB, accept some of it, or accept all of it. Our role is advisory. This is a recommendation.
- Rosenstein – when you talk about reducing the # of members, there are 21 voting members and 8 non-voting members, correct? If so, the concern is that faculty are not equally represented across the committee.
- Abebe – we would like to see the council be more effective than it has been. We want to increase the voice of the faculty. Nonvoting members don’t concern us but they may influence the decision-making process. Faculty should have an increased voice on CUPB. CUPB was unable to agree on what the mission of EIU was. At the very least, the President should have this discussion with the CUPB. He may feel the same way as the last CUPB felt, but I’m not so sure this would be the case.
- Sterling – when CUPB was given the program analysis responsibilities, the first thing they did was divide into smaller groups. They could not function as a whole as presently constituted – the committee is too large. If the CUPB’s only function was for the president and vps to pass out info, then it does not matter the size or how it is constituted. However, if CUPB is actually going to have a role in planning and budgeting for EIU, its membership has to be reduced.
- Waller – why not change the first sentence of this resolution – right now, the President can’t do this – why not change the wording to something like “Faculty Senate calls on the President to dissolve CUPB and reconstitute a new CUPB....”?
- Sterling – I think it (the resolution) is fine as it is written, but the President could either reconstitute or encourage the CUPB exec. comm to reconstitute itself. Or an ad-hoc committee could be established to accomplish this task. A number of ways could be used.
- Waller – but would it be best for us to use stronger language/opinion in this doc? Or is this presumptuous?
- Abebe – possibly, but the president listens to a variety of voices, as well as pressure groups. It may be unwise to be overly direct.
- Lawrence – the resolution, as it reads, does not provide background of the concern. Should we re-include this information in the current resolution – why we think CUPB dysfunctional?
- Abebe – we did this with the previous resolution, but we have backed off that approach at this time. We have backed off the ‘formality’ of how resolutions are usually written with this particular resolution.
- Oliver – is the President aware of the background related to the CUPB’s inability to come to a consensus on on EIU’s mission?

- Sterling – I’ve had discussions with the President on this issue, although I don’t speak for the Senate. I think he is aware of what happened.
- Rosenstein – concern – looking at the CUPB member list, it is clear that as many constituents are being represented as possible. However, I think it is still important to have increased student representation on CUPB, or as much as possible. I am concerned that student representation would be lost.
- Abebe – Senator Hugo was also concerned about student representation. CUPB has bylaws in place that determine how many students, chairs, deans should be included. If this resolution is approved, the President would have to navigate through the bylaws and faculty senate desires for a newly constructed CUPB. We thought it would be more beneficial for the president to have the greatest flexibility in this process.
- Rosenstein – adding students may show greater sensitivity towards our mission – educating students
- Abebe – so you are encouraging statement ‘b’ of the resolution to be revised? I have no problem with that.
- Sterling – there are actually 23 voting members on CUPB currently, 2 positions are currently vacant.
- Lawrence – what is the current proportion of faculty, students, and staff on CUPB?
- Abebe – 6 faculty elected, 4 students selected, appointments of 1 Dean, 1 Chair, Chair of Staff Senate, Chair of Faculty Senate, etc. Faculty representation is one from each college.
- Robertson – should we make a motion to amend the language of statement ‘b’?
- Abebe – I move that we approve
- Ludlow – there does exist a ‘friendly amendment’ where minor modifications proposed can be made without formalized approval procedures.
- Sterling – yes, but technically speaking there is no ‘friendly amendment’ process once a motion has been formally made and seconded, there probably needs to be a formalized motion to change
- Abebe – I support the motion but I believe ‘c’ should satisfy your concern regarding student representation
- Rosenstein – I think having faculty in ‘b’ is adequate, but everything we do here is all about students
- Sterling – I don’t support an increase of the proportion of student membership on CUPB. What I have found during my service on CUPB is that it is difficult to find students who were willing to attend all the meetings, do the work to learn the budgetary background, and learn the critical information/data to effectively serve on CUPB in one year. They roll over each year. Faculty and Staff usually serve multiple year terms on CUPB.
- Simpson – makes comments regarding students. Believes students can learn quickly if given the resources.
- JaLisa – we can make the request that underclassmen serve a multi-year term on CUPB.
- Stowell – I share Grant’s concern regarding a possible increase in the student representation on CUPB. I don’t think it is necessary.
- Wharram – in the process of reducing the total # of CUPB members, it automatically increases the proportion of student representation on the committee if # of student reps does not change.
- Rosenstein – as long as students are still represented while the CUPB membership reduces, I would be fine with that.
- Wharram – are students voting members?
- Robertson – yes, it is an important position. should we make a motion to amend ‘b’
- Wharram – I still support the ‘friendly amendment’ for ‘b’
- *Motion to amend ‘b’ on CUPB resolution
Motion by Rosenstein, seconded by Ludlow
- Abebe – reads the proposed amended ‘b’ – related to increased representation of Academic Affairs (faculty & students) on CUPB

