

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

3-1-2016

March 1, 2016

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 1, 2016" (2016). *Minutes*. 1075.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1075

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
March 1st, 2016, 2:00 – 3:15 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:01 PM
- Welcome: Vice-Chair Stowell
 - Senators in Attendance: Abebe, Bruns, Hugo, Lawrence, Ludlow, Mitrovski, Oliver, Scher, Sterling, Stowell, Waller, Wharram, JaLisa Smith (Stud. Gov. Rep)
 - Guests: C. Buchman (DEN), G. Hild (CAH), B. Lord (AA)
 - Introduction of Senator Mitrovski – Department of Chemistry
- II. Approval of Minutes from February 16th, 2016 2:00-2:05 PM
- Motion to approve – Sterling (Ludlow – Second)
 - Approved – no comments, discussion, corrections
- III. Committee Reports
1. Executive Committee 2:05-2:30 PM
- a. Request for candidates to serve on Textbook Rental Service Advisory Committee
 - Stowell – request from Holly Cox in behalf of Jeff Cross and Lynnette Drake to repopulate the Textbook Rental Service Advisory Committee. Do we have a senator that would be willing to serve?
 - Scher – when do they meet?
 - Stowell – they have not decided yet, but want to have their first meeting before Spring Break
 - Scher – am willing to serve depending on when they meet
 - Mitroski – would be willing to serve based on schedule of meetings
 - Stowell – important committee because of electronic material discussions and current purchasing restrictions on new textbooks
 - Stowell – I will send both names back to Holly Cox and she will hopefully follow-up with you
 - b. Parliamentary Discussion
 - Stowell – introduces the discussion – we have a need for one
 - Ludlow – I nominate Doug Brandt to serve as parliamentarian
 - Scher – do we know if he is interested in serving?
 - Stowell – not sure ...I can talk with Doug, realizing he only has a few more meetings in his interim role...maybe this will encourage him to run for the Faculty Senate next year as well (?)
2. Nominations Committee
- No report
3. Elections Committee
- Stowell – first item is relevant to the upcoming election. I have gathered names of electors from Jeff Cross, which includes full-time Unit A & Unit B faculty and department chairs. Those that should have been excluded have been excluded. I also have confirmed with all chairs of elected committees to confirm replacements needed for the upcoming Spring 2016 elections. We should now have a complete list of vacant elected positions for the upcoming elections (23 positions). In near future I will prepare the information/data for ITS needs for setting up the web-based elections as well as candidates. Later today we will discuss requirements for candidates seeking an elected position.
 - Stowell – Senator Oliver had presented a motion via email a few weeks ago regarding the requirements of potential elected candidates for the Spring 2016 elections = the removal of the 10 signature requirement but continue to require 10 votes.
 - Abebe – I second the motion. Friendly amendment suggested - change ‘10 votes’ to ‘at least 10’ votes.
 - Stowell – I expressed some concerns regarding the motion based on recent results from elections – we had a significant # of write-in candidates in past elections – there could be a long-list of candidates that don’t meet the 10 vote requirement. People can self-nominate for nominated committees. One thought could be we reduce the # of signatures required. Other thoughts?
 - Hugo – are personal statements still required?

