

3-29-2016

March 29, 2016

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 29, 2016" (2016). *Minutes*. 1074.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1074

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
March 29th, 2016, 2:05 – 3:25 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:05 PM
- Welcome = J. Robertson, Senate Chair
 - Senators in Attendance = T. Abebe, D. Brandt, T. Bruns, N. Hugo, B. Lawrence, J. Ludlow, S. Mitrovki, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, A. Rosenstein, S. Scher, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Waller
 - Student Reps in Attendance = S. Simpson and J. Smith
 - Guests in Attendance = President D. Glassman, A. Haynes (DEN), Provost Blair Lord (AA), M. Izadi (LCBAS)
- II. Approval of Minutes from March 1st, 2016 2:30-2:35 PM
- Motion – Abebe (1st) & Bruns (2nd)
 - All in Favor? (12)
 - Abstentions – Robertson, Brandt (2)
- III. Committee Reports
1. Executive Committee 2:05-2:30 PM
- a. Discussion of Letter from President Glassman
- P. Glassman – background on the rationale for the letter. I have been receiving numerous communications/letters from parents and students about the future of EIU. In addition, students are receiving diverse messages from faculty in class about EIU’s future. There are even reports of teachers crying in class about EIU’s future. I decided to address a letter to the faculty. I started drafting the letter before Spring Break. I decided it would be a good idea to share my sentiment, and then invite the Faculty Senate to participate in the statement in a recent FAC SEN EXEC Board meeting. A few edits later is what you have in front of you. Apparently, it has already been circulated to the campus and community (accidentally). So now it’s a letter that I almost have to send, and I believe in the intent of the letter. The current situation we face has already impacted student thought processing and decision-making in regards to the Fall 2016 semester. We are going to be open in the Fall. Please know that there are several bills being discussed in Springfield related to funding Higher Education. Hopefully one will be approved in order to resolve this situation. I don’t think we will have to go through this again in the future. In the sense of shared governance and because of the clout you have, I reached out to work on it together.
 - Stowell – motion to support the letter
 - Brandt – second the motion
 - Abebe – based on experience, I try to look at documents very carefully. In addition, I would suggest maintaining the tradition of keeping separate the duties of Faculty Senate and UPI. Third line – a few word changes are proposed – change to - ‘rapidly implement changes to meet the challenge’
 - Glassman – we have made that adjustment during the past week, but the current statement was added. But willing to change as you proposed.
 - Waller – if we don’t receive 16-17 funding, provide a sketch of what the procedures would be to make the necessary adjustments to EIU
 - Glassman – if no 16 or 17 funding is received a financial emergency would have to be declared and consulting with CUPB, FAC SEN, and EIU administration would need to take place to make serious decisions – a revised model of EIU would need to be created. CUPB data from a few years ago could prove helpful in that sort of circumstance.
 - Waller – so faculty would have a substantial role in that process?
 - Glassman - absolutely
 - Mitrovski – I am against endorsing the letter – I am not sure what we are endorsing? Your thoughts? Our thoughts? Not sure what we are endorsing here – nobody knows what is going to happen – while I am against colleagues sharing misinformation, I cannot keep people/colleagues from sharing their thoughts – whether positive or negative about EIU’s future - that is in violation of freedom of speech.
 - Glassman – the intent was not to prevent faculty in sharing their thoughts or limiting their rights. All I am asking is for you to support positive sentiments.
 - Mitrovski – not sure about endorsing a sentiment in faculty senate? Not sure that is the job of faculty senate
 - Robertson – recalled email from James Ochwa-Echel – he supports you and the letter, but students are seeing the budget situation so he hopes that one element of the letter would be to add a statement in the letter that would concisely and accurately convey the budget situation for the students.

Glassman – the letter started out as a communication between me and the faculty, not with the students and/or the community. Not a mandate ‘to do’ or ‘not to do’ something, or think a certain way.

