

2-16-2016

February 16, 2016

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 16, 2016" (2016). *Minutes*. 1076.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1076

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
February 16th, 2016, 2:00 – 3:50 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 PM
- Senators: T. Abebe, D. Brandt, T. Bruns, N. Hugo, J. Ludlow, J. Oliver, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, J. Roberston, S. Scher, A. Rosenstein, CC. Wharram, Stephen Simpson (Student Senate), JaLisa Smith (Student Senate)
 - Guests: J. Best (EIUAA), MA Hanner (EIUAA), A. Haynes (DEN), D. Klarup (COS), B. Lord (AA), A. Parrish (Math)
 - Robertson – welcome, thank you for meeting for a third straight week, thanks for your service last week especially S. Wharram as primary author of Senate Resolution on the budget crisis, I want to publically acknowledge that I have received no acknowledgement of receipt or feedback of the Resolution from our local politicians (Senator Righter or Representative Phillips), I will follow up with them on this.
 - Brandt – received feedback, last bullet point of the Resolution – ‘risk endangering the health of EIU’– some constituents wished the resolution pointed out that the damage had already been done and more damage was possible
- II. Approval of Minutes from February 2nd and 9th, 2016 2:00-2:05 PM
- Feb 2nd, 2016 – motion to approve (Sterling & Brandt) – all in favor – 2 abstentions (Bruns & Ludlow)
 - Feb 9th, 2016 – Ludlow notes word adjustment (Stowell & Abebe) – all in favor – 1 abstention (Bruns)
- III. Committee Reports 2:05-2:30 PM
1. Executive Committee
 - a. Call for Volunteers – Faculty Senate Spring 2016
 - Robertson – spoke with WILL reporter – agreed to 5 to 10 minute interview prior to Gov Rauner’s address on Wednesday – any advice or suggestions for the interview?
 - Robertson – CUPB meeting this Friday – regrettably the CUPB chair was one of 177 civil service position layoffs. To me, this represents an alarming ‘wake up call’ to the depth of EIU cuts
 - Rosenstein – time of CUPB session?
 - Rosenstein – 2 pm, open to the public, meets in 1895 room in MLK Union
 - Oliver – a few reminders – session being recorded, Senate website updated, guests please sign in 2. Nominations Committee
 - Rosenstein – contacted Lt. Hatfill – EIU Interim Chief of Police – resolution for parking advisory committee – not available to speak to me in my effort to find an answer to my question regarding this committee
 3. Elections Committee
 - Stowell – no report - call for Spring 2016 elections will be sent out in the near future based on timeline in our bylaws
 - Stowell – we have a temporary vacancy on Faculty Senate – ‘volunteer’ call sent to EIU faculty – we received three immediate inquiries – suggestion is to accept first inquiry as our candidate (motion by Stowell, seconded by Hugo)
 - Wharram – so we are choosing the first candidate to respond? Possibly concerned about that. A bit uncomfortable about that. Going with the most convenient/quickest response.
 - Scher – maybe we should at least require each candidate to submit summary of qualifications?
 - Oliver – one qualification to distinguish or consider might be ‘rank’ - first candidate is an Associate professor, other two are Assistant Professors.
 - Scher – voices concerns about using ‘rank’ as distinguishing factor
 - Rosenstein – offers comments about getting younger (Asst Prof) candidates involved
 - Bruns – to avoid appearance of bias, I think we should select the first one who responded, otherwise the process may get ‘murky’ – what about Faculty Senate bylaws? What’s the established process
 - Robertson – commented on this ‘gray’ area, why the vacancy exists this semester, sees the merits of all of your arguments/suggestions, we could also consider which department or college the candidates represent