- Stowell – reviewed the bylaws – nothing in our bylaws suggests this requirement for a candidate. Last fall we had one other elected position that did not require a candidate statement. Let’s open this up for discussion first, maybe focusing on the motion on the table first.
- Wharram – I think the write-in names from previous elections was not from the person running (from other people not running). Either way is fine with me. I was originally the one who brought up the idea. I would be happy with 3 or 5 signatures rather than 10. I do think the 10 signatures may be an obstacle for potential candidates, especially those in smaller departments. I still think we need the 10-vote minimum for a write-in candidates to secure an elected position.
- Sterling – this was the complication that I was wondering about with official candidates vs write-in candidates – the 10 vote minimum for write-in candidates. Candidates on the ballot sometimes get elected with less than 10 votes. Let’s keep the 10-vote requirement for write-ins, and let’s think about a 10-vote minimum for official candidates.
- Wharram – notwithstanding S Oliver’s motion, it might be simpler to reduce the number of signatures required rather than change the entire process.
- Scher – the signatures don’t always have to come from your own department, correct? Part of the idea is for a candidate requesting signatures from outside of your own department.
- Bruns – so the impetus of this is that 10 signatures may be prohibitive to some candidates. Reducing # of required signatures from 10 to 5 signatures might be a good test of this theory.
- Lawrence – and keeping some signature requirement maintains the formal nature of the process
- Sterling – and there still are the nominated committees – if a candidate does not want to collect signatures, he/she could self-nominate for a nominations committee
- Stowell – so now let’s first vote on the original motion (Oliver)
- Yes – Waller, Abebe, Mitrovski, Scher, Oliver (5)
- No – Bruns, Wharram, Stowell, Sterling, Ludlow, Lawrence, Hugo (7)
- Stowell – so first motion does not pass – would someone like to make a new motion?
- Wharram – motion - change 10 signature requirement to 5 signatures
- Ludlow – I second this motion
- Stowell – and is this just for the Spring 2016 elections?
- Wharram – this could apply for only Spring 2016 elections
- Mitrovski – asks for clarification on the motion – we are talking about the number of signatures needed to be elected or a candidate? Between 0, 3, 5, 10 signatures?
- Wharram – yes, currently I have motioned for 5 to be the requirement
- Mitrovski – statistically, I don’t see a difference between 3, 5, or 10. So how important is the # of signatures and do the signatures really matter?
- Bruns – provides rationale for considering the change in number of signatures
- Mitrovski – why is # of signatures a criterion that we are using in this process?
- Ludlow –because we are having difficulty finding candidates
- Mitrovski – my vote is probably going to be tied to whether or not a personal statement will be required – I usually place more emphasis on the personal statements. My suggestion is to go with the personal statements rather than the signatures. At detailed paragraph. People who really want to serve will put the effort into the personal statements.
- Wharram – your sentiments related to my original point – the signatures are just ‘busy work’
- Motion to Vote on: Reducing signatures from 10 to 5 for elected positions:
- Yes – Bruns, Wharram, Stowell, Waller, Sterling, Ludlow, Lawrence, Hugo, Oliver (9)
- No – Abebe, Mitrovski, Scher (3)
- Stowell – for bylaws revisions we need 2/3 majority of all senators (10 out of 15)– motion failed
- Sterling – reviews Senate Bylaws for voting on motions to confirm
- Bruns – maybe we can revisit and combine after the discussion on candidate statements for elected positions?
- Hugo – add comments on importance of personal statements – provides insights from candidates, especially from those candidates that we do not know personally
- Mitrovski – suggestion – require statements but limit the length
- Lawrence – personal statements – are they currently required?
- Stowell – traditionally, yes, apparently since the 1980s, but there is nothing in writing requiring them
- Ludlow – seeks clarification about which committees require personal statements – Senate only or other committees
- Abebe –confirms that Faculty Senate required personal statements for senate candidates last spring
- Ludlow – but each elected committee sets the requirement for personal statements. Not sure we (the Faculty Senate) can set requirements on the personal statement outside of the Faculty Senate. But I could be mistaken.

- Lawrence – we may want to require a personal statement for any/all elected positions. It will help us understand why a person is interested in running for the elected position.
 - Scher – I agree with Senator Hugo – the statements are useful – it moves us beyond just the ‘who you know’ – I think the personal statement must be ‘required’, not just ‘optional’
 - Mitrovski – consider limiting the length of these statements
 - Stowell – there are specific questions for each committee required to be answered by candidates – although some elected committees may not require questions to be answered.
 - Wharram – provides humorous commentary on what some of the questions might be for some committees
 - Bruns – requests clarification – are the candidate statements controlled by us or by the individual committees?
 - Ludlow – I could be mistaken, but controlled by the individual elected committees
 - Scher – the signature page and the statements should be considered/submitted together
 - Stowell – I sense that the general feeling here is that we should require the submission of candidate statements
 - Hugo – I motion that we formally require a candidate statement/question response for elected positions administered by the Faculty Senate – formalizing this as a ‘policy’ rather than just ‘tradition’
 - Waller – length limit considered?
 - Sterling – now that the process is electronic, length really does not matter
 - Bruns – offers amendment to Hugo’s motion–require 3 signatures along with personal statement from candidates
 - Hugo – I accept that amendment
 - Bruns – I second the motion
 - Vote on the motion:
 - Yes – Bruns, Wharram, Stowell, Waller, Sterling, Ludlow, Abebe, Lawrence, Mitrovski, Scher, Hugo, Oliver (12)
 - Unanimous – candidate statement required plus 3 signatures for elected positions
 - Stowell – we will finalize language of the motion + amendment and apply this to the upcoming Spring Elections
 - Stowell – call for candidates with this adjustment will be circulated later today or early tomorrow, with materials (personal statement and 3 signatures) due by Friday, March 11th. The elections will take place after Spring Break during the last week of March – probably from a Wednesday through a Monday. What did we do last year?
 - Ludlow – we only opened up voting for a few days, so a few more days may be helpful
4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee
 - Waller – no report
 5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee
 - Waller – no report
 6. Awards Committee
 - Hugo – distinguished faculty award packet distributed – waiting to receive completed nominations
 7. Faculty Forum Committee
 - Bruns – no report
 8. Budget Transparency Committee
 - Sterling – sent info about university reserves to Jemmie, and asked him to distribute to the Senate. He was not able to distribute it to you this week. Reserves being used up due to the budget impasse. Once appropriations are received, reserves should be refilled.
 9. Constitution and By-Laws Review Committee
 - Scher – we have on the agenda to review bylaws revisions that we discussed at the last meeting.
 10. Committee on Committees
 - Stowell – you should have received a copy of the spreadsheet on each committee + service requirements + meeting times + individuals overseeing the committee
 - Oliver – ready to upload to website?
 - Stowell – yes, after a few more informational additions – I will send that out with the call for candidates
 11. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics
 - Ludlow – no report