Wharram – agreed – I did not read this letter as a legislative mandate – to not discuss the real problems. Suggestion = I ‘invite you to join’ vs ‘ask you to join’ us in trying to stay optimistic about EIU’s future. I am still concerned when I hear students tell me that they have heard faculty and others telling them that they should be transferring. Faculty need to think twice before doing that. This letter invites faculty, in some ways, to think twice, and to consider the long-term health of EIU as well.

Ludlow – in agreement, suggesting a small revision in the last sentence in the third paragraph – focusing on the positive invitation. Sometimes what people hear and what they say are not always the same. “Our ability to remain positive during these challenging times could have a...fill in something more positive...effect on EIU’s enrollment for Fall 2016”.

Scher – I have never told a student to transfer to another university – but we don’t know what is happening in the long-term for EIU. We encourage students that we will be here in the fall semester, but nothing is certain (*referring to FAQs on EIU President Website). Are we denying what could potentially happen in the fall without the state appropriation?

Glassman – we will be open in the Fall of 2016. With no appropriation, we will have to restructure.

Scher – I plan to be here in the Fall, but we can’t guarantee this to students – I agree and support putting out a positive message about EIU for Fall 2016 but somewhat reluctant to endorse this letter – since we are independent governing body from EIU administration, maybe the Senate authoring their own version of the letter would be a better alternative?

Stowell – I like the letter. It’s the first time I have been reassured that we will be open in Fall 2016 (to the extent that is possible) with or without state funding. This is the first time that I have heard this – open in some way or another – that confidence is important - If we endorse the letter, it would help to avoid having to write our own.

Waller – I like the letter – I agree with P. Glassman’s analysis – when I vote on this letter that is what I will be expressing through my vote.

Bruns – I think we all know pessimists in our lives – the ‘glass half empty’ person – this type of person can impact EIU students and their decisions - I support the president’s letter. Also – based on recent primary election results, there should be an additional two votes supporting higher education funding bills in Springfield. Recent bills have lost veto override attempts by two votes. Primaries hopefully made a difference.

Smith – provides student perspective of this situation – we are trying to keep an optimistic attitude with students that we interact with. Students are already stressed enough with classes. The EIU situation creates additional stress. I do support the letter, or Faculty Senate writing their own. But it’s true – faculty suggesting students to transferring creates more stress and uncertainty.

Lawrence – I agree with the student sentiments. But I feel it more appropriate in Faculty Senate writing our own letter.

Robertson – let’s vote on the President’s letter

Glassman – I have no problem with making the ‘friendly amendment’ suggestions.

Wharram – and I would suggest that ‘exact language’ is not needed here

Bruns – and there is value in presenting unity to EIU faculty by supporting this letter

Rosenstein – we can make changes, but it still feels like we have to take sides on the issue – between President’s Glassman’s side or the other – the letter still seems divisive as it is written. If there is a joint letter, and the language used is more unified, that is something different. Would it be more problematic for some students and staff who don’t have all the information important to decide their future at EIU – provides an example of a student approaching her about possibly transferring. A lack of info makes it difficult to answer questions of concerned students that are approaching us.

* Motion for Faculty Senate to Endorse President Glassman’s Letter:

Yes – Oliver, Wharram, Bruns, Robertson, Stowell, Brandt, Waller, Ludlow, Abebe, Scher, Hugo (11)

No – Lawrence, Mitrovski, Rosenstein (3)

- Robertson – FAC SEN EXEC COMM meeting with P. Glassman - \$6000 expense to hire consultant to examine EIU athletics. Funds to pay the bill came from NCAA distributions - money received can only be used for athletics purposes. P. Glassman is considering recommendations of the consultant(s).

Anticipate announcement/conclusions by April 15th.

Scher – was report publicized?

Roberston – no, report not published/publicized. President Glassman and EIU Athletics Director consulting on this now

Rosenstein – so is the EIU Athletics AD-HOC committee on Athletics still necessary?

Robertson – suggestion is to have AD-HOC committee meet with Pres. Glassman and EIU AD in the near future to discuss questions/concerns that you have. Another thought is that perhaps forming the committee may have brought fiscal issues and other aspects of the report to the forefront to Pres. Glassman.

