

10-18-2016

October 18, 2016

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "October 18, 2016" (2016). *Minutes*. 1065.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1065

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 Agenda
October 18th, 2016, 2:00 – 3:50 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 PM
Welcome – Chair J. Robertson
Senators in Attendance – Abebe, Corrigan, Eckert, Gosse, Hugo, Hung, Oliver, Robertson, Rosenstein, Sterling, Stowell, Waller, Wharram, B. Young, B Berglund (Student Senate), L. Young (SVPAA),
Guests in Attendance – G. Aylesworth (PHI), J. Blitz (UPI), L. Burnhum (Journ), C. Flatt (AA), A. Haynes (DEN), D. Klarup (COS), B. Lord (AA), S. Park (ENG), A. Shelton (CAH), TML Scholz (CMN, WST, LASP),
- II. Approval of Minutes from October 4th, 2016 2:00-2:05 PM
Approval of Minutes – Eckert & Wharram
Comments/Edits – Robertson - last page of minutes – concerns our brief discussion last time about downsizing Faculty Senate and potentially CUPB – ‘might be too significant for Faculty Senate’ – clarification = ‘that proportional amount of downsizing for Faculty Senate might make the senate too small’
Vote – All in attendance except Hung
Absention - Hung
- III. Committee Reports
1. Executive Committee 2:05-2:10 PM
- a. President Glassman’s Address 2:10-3:00 PM
- Appreciate opportunity to meet with you today. Have received a variety of communications, many related to data relevant to EIU Vitalize project. Here to present, clarify, and listen to concerns from the Faculty Senate and the Budget Transparency Committee regarding data for Workgroup #4 and #7.
- P. Glassman – I firmly don’t agree with some of the conclusions of the B.T.C regarding the P/Ls for academic and athletic units. I do believe the data is accurate and helps answers at least some of the questions that need to be answered for this project. The academic P/Ls and athletic P/L are only ‘one piece’ of information under assessment for larger decisions to be made. I hope you and the work groups realize this. The P/Ls are not a sole criterion to be used for decision or recommendation to be made about academic departments. However, I firmly believe that the P/L info is important for review by subcommittees. Provides some examples of where/when the P/L data would be useful. Identifies C. Flatt and P. McCann as staff that have been asked to create the P/L statements.
- P. Glassman – Further discusses concerns brought forward in the BTC document. Understood – the P/L documents are unable to answer ‘all questions’ involved in the vitalization process. The P/Ls do provide only one view of the current situation.
- P. Glassman – is everyone clear on the P/L methodology? Or should I review it right now?
- B. Young – that would be useful (to review)
- P. Glassman – the P/L docs were developed to analyze EIU Ledger 1 revenues/expenses (true dollars) generated by each department. Scenarios could be a net (positive) or loss (negative). First scenario – how much tuition revenue generated by students taking courses in academic departments – analyzing real dollars from tuition. Total tuition revenue = gross tuition in Ledger 1 per department. Reminder - not every student pays the same in real dollars – which has been a real concern of the Faculty Senate BTC. Scholarships and waivers are removed from department P/Ls. Why? – department does not control who gets a scholarship. Second scenario – tuition revenue (real dollar) generation by students per academic major regardless of which class they are taking across campus, subtracted by Ledger 1 expenses. In both of these scenarios, revenue is subtracted from departmental expenses, but does not count ‘overhead’ costs (like facility maintenance) – just simple ledger 1 expenses. In both of these scenarios real revenue is brought in – including Pell and MAP money-although unsure of MAP \$ in the future. Hopefully will be received. Now on to answers to BTC questions regarding the methodology.
- P. Glassman – first question to be answered – ‘why are scholarships and waivers deducted from departments?’. Answer - Spreadsheet scenarios only look at ‘real’ ledger 1 dollars received by EIU – we did this to see what the ‘real dollar compliment’ was to the university or to the department. Could this be done without scholarships and waivers included? – yes. The spreadsheet is transparent – it identifies amount of scholarships and waivers on the document. The data is on the website and available.