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from February 16th, 2016
2. Faculty Senate Bylaws Revisions
3. Revised Constitution
4. CAA Minutes, February 11th, 2016
5. Call for Textbook Rental Service Committee Service

V. Provost's Address: Provost Blair Lord

2:30-2:35 PM

- Blair Lord – I took S. Stowell's report from the Committee on Committees was taken to the President's Council and the VPs committed to more involvement of faculty in shared governance and re-energize the committees. Some administrative announcements will be made in the near future. Dean Klarup will announce of COS associate dean search results soon. CAH search results will also be released soon – President Glassman is reviewing the results. Pres. Glassman is at the IBHE meeting today, along with all other campus presidents and chancellors. All remain optimistic that the budget gridlock will soon be broken and higher education funding will eventually be received.

VI. Amendments to By-Laws Revisions

2:35- PM

- Scher – S. Robertson was spearheading the revisions process. Document can be accessed via hyperlink sent to us via email. We have previously voted and approved all revisions.

- Sterling – the only issue remaining that I was aware of was the candidate signatures and personal statements.

- Stowell – filling of vacancies by the Faculty Senate was the one other issue that needs to be addressed. Some feedback I have received suggested that the Senate needs to be more formal in the process (ie - not just who responds first). I motioned electronically that we send out a call to the relevant constituency with three days to submit self-nominations, followed by the use of the random selection process to finalize.

- Scher – I am opposed to a random selection process. Regardless of the DEN letter, the preferred method is to consider the candidates and choose whom we think is the best, not just first candidate to respond, possibly requiring a letter of nomination or a personal statement? Using a random number generator is insufficient.

- Wharram – I agree, and suggest we extend the process to the nominated committees where candidates are appointed. Ask each candidate to provide personal statements. Some of my colleagues have questioned the existing randomized process.

- Bruns – those candidates that are never selected may still be feeling excluded. But there is some value in random selection to help us avoid a potential negative - us becoming to “clickish” through a subjective process.

- Mitrovski – that's why I see the value in personal statements – requiring them may broaden participation – hopefully this will overcome the risk of ‘clicks’

- Bruns – there have also been difficulty recruiting candidates

- Mitrovski – we need to better inform potential candidates about why it is so important to consider serving

- Abebe – we want to be consistent in the process – such as requiring faculty running for any elected position to submit a personal statement.

-Sterling – we have always treated the elected and the nominated committees differently/separately. But if we want to become more consistent in the process, we may need to start treating them more comparably. Maybe candidate statements for elected positions and possibly also for nominated positions. There are time issues, ‘click’ issues. Temporary replacements will still be needed.

Mitrovski – but we (the Faculty Senate) then determine what are the less or more important committees

Stowell – true, but the elected committees arguably ‘carry the weight’ of the university – they are at a different level

Wharram – perhaps this is not a large problem, never having served on a nominations committee. Maybe there is a wealth of talented candidates available? Do we have to use the lottery selection frequently?

