

10-4-2016

October 4, 2016

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "October 4, 2016" (2016). *Minutes*. 1066.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1066

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.

EIU Faculty Senate Session Minutes
October 4th, 2016, 2:00 – 3:50 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 PM
- Welcome = Jemmie Robertson, Chair
 - Attending Senators = T. Abebe, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, N. Hugo, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, A. Rosenstein, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, J. Waller, C. Wharram, B. Young
 - Attending Guests = G. Aylesworth (Phil), J. Blitz (Chem), M. Izadi (LCBAS), B. Lord (AA), S. Nusbaum (DEN)
- II. Approval of Minutes from September 20th, 2016 2:00-2:05 PM
- Motion = J. Stowell
 - Seconded = B. Young
 - Discussion = B. Young - Positive feedback about level of detail of minutes
 - Vote Results = Yes (13), No (0), Abstentions (1) = Rosenstein
- III. Committee Reports
1. Executive Committee 2:05-2:10 PM
- a. CIUS Meeting Volunteer
- Robertson – any volunteers to represent us in the CIUS meeting next Monday October 10 via digital web teleconferencing? All executive committee members are tied up in obligation.
 - Robertson – executive committee is still attempting to meet with President Glassman. Scheduling conflicts have kept us from meeting recently. He is attending the next Faculty Senate session on Oct 18.
 - Rosenstein – I may be available, at least during 9-11 am, so I will be in touch.
- b. Provost's Address: Provost Blair Lord 2:10-2:15 PM
- B. Lord – update on Assoc VP for enrollment mgmt. search – 4 candidates will visit campus starting on October 11th. Open session for each will be hosted. Provost search request from President Glassman – you will be discussing later, and EIU BOT approved use of consulting firm to assist with the process.
- Robertson – curious about your thoughts on constitution of work group #7? (4 faculty, 4 non-faculty).
- Lord – Your constitution is correct. President added one faculty member from each college. It's ultimately the President's decision. No further comments at this time.
- Robertson – update on status of Redden Grants?
- Lord – applications are at the Foundation right now. Enough foundation funds available to fund approximately 2/3 will be funded this year. Chairs and Deans ranked the applications, and I largely accept the rankings, and then submit to the EIU Foundation. A few time-sensitive proposals were requested to be expedited through the process.
2. Elections Committee 2:15-2:30 PM
- Stowell – no report
3. Faculty-Student Relations Committee
- Waller – will meet with Luke Young and Student Government in the near future
4. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee
- Corrigan – no report
5. Awards Committee
- Hugo – a few applications received for annual Mendez award. Will re-send announcement.
 - Oliver – should I re-send the email announcement to faculty?
 - Hugo – yes please.
 - Robertson – response rate so far?
 - Hugo – just a few but last year we had a late rush of submissions
 - Robertson – implies that we as faculty operate in a similar fashion as students? (smiles)
 - Oliver – asks Booth Library senators about the awards displays on main level of Booth – both have no more room to add recognitions for award winning faculty (Mendez, Distinguished Faculty, Faculty Laureate, etc)
 - Bruns & Corrigan – we will check with Library admin
 - Lord – Dean Lanham supports the recognition spaces, and will most likely support additional display boards.

- Bruns – did we find resolve the financial award for DFA?
- Robertson – still figuring that out.
- Hugo – this has been discussed, and myself and B. Young looking into it
- B. Young – correct, still trying to resolve

6. Faculty Forum Committee

- a. Bruns - Forum Scheduled on Wednesday, October 12th, 4PM-6PM in the MLK Union Charleston/Mattoon Room, Statements from and Q&A with Candidates Reggie Phillips (4 pm) and Dennis Malak (5 pm). Speech followed by Q & A for each candidate. L. Young will assist with student senate involvement.
Robertson – press releases to announce the event would be helpful
Bruns – will do

7. Budget Transparency Committee (*BTC)

- Sterling - Questions concerning Vitalization Project Data Sets – it probably aligns with John Blitz’s presentation – similar concerns
- Robertson – there also may be some connection to questions from Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics

8. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

- Wharram – we met this past week. List of questions created – will reach out to Jim Davis (FAR) and the IAB for possible discussion/answers.