* Vote = Opposed (8) Lawrence, Stowell, Brandt, Sterling, Abebe, Waller, Oliver, Scher
In Favor (5) Robertson, Ludlow, Rosenstein, Wharram, Hugo

- Proposed amendment to ‘b’ not approved
- Robertson – are we in position for final vote on CUPB resolution authored by Abebe and Sterling?
- Ludlow – yes – previously ‘moved’ and ‘seconded’ at last meeting

*Vote - *In Favor (13 - *unanimous*) - Lawrence, Robertson, Stowell, Brandt, Sterling, Ludlow, Abebe, Waller, Scher, Rosenstein, Wharram, Hugo, Oliver

*CUPB resolution, as written, unanimously approved

2. Email from Kathleen O’Rourke concerning UPC faculty member replacement
 - Already discussed by Elections committee
3. CAA Minutes, Jan. 14th, 2016
 - Not discussed

V. Provost's Report: Blair Lord

- Welcome back. Thanks for scheduling this meeting during the 2nd week. Pres Glassman spent last week in Springfield to make the case for funding for EIU. He came back frustrated. That same afternoon we sat in on the regularly scheduled call with presidents and provosts to discuss the press release from the governor. A collective letter was circulated to all legislators and the governor from the university presidents pleading with them to not harm higher education in the state. That is the latest from the very troubling situation. On the budget sheet that was circulated, some slivers of good news. As of close of business last Friday, spring enrollment was down only 3.84% from last spring, much less of a decline compared to last year. Spring enrollment #s were a bit better than expected mostly from graduate student enrollment - ~11% increase. A few programs have had significant increase (Technology, Education Leadership). Next fall – the news in our state is not great – down in applications, down in admits, efforts are focused on ‘yield’ – we need larger % of ‘admits’ in seats by the first day of fall semester. We have a new interim dean of COS – Former Chair of Chemistry - Doug Klarup. He has a high # of to-dos to immediately deal with. Overall, I felt the search process was a success. Interim Dean Search for Arts & Humanities is underway. The committee from the previous search is still in place. We have more time for this search – the entire Spring semester. Also the interim associate dean search for COS is also underway. It will most likely extend into the Fall semester. We have been meeting with existing admissions staff – collecting feedback from them. Chris has given us three weeks to find a replacement. We probably will proceed with an interim appt. with Admissions Director. The office is in a better situation than a few years ago, so we are confident we will do well in the process.

Waller – how many candidates for the interim dean in Arts & Humanities?

Lord – not sure as of right now – greater than 2, but less than 10.

Sterling – I think the dean said 4 candidates.

Scher – any input with the VP of University Advancement position opening?

Lord – not much – don't know what the President will do with that position at the moment. He did not have much warning/notice with that position.

VI. New Business – Wharram – can we ask the interim director of admissions to report to the senate this semester?

Lord – yes, we can do that once an interim director is appointed.

VII. Possible Continued Debate Concerning CUPB (TBA) and/or By-Laws Revisions (TBA)

- already noted under ‘Communications’

VIII. Adjournment - 3:30 PM

IX. Future Dates and Guests:

Spring 2016 Faculty Senate Sessions: January 19th, February 2nd & 16th, March 1st & 29th, April 5th & 19th

Guest TBA, February 2nd: President David Glassman

Guests TBA, February 16th: Rebecca Throneburg, Discussion of CASL Assessment Data
Mary Anne Hanner and John Best, EIU Annuitant Association