Bruns – the lottery system is a bit ‘hit-and-miss’ and has flaws – the process can overlook a ‘serious’ candidate

Stowell – and I have been on the nominations committee and have witnessed different situations with candidates

Scher – provides a case study related to campus parking – vacancy on parking advisory committee – the spouse of the chief of police applies for a position along with other candidates – we use a random process in this situation? The Senate needs to clarify a fair, best-intentioned, consistent process to select best qualified candidates to fill vacancies.

Ludlow – that’s an important point, just because we may not use a random selection process every time, we might at time use it if all candidates are deemed equal. We need to decide on a case-by-case basis. And realistically, most situations only include 1 candidate to fill a vacancy. A personal candidate would be valuable if we have multiple high-qualified candidates.

Abebe – and at times a personal statement from a prospective candidate would be important

Stowell – is this for replacements/vacancies or for every nominated committee?

Wharram – I am comfortable leaving it up to the nominated committee to decide the methods used, but I want to make sure the nomination committee knows that they don’t have to use the same methods all the time. They can adapt to the situation of each committee need.

Bruns – so the nominated committee will be making the decision? It is three senators. I am feeling nervous about that. Even after the nominations committee makes decision on candidates, does the Faculty Senate vote on the results?

Stowell – yes, the Faculty Senate does provide final approval (vote) of candidates presented by the nominations committee.

Ludlow – what about short-term vacancies that are being filled by the nominations committee, typically in the Fall semester?

Stowell – I remove my previous motion to use the random selection process to fill nominations committee vacancies.

Wharram – the understanding from Senator Rosenstein is that they assumed or inherited that method to fill vacancies

Bruns – I think we should make a new motion to be more specific with the methods that the nominations committee should use to fill vacancies.

Wharram – motion = require a personal statement for a candidate seeking a nominated position

Abebe – I second that motion

Bruns – do we need to clarify the selection process with this motion?

Wharram – this motion is operational, not meant to change a by-law.

Sterling – Bruns is correct – we need to officially change the bylaw if we are going to require a candidate statement.

Abebe – the problem is that there is no standard for our elected positions – in the absence of a standard, we are going to be arbitrary in our selection process of potential candidates.

Bruns – maybe we look at this as ‘house’ (Nominations) and ‘senate’ (Elected) – provides commentary on the comparisons. Random selection may be appropriate in some instances, but in others we need to be specific about what is required.

Mitrovski – would we as senators see the statements provided to the nominations committee, or just the nominations committee?

Wharram – currently, it’s just the nominations committee

Mitrovski – so doesn’t that degrade the whole process – putting the final decisions in the hands of three people.

Abebe – the nominations committee represents the Senate, so we either trust them or we don’t

Wharram – provides commentary on the case of 25-30 candidates for each position – the nominations committee could filter through the entire group of candidates to reduce the group to a few finalists.

Bruns – I am comfortable with the nominations committee trimming down a long list of candidates and presenting finalists to the Faculty Senate to vote on.

Sterling – but how long is that going to take? There are many nominated committees.

Mitrovski – but that is ok, it is our responsibility. This might be one reason why we are not getting candidates.

Bruns – provides hypothetical example of parking advisory committee – two different types of candidate responses possible

Scher – we need to strike a balance between improving the process and discouraging people from serving. We need to find the balance point. These proposed statements will hopefully improve the process and help the committee identify the best candidates without discouraging colleagues to serve on committees.

Ludlow – realistically, there probably won’t be huge numbers of candidates submitting personal statements for vacancies on nominating committees

Wharram– reviews the motion – require candidates to submit short personal statements for appointments to nominated committees, and when filling vacancies on nominated committees.

Yes – Bruns, Wharram, Stowell, Sterling, Ludlow, Abebe, Lawrence, Mitrovski, Scher, Hugo, Oliver (11)

No – Waller (1)

VII. Adjournment - 3:15 PM

IX. Future Dates and Guests:

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

Stowell – who should we invite to present to the Senate during the last three meetings of Spring 2016?

Abebe – I really wanted to hear more from the admissions director. She deserves more time to present.

Lawrence – I thought she was scheduled on March 29th with Rep Phillips?

Sterling – I suspect that was a mistake – probably before we added the special meeting a few weeks ago

Wharram – did Jemmie mention that Rep. Phillips wanted the Admissions Director present during his visit?

Stowell – not sure

Abebe – she can help us better understand the impact of the budget impasse on recruitment & admissions.

Stowell – thank you for attending. Meeting is adjourned.

Future Guests:

March 29th: Representative Reggie Phillips

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