9. Nominations Committee

- Rosenstein – no other request beyond President Glassman’s request for Provost Search Committee
- Robertson – I shared email about the Provost search committee earlier today – President Glassman has requested two names from the Faculty Senate (*See comments under ‘Communications’ below)

IV. Conversation with UPI President Jon Blitz 2:35-3:00 PM

- Blitz – this is a 3 part presentation (referring to PowerPoint presentation being projected)
- Blitz – we are ‘mutual constituents’ – I will start out by talking to you as my constituent, then I will change ‘hats’ during the presentation...
- Blitz – common question to UPI - what is UPI’s role in the Vitalize EIU Project? – UPI exec comm meeting next Tuesday at 445 pm in Casey Room of MLK Union to discuss this very question. Please attend and share opinions/concerns/questions.
- Blitz – the Vitalization project does not violate any contractual stipulation of the collective bargaining agreement with EIU administration. Most may suggest the process is a good idea, as long as it is done thoughtfully and properly. So UPI has ‘limited to no’ role in the process although all of us could be largely affected by this process. All of us (and you) need to pay close attention to the process – especially if there are any potential violations of the bargaining agreement and we have to fight a battle on the back end of the process. Let’s watch closely and stay aware of what is happening in the work groups.
- Blitz – my current concern is work group #7 and Article #18 of the current agreement (Department Reorganization and/or Academic Program Elimination/Reorganization Review Committee). If any academic programs are proposed for elimination, the proposal must move through the appropriate committee established for this potential purpose. I would recommend that work group #7 keeps UPI updated on what is going on related to this.
- Rosenstein – will the DEN have reps at each work group meeting?
- DEN rep – we will try
- Sterling – this will be difficult based on how many work groups and meetings will be held – too hard to cover
- Rosenstein – work group schedules and summaries of meeting activities will be publicized and posted
- Blitz – now let me change roles – let me talk to you as your constituent - I have concerns about academic dept profit/loss statements vs EIU Athletics profit and loss statements. I know that the Budget Transparency sub-committee is also looking at this very closely.
- Blitz – projects on the screen example of an academic department profit/loss statement – typical revenues and expenses. Revenues – Expenses = profit or loss for this academic department. (Salaries – Tuition rev)
- Blitz – projects EIU Intercollegiate Athletics profit/loss statement – brings up significant concerns about the accounting practices of EIU athletics – Points out revenues and expenses for EIU athletics. EIU athletics does not teach any courses yet they are claiming tuition revenue from student-athletes. *Therefore - tuition revenue is being double-counted (academic departments and EIU athletics). Academic departments do not

count student fees as income. Athletics are counting student fees, housing, and dining fees in their 'revenues'—giving themselves credit for the revenue raised from these sources (*most likely these revenue sources are also being counted by Housing and Dining). EIU athletics accounting practices, over time, leads to a grossly inflated view of revenue generation at EIU, and within their own department.

- Wharram – the accounting challenge is that all these academic spreadsheets were created by one person – Candice Flatt - while athletics creates their own spreadsheets made under different conditions - not transparent and very confusing. Candice created thousands of spreadsheet rows and columns for the vitalization project. Main issue is Ledger 1 vs other Ledger data. Candice will present data to work groups. Problem = Two separate entities are creating data sets based on radically different premises.
- Wharram – question – why are scholarships subtracted from department tuition? Goal – making the pluses and minuses added up – decisions made in accounting.
- Wharram – the Ledger 1 data is valuable that Candice Flatt organized. We need to bridge this gap between these two accounting practices.
- Eckert – any concerns about athletics department taking credit for fees, housing, and dining?
- Rosenstein – she did not include it in her numbers
- Eckert – why would athletic department credit itself for this?
- Rosenstein – makes comparison to an academic department that is bringing in highly skilled students
- Wharram – there needs to be an accurate way to account for when athletics brings in student-athletes – who or what department gets credit for revenue generated in these situations. All work groups need to operate from the same assumptions on this.
- Bruns – student-athletes pay tuition for academics, not sports. Athletics should not be counting tuition at all.
- L Young – who is doing the accounting for athletics?
- Abebe – dangerous conversation – we have made this a 'cost' issue – we continue to move in this same direction – we should not spend much time debating 'where' the funds are silloved or the accuracy of the data – for the most part it is accurate - we have an obligation to form the opinion of the campus into a 'growth' issue rather than a 'cost' issue – that's the direction I believe we need this conversation to go
- Rosenstein – we need to have some faith in our colleagues that will be reviewing the financial data – uses Special Education department as an example of a department that make a significant impact on this campus and to the mission of the university - but may not generate a surplus (profit) or might be showing an annual operational deficit. I know this process is about cost, but what about 'mission' of our campus? I have confidence in my colleagues evaluating the data, and that they will not be making decisions that will negatively impact the mission of the university, or academic departments that are central to the campus.
- Abebe – agreed – but the more we talk about 'cost', the more dangerous this process becomes
- Waller – I think in the end decisions will be about 'cost', that's why the numbers are disturbing – especially if decisions will be made from this data
- Abebe – makes additional discussion point
- Bruns – in order for the process to work out, we have to have good information, and EIU athletics data is highly questionable – methods of collecting data between academics vs athletics is too different
- Wharram – I think this is rectifiable – we need to correct this immediately rather than wait – also there are other ledgers to consider as well (ex – fundraising, external grants, etc).
- Sterling – when the Budget Transparency Committee met to review the data, we immediately created a long series of concerns about the process – two different methodologies – President Glassman made initial choices that have resulted in this data being created and revealed without consulting faculty – work groups are already looking at this data – the data is fundamentally flawed – just like John Blitz highlighted to us - all of these problems could have been solved with faculty involvement prior to publicizing it – looks like administration wants the data that work groups have available to them to look good for athletics and not so good for academic departments – which leads to inaccurate conclusions and poor decisions.
- Gosse – let's look at the 'win-win' here – there is a tension between academics and athletics – we have different missions – apples vs oranges - why is athletics in this conversation? I am all for accurate data, and it needs to tell a story? We don't report to athletics. Athletics is part of the university but why can't we focus on having the right data. Let's get the right data so it can tell the right story. This process has four levels of recommendations (possible outcomes). I understand the tension but are we taking on a big burden if we take on athletics data?
- Bruns – not sure it's that huge of a burden to try to correct athletics data. Shares thoughts on the data within the context of the process – needs to be reported to committee chair work groups
- Sterling – happy you brought up OSU – that athletics department makes an actual profit every year – they can do their own thing - but at EIU realistically athletics loses money every year – if we leave them out of the conversation than academics will absorb any and all proposed cuts.