Abebe – when new presidents are appointed, usually they want to know how ‘clean’ the athletics department is functioning. This might have something to do with this activity.

Scher – I think the AD-HOC committee on Athletics should stay active – especially as the President announces conclusions and recommendations.

Waller – do you know if Pres. Glassman’s view on NCAA D1 vs DII classification is changing?

Robertson – P. Glassman did have the consultant analyze this. Still being analyzed – significant cost savings were not immediately identified from moving from D1 to DII.

Stowell – I would also encourage the committee to continue functioning – some of the issues in the annual report are longer standing issues that are independent and still need to be addressed.

Robertson – the committee will still be useful to have discussions on these issues – hypothetically, if athletics was not changed, then discussions will be needed, as well as if teams were cut – to help student-athletes transition

Oliver – encourages the Ad-Hoc committee to continue to work with the IAB

Scher – but their focus is somewhat different and they are not faculty elected, rather appointed

Robertson – IAB members are appointed and not elected?

Scher – correct, by the FAR (Jim Davis) and the EIU AD

Brandt – I think there was a recent change to that, where they would be appointed by Faculty Senate

Oliver – a member of the Faculty Senate nominations committee is supposed to meet with the FAR and now the President to review and to fill IAB candidates. Having served on the IAB, there are faculty colleagues that are concerned student-athlete well-being and the budget situation that EIU Athletics faces. Greater collaboration is still encouraged.

Scher – I still want to protect our role as elected representatives of our faculty

Stowell – comments on tuition changes and student fees proposals – any changes will now go through the student sub-committee that will review any proposed changes to tuition or fees

2. Nominations Committee

2:35-3:00 PM

- Rosenstein – reviews procedures for filling nominated (appointed) committee vacancies – usually occurs shortly after Faculty elections.

3. Elections Committee

- Stowell - reviews personnel challenges with the online elections process. However, current system is in place and it has been tested – should be ready to use. He reviews positions and # of candidates for each. *3 positions have no candidates. Hopefully those positions, if not filled in this election cycle, will be filled in the fall. Most popular committee this year (surprise, surprise) = Academic Program Elimination Review Committee

- Ludlow – suggestions on the three vacancies – an email sent to individuals in that particular voting unit has proven helpful in recruiting a few candidates

- Oliver – what will happen this fall with online system based on the staff changes?

- Stowell – results will come from a supervisor of the staff member leaving – there is a pathway that has been created for the process so that a different staff member can use in the Fall

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee

- Waller – no report

5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

- Waller – no report

6. Awards Committee

- Hugo – Lynn Curry has been identified as the 2016 Distinguished Faculty Award recipient

- Hugo – motions for approval of Dr. Curry as candidate, Ludlow seconds

- Oliver, Wharram, Bruns, Robertson, Stowell, Brandt, Waller, Ludlow, Abebe, Lawrence, Mitrovski, Rosenstein, Scher, Hugo – 14 - *unanimous*

- Hugo – will circulate news later tonight

7. Faculty Forum Committee

- Bruns – reports on progress of proposed program planning – tried to get former Gov. Edgar, now trying to get Senator Righter for April program. Not sure if he has accepted. Will touch based with planning committee. If this program falls through, are we interested in pursuing a different topic?

- Abebe – suggests it is too late in the year to change direction or focus

8. Budget Transparency Committee

- Abebe – no report

9. Constitution and By-Laws Review Committee

- Robertson – did we vote to disband the committee?

- Scher - Our business is done for now but we could reconvene in the future.

- Scher – are we voting on the CFR amendment in the Spring 2016 faculty elections?

- Robertson – we should be but it was an oversight on our part

- Scher – maybe we can push the opening back and add it to the elections?

- Stowell – we can try – I will contact ITS staff to see if it is possible – I will need the finalized language for it

10. Committee on Committees

- Robertson – disbanded this committee?