- Stowell – w could discuss an unlimited number of considerations for the candidates, but we are talking about finding a substitute for the remaining four sessions of this semester – not a 3-year term candidate
 - Ludlow – regardless of whom we select, can we please encourage the other two candidates to apply for a Faculty Senate position in the upcoming elections
 - Rosenstein – could we use random selection?
 - Robertson – we could draw out of a hat?
 - Wharram – in the interest of the situation, I withdrawal my concern – as long as it is not precedent setting
 - Robertson – ok – let’s move on to a roll call vote to accept Prof Svetlana Mitrovski as our candidate
 - Oliver – roll call vote –
 - (YES) - Bruns, Robertson, Stowell, Brandt, Ludlow, Abebe, Hugo, Rosenstein, Wharram, Oliver
 - (No) - Sterling
 - (Abstain) – Scher
4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee
- No report
5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee
- No report
6. Awards Committee
- Hugo – Distinguished Faculty Award (DFA) application packet sent out to EIU Faculty. Deadline is March 4th. Waiting to receive applications.
 - Robertson – when do we need to submit name for the award?
 - Hugo – by mid-March – so the goal is to have a name by the end of Spring Break
 - Oliver – let me know if you want me to re-circulate the application packet to EIU Faculty
7. Faculty Forum Committee
- Bruns – reached out to the CEPAL group (the union’s political and legislative committee) – possible faculty forum for them to speak/discuss on issues on higher education funding
 - Robertson – one related comment – Senator Phillips scheduled to speak on March 29th to Faculty Senate
8. Budget Transparency Committee
- Sterling – no report
9. Constitution and By-Laws Review Committee
- Scher – report/discussion coming later in the meeting
10. Committee on Committees
- a. Review of Elected and Nominated Committees
- Stowell – hopefully last discussion on this topic, future efforts needed to keep this list updated. Refer to handout to review committee recommendations.
 - (1) Admissions Review Committee – no IGP – no reference to an appeals process – Admissions Office handles appeals reviews
 - Stowell – recommendation = delete from the bylaws
 - Wharram – did not Kara mention this in her report last week to the Senate?
 - Ludlow – she mentioned that there was a process, but not a committee overseeing the process
 - Sterling – wouldn’t this require us to change the Senate Constitution as well?
 - Ludlow – probably so – I will look it up
 - (2) Committee of Brand Champions – Stowell provides background information on this committee – there used to be a Philanthropy Communications committee – previous VP Patrick Early

constituted this committee – my recommendation is that we should have an advisory committee for marketing. If we don't appoint or constitute now, I am ok with that.

- Scher – should we probably discuss this with the VP of External Affairs and others involved in marketing?
- Wharram – this is a reminder - there is a committee and it has been populated, not sure who is on it but they have not met although they are eager to meet. So there is a mechanism in place to populate this committee.
- Rosenstein – it was a nominations committee, it was populated but VP Martin did not initiate meetings – which probably could have helped with processes he was involved in this past summer. The committee may have been eager to meet but the VP did not use the committee
- Stowell – we need to probably visit with the VP – maybe change the name to Brand Champions - will move it to the next committee – constituted but needs encouragement to meet
- Sterling – and possibly a name change?
- Stowell – (3) Institutional Review Board on Human Subjects in Research – John Best is here and used to chair the committee. He served on Faculty Senate when it was recommended that it be removed from the list of Faculty Senate committees
- Best – I picked a good day to show up as a guest. We are still talking about IRB in the Senate?
- Stowell – it's still in our bylaws – looking to remove it.
- Best – provides background on the IRB. Instrument of the Federal Government. On any college campus that involves human subjects in research. It is not a university sponsored committee. I recommend it being removed from the Senate bylaws.
- Stowell – (4) Research & Creativity Activity – achieved objectives/purpose – does not have a future purpose. I recommend removing it from the list.
- Stowell – same with (5) Student Success Center Advisory Committee.
- Stowell – the rest of the listed committees - I am willing to contact correct VP involved and encourage activation and continued population of the committees.
- Ludlow – comment on Admissions Review Committee – not in Constitution. Is in Bylaws.
- Stowell – last group – committees with name change recommendations – (6) Financial Aid/Grants Committee – name change to Grant-In-Aid Appeals Committee – only constituted when there is a loss of Grant In Aid.
- Stowell – (7) Records and Registration Advisory Committee – name change recommended by Amy Lynch = The Office of the Registrar Advisory Committee.
- Stowell – (8) Sports and Recreation Board – name change recommended to 'Campus Recreation Board'
- Stowell – Student Publications Board = name change to 'Student Publications Board'
- Stowell - Tuition & Fees Review Committee – they only review changes in student fees not tuition
- Sterling – we need a committee to also review proposed tuition increases. Maybe at the same time when student fees increases are proposed and reviewed. I would have like to have seen more faculty involvement in the tuition increases last year. It would have been nice for somebody to have a chance to ask 'why' or 'wait a minute' for both fee and tuition fee increase proposals last year.
- Stowell – what is the process for proposing tuition increases/changes?
- Sterling – there is no process, the president proposes an increase to the EIU Board of Trustees. Faculty are not informed or consulted.
- Robertson – considering rising costs of higher education, if we leave the current name (Tuition and Fees) might be advantageous, along with encouraging faculty involvement
- Stowell – this is a Student Senate subcommittee with faculty appointments
- Sterling – maybe we request that the President visits Faculty Senate with future tuition increase proposals?
- Bruns – with the way state funding levels are at today, there is likely to be significant discussions/dialogue on this topic in the future. Hopefully faculty can be involved in these future discussions. It would be nice to have this mechanism in place to work with the administration on this.
- Stowell – and hopefully students are involved in the conversation as well
- Brandt – motion to adopt committee changes/recommendations. Second = Ludlow
- Robertson – reviews motion – adopt committee on committee recommendations.
- Ludlow – including the Brand Champions category change
- (Yes) – Robertson, Stowell, Brandt, Sterling, Ludlow, Abebe, Hugo, Scher, Wharram, Oliver, Rosenstein (11)