P. Glassman – problem with that is that it converts the analysis to something different than a gross profit analysis (or ‘real’ profit analysis) – but some of the dollars never were received by the academic department. So it would be called something else at this point

P. Glassman – next question dealt with ‘high performing students’ – many majors have high-performing students (scholars) – does taking off the scholarships from the P/L docs penalize the department? – not necessarily the case – the administration will consider the high quality scholarship students in a particular department and understand that their scholarship \$s are not included in the P/L – this will be considered in a different criterion

P. Glassman – another question was related to external grant dollars – how are they being considered/credited for an academic department? – the BTC was concerned about not counting that money in the P/Ls. Answer = grants and contracts are not ledger 1 revenues, but are ‘zero sum’ revenue activities. Used to pay for research expenses (supplies, sometimes buying research time for faculty)

P. Glassman - Provides additional comments about how research money won’t be captured in the P/L docs. But it will be considered in the holistic evaluation of the academic department – this is highly meritorious for departments = Will be considered in the ‘totality’ of the evaluation process.

P. Glassman – next question about senior seminars – who gets credited for the tuition revenue generated? Answer – the tuition revenue generated from the course goes to the department of the instructor.

P. Glassman – what about study abroad courses? Treated like any other course. Tuition revenue credit will be given to the appropriate department based on the class subject code (ex = Art). Reminder - these programs are also ‘zero sum’ activities. Any excess \$ are supposed to be returned to students.

P. Glassman – next question - what about data from non-appropriated ledgers (gifts/scholarships)? Misleading? No – if revenue sources are included from other ledgers (Ledger 2 or other), then expenses should also be included as well (“zero sum”). Ex = large donor gift accounts exist in some departments – at some point the \$ needs to be used. Policy is gift \$ should be used within 2 years.

P. Glassman – next question - what about dep funds spent on GAs that end up benefitting outside departments? Discusses writing center scenario with English GAs staffing the EIU writing center. Answer = the P/Ls don’t have a response for this situation. The chair, dean, and assessment process must account for this type of situation. Discusses another department situation involving tuition waivers from the state for students, which causes a negative P/L assessment. Department needs to bring this up.

P. Glassman – next question is on student-athlete scholarships. Discusses GIA fees and fee distributions by administration. EIU athletics does not tell student-athletes what to major in. Note – EIU athletics must pay for scholarships.

P. Glassman – academic P/Ls don’t take into consideration of other important work of the faculty in departments (research, service, teaching outside home department, etc) – doesn’t that seem unfair?. Probably so – difficult to reflect all credit for all of these valuable activities on the P/L statements. Discusses how some expenses are transferred from one unit to another depending on the situation (Ex – Director of Faculty Development used as an example – expense for those CUs are picked up by the Provost’s office). The CUs are a managerial issue by administrators per department. The Chair has accountability for CUs in the department, and make managerial decisions related to CUs as they see fit.

Rosenstein – thanks for answering these questions. We understand the limitations of the P/Ls. For the last few years much transition across campus – lots of sensitivity has developed (“raw nerves”) due to uncertainty – not knowing future outcomes sets people into a defensive mode – so the P/Ls were circulated first – ‘real-time’ data– indicating that if negative balances existed in departments, cuts would soon follow. Thought of cuts because of negative P/L balances creates questions and anxiety – key question of ‘what makes us a strong university?’ Hard to explain beyond P/Ls – hard to place value on research, service, etc – P/Ls can’t explain the qualitative value within departments. Easy to read P/Ls and make decisions, but not as easy to assess value of research and creative and factor those variables into the decision making process. This factors may have caused the initial response to the P/Ls.

Rosenstein – as a faculty member, we believe that we are ‘all in this together’. We don’t want our students to feel like we are pitting athletics vs academics. Athletics P/Ls were created and interpreted in a different way than the academic departments. ‘Zero sum’ accounting methods were applied to academics but not athletics? Why were the methods different? Use of different methods leads to different conclusions of gross profit and loss statements. It made it appear that athletics received different treatment of what and how they had to report data, along with recent budgetary issues experienced by EIU athletics. This created more tension between academics and athletics.