- Stowell – it was an ad-hoc committee, we completed our objective, vote probably not needed to disband

11. Ad-hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

- Rosenstein/Wharram – no report

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from March 1st, 2016

2. Letter from President Glassman Seeking Senate Endorsement

3. CAA Minutes, February 25th, March 3rd, and March 10th

V. Provost's Address: Provost Blair Lord

3:00-3:05 PM

- Lord – Dean of CAH announcement this morning. Anita Shelton, chair of History, has agreed to serve as the interim dean of that college for the coming year. Please welcome/support her. Associate Dean search for the COS has been completed – Michael Cornebise will assume that position. Those two cover large positions. In response to the question of who will provide technical support for future Faculty Senate elections? – We had to make some tough decision lately with staff – individuals essential to the operations of the university. Directly impacting all of us. Others will step in and assist with these types of functions/duties. We hope legislators do their duty and stop this budgetary mess so we can bring some of these essential staff back to campus.

VI. Other Business, TBA

3:05-3:25 PM

- Scher – Enrollment Management Advisory Committee meeting – the message being sent to prospective students considering Eastern – I would suggest that it needs to be more prominent on the EIU homepage. We also received a demonstration of a new, internal client management system (software program) that allows EIU to track, process, and generate data on student recruits – allows admission counselors and director of admissions to create useful graphs, figures, etc on prospective students. Applicable to Faculty - The 'MY EIU' portal can track/target students interested in any of our departments and allows us to directly contact them. Senator Stowell is using the tool to do just that in the Psychology Dept. * Most important current task = to be open in the Fall we need to get students to decide to attend EIU next year. We can help in the process. The enrollment data looks decent, but predictably less favorable than last year.

- Lord – under current circumstances, the 'funnel' admission numbers look decent. But the longer the current fiscal situation continues, the worse those numbers will look. Chatted with Deans today - we are also trying to identify someone in each department to take a proactive approach with this process.

- Scher – Textbook Rental Advisory Committee – several topics discussed, main focus was on the future of electronic materials like textbooks and activity books on our campus. Textbooks are only one factor involved in electronic resources. How this is managed will be a main focus of discussion by that committee in the foreseeable future. Also –

the TRS is down to two permanent staff members – will hire temps during the ‘busy’ season. This was shocking to me. It creates some ‘awe’ based on what Susan Allen has done for me and other faculty colleagues in the recent past. Finally, surprisingly in fiscal year 2015 the TRS fee was reduced from 9.95 to 9.75 per semester hour. That was done as a way to shift money to a different fee. I could not find out actually which fee the money was shifted to. Probably done during the fee increase debacle of this past spring (2015) (?). The TRSA committee will meet again before the end of the semester. Send us questions/concerns so I can bring them to the committee at the next meeting on April 15th.

Robertson – there are interactive texts in my discipline – is the big issue the ‘cost structure’ of these types of texts?

Scher – yes, that’s the biggest issue. The annual fee for an e-book undercuts the TRS financial model. From my own experience, I am using a textbook + web quizzing supplement – not sure of the agreement that TRS has established but the agreement is allowing us to have access to the materials beyond the normal time period. Maybe arrangements with major academic publishers will be the path to take in the future? *Point – as of now, the TRS model and e-resources is not going to work well.

Ludlow – recruitment-retention comment = in the English Dept. several faculty created handout with talking points to those students considering transferring – we have permission to make this handout public – I will send it if you are interested - it doesn’t ‘sugar-coat’ the problem, but the handout provides practical points for students to consider when thinking about transferring because of the current issue EIU is challenged with.

Bruns – question on TRS – have you been in contract with Booth Library about negotiations with publishers? We are experienced with negotiations with vendors and publishers. Contact Sarah Johnson at Booth Library.

Robertson – we meet next week and April 19th. Rep Phillips could not be here today but has proposed Monday, May 9th (*the week after finals week).

Scher – and we also may need to meet later in the summer if current conditions don’t change.

VII. Adjournment no later than 3:25 PM

- Chair Robertson

IX. Future Dates and Guests:

* Upcoming Spring 2016 Faculty Senate Sessions: April 5th & 19th

* Proposed Summer Meeting Date: Monday, May 9th with Representative Phillips

Submitted by J. Oliver, Senate Recorder