- (No) – none (0)
- (Abstain) – Bruns (1)
- Robertson – maybe next step is to have a motion to disband ad-hoc committee on committees?

11. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

- Rosenstein – no report – hoping to schedule a meeting soon

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from February 2nd, 2016 -
2. Proposed Faculty Senate Bylaws Revisions -
3. CAA Minutes, Jan. 28th, 2016 -
4. Call for Volunteers – Faculty Senate Spring 2016

V. Provost’s Address: Provost Blair Lord

2:30-2:35 PM

- Academic Affairs is trying to digest forced changes on campus with the absence of state funding. Trying to manage the challenges as best as possible.

- Stowell – please update us on COS Associate Dean.

- Lord – Process concluded. Now in Dean Klarup’s hands.

- Robertson – could you update us on the interim CAH Dean search?

- Lord – process is in motion. Coming to a conclusion – will update you at the next session

VI. By-Laws Revisions

2:35-3:30 PM

- Sterling - we left off at #8 in Elections Committee. We completed #7 of Elections Committee.

- Sterling – #8 - suggested word changes discussed (if feasible)– coin flip if tie in the voting process – but occasionally we need additional exceptions in case of faculty being off campus (sabbatical) in case they are not physically present to view the coin toss (flip).

- Sterling – let’s come back to #12 & #13. Let’s summarize small changes in D-E-F-G-

D – Student-Faculty Relations committee – if possible 3 members of the student senate be added – usually composed of both student and faculty senates. The word changes provide flexibility in the composition.

E – Faculty-Staff Relations committee – we hope to create more ‘combined’ committees, but if not the committee can still exist – the word changes provide this flexibility

F – Faculty Forum Committee - hoping for 3 members of FAC SEN, Staff Senate, and Student Senate – but the wording allows flexibility if that does not happen.

G – Awards Committee - Mendez award has specific members to serve on the committee – added flexibility in case a member of the Awards committee gets nominated for the award. NO changes on DFAward. Awarded during Spring semester – Usually presented during Spring Semester Commencement – but we don’t control that event’s itinerary.

III – all FAC SEN voting will not be required to be ‘roll call’ - but notation of each senator’s vote needs to be included in the minutes. However, roll call vote can be requested by a senator.

IV – Ex Officio removed. It does not mean ‘non-voting’. It means holding a position by virtue of your office. A non-voting parliamentarian or non-chair senator can fill the function. Provides flexibility with fulling parliamentarian roll.

- Sterling – back to Elections committee #12

#12 – currently we fill a vacancy by going back to election results when position was originally vacant. Candidates with 10 or more write in votes were considered - One election to the next looking for a suitable candidate. Some felt this process does not work well. Frequently we don’t have candidates from past elections, sometimes under-supported candidates. Some errors have been made along the way as well. We suggest redoing the process and clarifying the language in terms of ‘definition of vacancy’ as it correctly applies.

(12a). Our bylaws don’t cover positions where no candidate was voted in.

(12b). With short-term vacancies (one year or less) the Senate will choose a replacement. Elections committee will check most recent election results for possible candidates for the position but the Senate not required to select candidate from previous elections.