Rosenstein – I serve on one of the work groups. I can only speak for my work group – we see the P/Ls as only one piece of data to consider in the larger process. I trust my peers that they will look at all of the

data, not just P/Ls. I wonder about other data and info that will be released that will impact decisions in this process. P/Ls went from 'rumor' to 'reality', but they only consider the net profit or loss, nothing qualitative. This is why we are asking these questions.

P. Glassman – thanks for your questions and comments – don't forget that I was a professor, faculty senator, chair, and dean. I've been in your shoes and understand the trepidation felt about the current process. I have lost a job earlier in my career during a major program review – entire department of faculty lost our jobs at Virginia Tech. So I know the gravity of the situation at EIU. However, I also know the importance of looking at data holistically to help us make important decisions. We can't maintain the status quo. Change is needed because we can't support our structure with current tuition dollars.

P. Glassman – athletics is a different entity than academic departments. They almost have to be treated differently than academic units. More like comparing 'apples' and 'oranges'. If we just talk ledger 1 funding with EIU athletics, that department has a \$1.3 million deficit. We provide institutional support to from appropriated dollars to help them balance this annual deficit. This begs the question 'what is their value to the university'? Provides more background on deficits with athletics and change of leadership at EIU. Deficit used to be \$1.8 million a few years back with Dr. Perry. I reduced it to \$1.3 million because of the budget crisis. Discusses difference between ledger 1 and ledger 2 (student fees) funds for athletics. Again refers to comparison between athletics and academics is more like 'apples and oranges'

P. Glassman – discusses ledger 2 monies for athletics. Why do we count housing and dining \$ for athletics? Athletics has ledger 1, 2, 3, & 5 revenues. What's different about intercollegiate athletics than academic departments?

P. Glassman – EIU athletics must pay for their scholarships, housing, and dining expenses in real dollars (cash) to EIU. These expenses are not just waived off a budget doc. Athletics also has to pay for all or most of their overhead costs and deferred maintenance (fields, yards, track, courts, etc). Example of EIU tennis – the athletics department had to pay for the resurfacing of the EIU tennis courts. Another example was the resurfacing of the football field/track a few years ago. Athletics also requires all student-athletes that they have to live in EIU resident halls freshman and sophomore years (not an EIU policy – generates additional housing and dining revenue). Begs the question - Should all EIU fresh and sophomores stay in residence halls? Something to consider – ISU requires this right now. That would benefit EIU housing and dining directly, which could be used to revamping residence halls, which might lead to more students choosing EIU because the on-campus housing would look nicer. Local landlords would be disappointed but we don't conduct business for local landlords directly in mind.

P. Glassman – the major issue/concern from the BTC is about why athletics is getting credit for tuition?

P. Glassman – because EIU athletics incurs the real costs of housing and dining. Seems reasonable that EIU athletics should get credit for that revenue. Currently 499 student-athletes identified by EIU athletics. Vast majority of student-athletes have been recruited by the coaches. Most of EIU athletics teams do not allow walk-ons – nor do they host tryouts. These reasons and others suggest that EIU athletics should benefit from the tuition revenue generated by these students. How much credit? Currently academic departments and EIU athletics are both getting full 100% credit for tuition generated by student-athletes. These are tangible benefits of sponsoring an athletics department. Other intangible benefits of sponsoring intercollegiate athletics include donors, alumni relations, advertising from successful former EIU athletics (mentions Garrapolo), etc.

P. Glassman - Adds comments on hypothetical reclassification to NCAA DIII – pros and cons of that type of move and impact on P/Ls. It's a big 'what if' – no competition against ISU, U of I and other Division I teams, impact on student recruitment, donor connections, exposure, damage to EIU brand (dying university?),

P. Glassman – while at University of Southern Indiana (NCAA Division II), the school had to make a significantly larger contribution of institutional support to athletics.

Hung – regarding intercollegiate donors and alumni relations – I've been told that when people make donations to athletics, it stays in athletics. I would like to see a clearer assessment of the benefits of these donations (athletics only? or also academics?). In what ways are these donations assisting the academic mission of our school? If EIU athletics is great for EIU, we need to examine benefits to EIU academics.