- Wharram – we need to figure out how EIU athletics generated their data. Also – this data was produced to ‘write their (athletics) story’ that you are talking about (to Gosse)
- Waller – should we resolve that working groups be provided better data from EIU athletics before decisions are made? So we can compare ‘apples to apples’?
- Hugo – should we request a uniform report from athletics?
- Eckert – work group 4 is the only committee evaluating athletics data – adds additional comments
- Waller – but the athletics data is relevant to many different work groups
- Lord – observations on the data – it’s tied to Banner – ledger 1 – Athletics data was put together by the Business Office not the academic office. Vitalize project will look at all aspects of the university. Comments on academic units at the university that are or are not cost centers – like facilities. There exist inherent contradictions in higher education when attempting to compare departments. Academic units are inherently enterprises, but all other units are cost centers.
- Bruns – if we had a more accurate accounting statement from athletics, we could make more accurate conclusions. But the athletics data needs to be cleaned up, it’s too wildly different. It needs to be rectified
- Wharram – it (athletics data) just looks bad – generated in such a radically different way.
- Stowell – this data creates additional questions about Housing and Dining data? Facilities costs?
- Wharram – they don’t have the same spreadsheets. Ex - Student housing is a zero-sum method.
- Robertson – we need to ask for conclusions from the consultant that visiting campus last spring to evaluate EIU athletics
- Waller – asks on motion again? Should we do anything at this time?
- Hugo – but work groups are already meeting – the sooner the better to make a request
- Bruns – and the athletics data is offensive to most faculty
- Abebe – is it because it is based on political motives?
- Robertson – asks question on per student tuition revenue # indicated on athletics budget document
- Wharram – comments on differences between budget docs in IAB report and the athletics data here
- Bruns – suggestion - communicate with work group chairs about this concern and concerns our BTC raised
- Abebe – we want to avoid being accused of corrupting the process
- Oliver – comments about how the data looks very similar to data presented by the former EIU VP of students affairs back in 2015
- Waller – what should we do at this point in time?
- Bruns – communicating concerns with work group chairs including email from Grant Sterling in behalf of our BTC
- Stowell – motion – work group #4 – critically dependent on athletics data – the chair of the committee requests clarification and potential recalculation of the data – the work group has the authority to ask for this
- Hugo – second the motion
- Waller – friendly amendment – add language that suggests the current data is incomplete/unclear
- Bruns – should we send the concerns of our BTC to work group #4 and encourage the committee to ask for clarification/answers
- Eckert – agrees and add related comments
- Wharram – note - a change of the data might lead to revenue being deducted for scholarship student-athletes from academic department profit/loss statements. The pluses and minuses must add up across the budget documents.
- Robertson – reads the motion related to workgroup #4 request for accurate athletics data – see BTC concerns that will be attached to the recommendation
- Oliver – points out discrepancies between # of student athletes listed in IAB report vs Vitalize data (402 v 499)
- Corrigan – note – the assistant comptroller is the chair of work group #4 and this is the source of the athletics data
- Vote on Motion for ‘Athletics Data Request for Work Group #4’ – read by Chair Robertson
- Yes = (13), No = (0) (*Rosenstein needed to leave by 3 pm)

V. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from September 20th, 2016
2. CAA Minutes from September 22nd, 2016
3. Communication from President Glassman regarding Provost Search Committee
Robertson – requesting 2 names from Faculty Senate – will select one. Teshome has offered his name and I will gladly volunteer as well. Suggest that these be individuals not serving on a work group to even out the work load.
Rosenstein – I nominate Sue Gosse
Gosse – I appreciate that but graciously must decline

Bruns – I second J. Robertson as the 2nd name
 Robertson – any other nominations?
 Eckert – formal motion to nominate Abebe and Robertson for Provost Search Committee
 Bruns – I second the motion
 Rosenstein – I respectfully ask you both of you to leave so we can discuss the nominate candidates
 Senate discussion on candidates
 Bruns – both would be highly effective and I support both
 Candidates return to the room
 Motion Voting = unanimous support for both candidates
 Sterling = concern - composition of Provost search committee looks to be ‘light’ on faculty. Rep from Pres. Council, a Dean, a Chair, rep from CGS, rep from COTE, rep from Fac Sen, rep from Student Affairs, rep from Business Affairs...etc...the majority of this committee could consist of non-faculty members – that’s concerning to me. Provost duties are varied but I suggest that a Provost should be selected by a committee consisting mostly of faculty members.
 Robertson – I motion that we send President Glassman, along with our two nominations, a statement (adapted from the wording of last week’s message) that state that ‘the Provost search committee should consist primarily of faculty members’.
 Eckert – could we also comment on the fact that our last statement/suggestion was politely ignored. There are members of workgroup #7 that surprised me. It’s a critical workgroup yet our suggestion was ignored.
 Robertson – I would be willing to communicate with the President that we (Fac Sen) was disappointed in the constitution of work group #7
 Young – also concerned – there is only one senior academic on work group #7
 Waller – is this committee (WG #7) supposed to make a recommendation or assess strengths/weaknesses?
 Robertson – not sure the exact role of the provost search committee vs consulting firm
 Sterling – last presidential search committee made recommendations after the search firm accumulated candidates
 Waller – makes related comment
 Robertson – anyone second the motion? Or should we drop it?
 Sterling – if you are making a motion on Provost search committee statement about faculty involvement, I second the motion.
 Robertson – re-reads his motion for provost search committee – suggesting ‘greater faculty representation for optimal functioning of the committee’
 Rosenstein – I think given the current organization of EIU, the motion makes sense, but we don’t know what President Glassman’s plans are for future re-organization of the university. He has not shared those plans with us. Can we add appropriate wording to this motion recognizing this? (this would be a ‘friendly amendment’)
 Robertson – valid point – making a recommendation will hopefully be considered and not ‘offend’ – he is obviously not bound by our recommendation
 Gosse – we can have this dialogue with him at the next Fac Senate meeting?
 Bruns – the other side of this is that President Glassman may feel that he did respond to our work group #7 recommendation
 Corrigan – why did he have to add?
 Bruns – adds more comments
 Sterling – reviews composition of work group #7
 Wharram – great question for two weeks from now
 Eckert – asks questions about current work group 7 members – are there four academic faculty? S. Stephens?
 L. Young – I know Scott Stephens from LCBAS
 Robertson – we have a motion and a second? Vote on original amendment or with friendly amendment?
 Sterling – go directly to the re-worded proposal for provost search committee with friendly amendment
 Robertson – re-reads recommendation for provost search committee composition
 Yes = (13), No = (0), Abstentions = (Wharram)
 Motion passes.

4. Communication from Grant Sterling concerning Questions from the Budget Transparency Committee concerning Vitalization Project Data Sets. (*aligns with conversation with UPI President John Blitz)

VI. Other business, if time allows

1. Faculty Senate future staffing level and representation discussion
 - a. Forthcoming proposal by Senator Jemmie Robertson to be introduced and discussed

Robertson – simple proposal to replace 5 senators each year on Faculty Senate with 4 senators – after 3 years Faculty Senate would be downsized to a total of 12. It may correspond with any proposed CUPB downsizing.

Sterling – should we downsize at the same percentage as CUPB

Robertson – proposal is being written to downsize CUPB from 23 to 12, might be too significant for Faculty Senate

Waller – agree with the proposal – small committees are more efficient

Bruns – smaller committees are better, except for Faculty Senate – value in the differing opinions

Wharram – I agree with that sentiment

Stowell – noted – but EIU faculty #s have dropped 20-25% in the last 5 years

Bruns – recognized but I don't think Faculty Senate should be downsized – too important of a role in shared governance

Robertson – will revisit in a future meeting

VII. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

Fall 2016: Oct. 18th (with President Glassman, TBA), Nov. 1st & 15th, Dec. 6th