(12c) – length of vacancy coverage (short-term vs long-term). Recommendation - No appointed replacements beyond one year. Position vacancy will be included on the following Spring elections.

(12d) – more clarification on length of filling vacancy.

(12e) – protocol in case of resignation – edited language that already existed. Hopefully these edits clarify the process for different situations of position vacancies. The current language is unclear and awkward.

Bruns – I hope we are moving into an era of greater faculty involvement, hopefully working together with the administration to solve problems. My only question is ‘how does the Senate choose’ a replacement candidate?

Sterling – my interpretation was to not put an absolute mechanism for selection in the bylaws for candidate selection because we have all different types of committees with vacancies. For example, the process for filling the vacancy today for Faculty Senate is a good example. My intention was to leave this ‘open-ended’ so that the senate had ‘flexibility’ in the process to fill vacancies on different types of committees.

Ludlow – is it possible that someone who was appointed as a replacement for a position could read 12d and interpret that they cannot run for the position in the next election?

Bruns – add a comma, then ‘unless elected’

Sterling – also 12e is existing language

Sterling – 13 – the change to 13 rolls the function of the Ad-hoc ‘committee on committee’ into the duties of the Election Committee – making sure elected committees are actually meeting when they are supposed to and reporting to the Senate if they are not.

Rosenstein – what is our role in the governance of these committees? We can’t force committees to meet. Isn’t our role to make sure the committees are populated, but not to govern these committees or influence decisions made by these committees? Our monitoring their meetings seems a bit ‘heavy-handed’.

Ludlow – how is this proposal different than what we just did with the Committee on Committees?

Rosenstein – responds on what she thought the role of the C on C was

Ludlow – certainly we can encourage each committee to meet

Rosenstein – but the recommended language, including the term ‘violation’, sounds punitive to me – do we have the authority?

Bruns – but we do have the right to know the status and activity of each committee – for us to be informed of what is happening, even if we can’t enforce – for example the Parking Advisory Committee that never meets

Sterling – under the Faculty Senate Constitution, we can overrule decisions made by some of these committees. In addition, I was appalled that we have all of these committees that had not met for at least a decade. These committees create the impression of shared governance and faculty oversight on decisions made across campus. I dislike the idea of having committees sponsored by Faculty Senate that don’t ever meet, usually because an administrator does not bother to call the committee to meet.

Rosenstein – perhaps we need to keep the administrators more accountable for overseeing the committees – maybe have them report to the Faculty Senate on an annual basis regarding the activity of the committees that they have oversight for.

Scher – many of these committees are described as ‘Committees of the Senate’ – so we do have authority over some of them and encouraging them to meet. They probably should be required to provide updates on what they are doing on a regular basis.

Rosenstein – provides additional questions/comments/concerns – some committees are ‘as needed’ – aren’t they?

Ludlow – I thought the committees being discussed in point 13 are listed in #2 (under Elections Committee)

Ludlow – to Rosenstein - would you feel more comfortable with the term ‘failure’ rather than ‘violation’?

Rosenstein – the committees listed in #2 – if those are the ones being discussed then it would make sense to monitor their activity – and yes, a word change might be needed

Bruns – oversight is our role – ‘in the interest of shared governance’ would be the suggested wording change

Sterling – I like that wording and am willing to change it.

Rosenstein – and some of these committees are populated by faculty senators, but some are not

Stowell – we know some committees for sure are meeting – CAA, UPC, COTE, CGS, CUPB, etc. We receive minutes. Some are contractually obligated. Oversight will not be a large additional responsibility.

Sterling – if you see the role of Faculty Senate as helping these committees to identify members to serve than I completely agree with your terminology suggestions. If you see these committees as key parts of shared governance, then maybe the wording needs to be a bit stronger – leaning towards oversight rather than just populating committees

Rosenstein – some of the committee inactivity rests on the shoulders of administrators – that’s why I suggested that administrators should report to Faculty Senate

Wharram – we have a number of committees to populate and encourage them to meet (ie – Brand Champions), we need to encourage new members to contact the correct ‘contact person’ who initiates the committee meeting

Stowell – adds more comments on the purpose of the committee on committees – provide information to interested candidates who want to serve on each committee