P. Glassman – donations to EIU athletics stays in athletics. It does not cross-over. When I meet with academic donors, they often inquire about EIU athletics, even though they are not giving money to athletics. This happens on a regular basis. Athletics keep donors engaged and following the university.

Rosenstein – if a gift to athletics for scholarships occurs, does that become 'real' dollars for academics?

P. Glassman - correct

Gosse – I appreciate you mentioning that the P/Ls are only one piece of the process or ‘story’. Is there a rubric or template for how academic chairs should use to promote the value of their academic departments (‘toot their own horn’)?

P. Glassman – no template has been created but the chair of each department knows their department the best. They should lead the promotional efforts for their own departments. Discusses future steps in the Vitalize process that might allow a chair to step forward and provide clarification on a proposed recommendation from a work group. There is a feedback model in place that will be used before I see work group recommendations and act on them.

Guest (faculty member) – can we fix problems through simple accounting? Or do we need state support? Should we discuss how to survive without state support? And should we avoid cutting programs because once cut we will never get them back? This is also a matter of reputation as well? We had a high reputation across the state but it has suffered. Value of education is difficult to measure in money.

Stowell – thanks for visiting and responses to BTC questions =Very educational. As a work group chair, this type of education/information that you have shared today needs to be more broadly distributed to all work groups and across the greater campus.

P. Glassman – the P/Ls provide data on revenue and expenses, but that’s all. I don’t have any preconceived decisions that I want to make. We have revenue centers and expenses centers across the university, such as facility maintenance –cost real dollars. Discusses response this past summer to poorly maintained campus grounds – has impacted college decisions (refers to letter received). Discusses factors that affect the university, including ‘public perception’.

P. Glassman - We need to live by ledger 1 funds. Two pieces of ledger 1 funds – state appropriation dollars and tuition dollars (both a bit ‘shaky’ right now). The state’s poor support is causing students to think twice about attending EIU. State appropriation has gone down every year for the past decade, with little hope in the trend reversing. The best case might be at least a stable appropriation for the next few years. But costs will continue to go up. The place we need to move is increasing the amount of tuition revenue but not the price point = increased enrollment at EIU. Higher education is changing. Students used to come to college to learn, grow, and then go find a job. Students are now coming to get a job. There needs to be distinguishing programs at EIU that lead to careers and jobs, based on US workforce information and market trends. The long-term solution is to remain a public comprehensive university that prepares students for their first job and beyond. Conclusion - the current model needs to change at EIU, with new programs to satisfy future student consumer wants and needs. We have 10,000 students each year interested in EIU, but we are having trouble getting them to campus.

Hung – I agree with your vision with where EIU needs to go – I think the process we are doing is important – articulates additional reactions from the faculty to the P/Ls – one jarring point from the P/Ls is the heterogeneity within the docs although so many variables unique to each department and program – your explanation of the reason and purpose of the docs was helpful – but the docs still create tension and the tension was not properly channeled – maybe more established channels of communication to/from faculty and public that have useful information for workgroups to consider would have been useful – and workgroups reaching out to campus and public is really critical – hopefully all work groups will consider some level of communication channel between campus/public – at least to key stakeholders – provides comments about work group #2 and efforts to gather input from stakeholders – comments will help to better understand differences in P/Ls

Hung – I agree with you on the numbers (data) – faculty are not used to analyzing budgetary data – we have rarely had to ‘report’ on dollars/cents in the past – we are used to reporting on graduation rates, # of majors, assessment data, etc. Steep learning curve for faculty to account for our own existence = this may have caused a ‘reactionary response’ to the P/L data – but that really should have been the primary message from the data. Maybe we are looking at a cultural shift at EIU with more data-based accountability, with P/Ls being only one piece of data of many that are important to consider = knowing this will reassure faculty on campus.

P. Glassman – workgroup #7 has the templates from program analysis three years ago. There is good and usable data that still exists from that exercise for the work groups. When we created the P/Ls for this project, we met with the council of chairs and I asked them who the data should be available to: Entire community or just administrators? Work groups, deans, chairs, EIU community? No complete agreement due to transparency concerns (pros and cons discussed).

Sterling – there is a great deal of trepidation regarding workgroup #7 – not just because of fear of change – you have emphasized the P/Ls are just one piece of data for decision-making – but across campus faculty are fearful – why? - we don’t know who is serving on workgroup 7 – the concern is that decisions will be made by people that don’t understand the diversity of academic departments and the other data

needed to be considered in assessing ‘quality’ and ‘importance of mission’ before decisions are made – the reports from workgroup #7 is that because of so much data involved and so limited amount of time, P/Ls alone may, in fact, be primary (only?) data used to make key recommendations/decisions. Maybe after preliminary recommendations are made by work groups, department chairs will have a chance to respond?

P. Glassman – I believe members of work group #7 will have the ability to discern data and make sound decisions. To my estimation these are good people and will be able to do the job (represent faculty). Lots of years of faculty experience across campus, along with a few non-faculty committee members who are competent, bring a different element to the discussion, and who I trust. Hopefully it’s not based on the fact that I selected the images. So let’s not pass judgment until we see the product of their work.

Sterling – response = this is the committee that faculty members were primarily concerned about, and faculty have yet to be reassured that the work group members will accurately represent faculty priorities beyond the P/L data.

P. Glassman – I think whatever the recommendations are, then reviewed by the chairs, and maybe revisited by the work groups, will be accurate as they are presented to me.

Abebe – thank you for explaining the process today. Our responsibility (faculty senate) is to watch out for faculty interests and to advise the president on the issues that concern the faculty. Your explanation of EIU athletics was accurate – the program brings direct benefits to this campus. What has happened around campus recently is an accounting maneuver which is misleading on the athletics profit and loss sheet that has created tension between academics and athletics. If we treat athletics the way we are treating them right now (within the P/L docs and within this process), we very well may pit one group of students against another. I have many student-athletes in my classes and I enjoy having them in my classes. When asked their purpose for being on campus and what they are paying for, they mention that they are here for their education, not for their sport. The accounting maneuver used will not promote long-term, sustainable support for athletics on this campus. Further, it confuses the concept of ‘student-athlete’ on this campus. I think the faculty senate does not want to create more tension on the issue, but I would encourage you to take this into consideration as we continue to try to build relationships between athletics and academics at EIU.

Rosenstein – what is the official channel for information coming out of the workgroups? Minutes available or task force chair disseminating information to the campus? Progress reports for the workgroups?

P. Glassman – work groups were asked to keep minutes of meetings. I will follow-up with work group chairs on this.

Eckert – limited minutes currently available only

Hung – will draft recommendations be available to everyone?

Glassman – draft recommendations will be submitted to relevant VPs, who will then take them to unit leaders for discussion.

Hung – can I access draft recommendations from all workgroups by early November? Campus community should be able to access and recommendations through concrete channels of distribution.

Robertson – thanks for your time today President Glassman

P. Glassman – thanks for spending this time together to discuss these important items. We are all in this together.

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| b. Provost’s Report, Provost Blair Lord | 3:00-3:05 PM |
| 2. Elections Committee | 3:05-3:30 PM |
| 3. Nominations Committee | |
| 4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee | |
| 5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee | |
| 6. Awards Committee | |
| 7. Faculty Forum Committee | |
| a. Faculty Forum Follow-Up (Forum occurred on Wednesday, October 12 th at 4PM) | |
| 8. Budget Transparency Committee | |
| 9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics | |

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from October 4th, 2016
2. CAA Minutes from October 6th, 2016
3. Communication from Provost Lord Concerning AY ’19 Academic Calendar

4. Communication from Grant Sterling concerning Questions from the Budget Transparency Committee concerning Vitalization Project Data Sets
5. Request from Marita Gronnvoll concerning CAA staffing

V. Other business, if time allows

VI. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

Fall 2016: Nov. 1st & 15th, Dec. 6th