Rosenstein – notes that the terminology used with nominations vs elections committee is different
 Brandt – makes a motion to adopt proposed changes to bylaws of the Senate (Abebe = second)
 Wharram – question of populating the committees, specifically the nominated committees – the lottery system in particular. I have a few constituents concerned about the system. Is it typically the way we do it?
 Rosenstein – that is the method I inherited
 Bruns – what were the complaints about the lottery?
 Wharram – a few colleagues, who felt they could help through service on a committee, have ‘lost’ the lottery process multiple times – so they are questioning the use of it – they are a bit disgruntled based on past results
 Brandt – years ago on Faculty Senate, new applicants were given higher priority to fill nomination vacancies the next year if they were not selected the first year.
 Rosenstein – the previous chair used the lottery system, so that is what we adopted – true randomization is most fair. Some have emailed and encouraged their selection based on their credentials. We don’t have to use the lottery in the future.
 Ludlow – suggestion – let’s move forward with the motion and come back to this
 Ludlow – clarification on #13 – are we going to change the wording?
 Robertson – have not heard the wording thus far
 Ludlow – I heard two suggestions
 Bruns – ‘in the interest of shared governance’ suggested for the language change on #13 - (Bruns, Ludlow=second)
 Stowell – for clarification – did we include in the motion to strike language on Elections Committee #2? – Admissions Review Committee.
 Sterling & Stowell – yes, Admissions Review Committee will be struck, also language change of ‘composed of vs. comprised of’.
 Robertson – and I will make minor writing edits/errors
 Oliver – roll call vote – Amendment = revision of language of item #13.
 Yes – Bruns, Robertson, Stowell, Brandt, Ludlow, Abebe, Hugo, Scher, Rosenstein, Wharram, Oliver (11)
 No – Sterling (1)
 Robertson – Senate bylaw adjustments as a ‘whole’
 Yes – Bruns, Robertson, Stowell, Brandt, Sterling, Ludlow, Abebe, Hugo, Scher, Rosenstein, Wharram, Oliver (12)
 No – none
 Sterling – suggestion – disband Committee & Bylaws Review Committee?!

VII. Guest Address: Mary Anne Hanner and John Best, EIU Annuitant Association 3:30-3:50 PM

- Hanner – EIU Annuitants Association (EIUAA) – our role is less complex than yours!
 - Hanner – current president of Annuitants Association – here with John Best, now a member of the membership committee. The Association has one mission – preserve, strengthen, and protect retirement benefits of SURS annuitants. We have a broad range of members – annuitants, spouses, survivors, EIU employees
 - Hanner – historical tid-bit – state university annuitants association (EIU is a chapter) – SUAA – a founding member was William Zigel – former EIU employee. We now have 735 members. At least 50 are current EIU employees – Sterling, Klarup, Lord.
 Hanner – we defended our benefits at the Supreme Court level of Illinois during the Summer 2015. Our attorneys suggested it was a powerful response by annuitants across the state. We monitor legislation closely. We have a very active legislative action group locally and at the state level. We are constantly working on getting action in Springfield. We expect bills filled to reduce benefits of current employees. EIUAA has established a scholarship from dues into a foundation account. We give a \$500 scholarship each fall and spring - must be a child or grandchild of EIU annuitant. It is listed under scholarships on EIU website.
 Hanner – we have brochures for you to distribute to colleagues across campus. We encourage you to join the association as employees. We have 3 chapter meetings per year - some social aspects to the meetings as well.
 Best – great to be back with former colleagues. Great to see such a hard working group of faculty keeping this institution moving forward. You play a vital role.
 Best – back when I was a senator I probably heard this same speech given – your pension is under attack and will continue to be under attack – we are actively working to protect your retirement benefits – it is in your best interests to join the EIUAA now and help – as our numbers increase our voice increases – your membership dues are used wisely to protect your future and benefits that you have earned.
 Bruns – are you meeting with Staff Senate as well?
 Hanner – yes, and Civil Service council as well. We indirectly assist the state level organization with our dues.
 Hanner – contact me at 217-508-0840 if you have questions about EIUAA.

VIII. Adjournment - 3:50 PM

IX. Future Dates and Guests:

Upcoming Spring 2016 Faculty Senate Sessions: March 1st & 29th, April 5th & 19th

Future Guests:

March 29th: Representative Reggie Phillips & Kara Hadley-Shakya, Interim Director of Admissions

Postponed, Date TBA: Rebecca Throneburg, Discussion of CASL Assessment Data