

11-15-2016

November 15, 2016

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "November 15, 2016" (2016). *Minutes*. 1063.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1063

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 Minutes
November 15th, 2016, 2:00 – 3:50 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 PM
*Welcome – Chair Jemmie Robertson
*Senators in Attendance – T. Abebe, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, B. Hung, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, J. Waller, C Wharram, B. Young, B. Berglund (Student Senate)
*Guests in Attendance – J. Blitz (UPI), B. Lord (AA), S. Nusbaum (DEN), A. Shelton (CAH)
- II. Approval of Minutes from Nov. 1st, 2016 2:00-2:05 PM
*Motion – B. Young
*Seconded – T. Bruns
*Discussion – spelling error noted (Robertson), Waller – not in attendance (remove)
*Vote – 12, No – 0, Abstentions - Waller
- III. Committee Reports 2:05-2:30 PM
1. Executive Committee
- Robertson – reviewed meeting with Pres Glassman on Nov 14th. Vitalization process was discussed – specifically work group #7 as well as when Faculty Senate could review recommendations. He stayed firm on current process and flow of information. December 15th all recommendations will be available for review. We won't be in session after Dec 15th.
 - Eckert – do we need to schedule an additional session after Dec 15th
 - Robertson – possibly – something to consider
 - Robertson - Also spoke about prospective AY16-17 funding – time again to advocate with Springfield for full funding. EIU has received \$24 million of \$26 million of the 'stop-gap' funding. MAP funding from AY15-16 has also been received. No Spring 16-17 funding has been negotiated or received yet, as well as no AY16-17 MAP funding. President Glassman remains optimistic that EIU will receive at least \$8 million
 - Waller – President Glassman promised that all work group discussions/minutes will be made public so we know how conclusions were reached. That has not happened. Not a transparent process.
 - Stowell – he did not address that in our meeting yesterday. Shared comments as a work group chair.
 - Waller – although President Glassman promised transparency, some key discussions and decisions occurred in email discussions – seems like it was done secretly.
 - Eckert – adds comments about the use of email discussions – not included in work group minutes.
 - Hung – from my experience on work group, not informed of any requirement to make our emails public. Minutes and meeting times were published. But I was never on notice that my emails were to be gathered and published.
 - Stowell – neither did I receive such instruction regarding emails
 - Sterling – a real concern is that work group #7 had extensive conversations outside of their open meetings – substantive discussions occurred but not in the public domain. No discussions about future of philosophy department in public.
 - Stowell – there was a private card sorting/submission process utilized.
 - Eckert – yes, the work group procedures have been unsatisfactory – lack of minutes, lack of details and info
 - Blitz – emails are subject to the Freedom of Information Act if you want access to emails. If you phrase it properly you should be able to gain access to emails.
2. Elections Committee
- Stowell – one volunteer (Yordan S. Yordanov - BIO) applied for at-large CAA replacement position for Deb Reid
 - Recommendation to approve Yordan for one-semester replacement
 - Motion – Young
 - Seconded – Eckert
 - Discussion – none
 - Voting – unanimous (Yes – 13, No – 0)
3. Nominations Committee
- Robertson (for Rosenstein) – Library Advisory Board – B. Young has agreed to fill in for Mary Simpson, and Rosenstein will put out a call to fill Carrie Dale's position (unable to serve based on class schedule conflict).

4. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

- Hung – went to staff senate meeting last wed. Large part of meeting was focused on report from Kelly Miller from Admissions. Discussed findings from campus survey report - circulated survey card on various aspects of recruitment. She reported on a variety of items from student survey: 1) 3 attractive elements – Greek life, student newspaper, volunteerism-community engagement; 2) new changes for financial aid – can apply two years in advance – but weak response (probably due to lack of state funding to support ACT test taking) = high schools have been unable to pay for the test = ACT scores are delayed because ACT testing is delayed, large number of HS seniors are now taking ACT in Fall of senior year rather than Spring of junior year, 3) EIU Commitment to Excellence – has been updated, new policy (incentive) is that if your GPA increases into a higher range, your scholarship amount will increase as well, 4) on-campus recruiting is very influential – if a personal connection is developed with someone at a school, often that student chooses that school, 5) Office of Admissions – has filled 3 vacancies – transcripts and 2 recruiters (latino students & Chicago suburbs), 6) ongoing counseling available on campus, 7) looking for permission for outside consulting firm to help with marketing to better target specific markets – money would be ‘well spent’, 8) All Illinois campuses are behind in recruitment #s – except U of I and UIC – summary of campus survey report. Change in overtime law – starts in Dec – policies need to be finalized by Dec – if you make less than \$47, 476 you are eligible for overtime. Union contracts will need to be adjusted, if necessary. Will need to be handled case-by-case – end result will not be a reduction of pay for the affected staff. New IBHE chair Tom Cross visited EIU this semester – will proceed with a more aggressive approach in Springfield for higher education funding, specifically to help first generation students to succeed.

5. Faculty-Student Relations Committee

- Waller – meeting with Luke Wheatley – will coordinate political activities next semester

6. Awards Committee

- Young – I want to note that recipients of ACA have been notified – a few among us today. Resolution that the Faculty Senate recognizes the recipients – and thanks to the UPI for negotiating the monetary award.
- Young – thanks to the FAC SEN member who served on the ACA committee (Corrigan)
- Young – Resolution = Faculty Senate commends the recipients of the ACA and the ACA committee
- Seconded – Hung
- Vote – unanimous (13, 0)

7. Faculty Forum Committee

- Bruns – no report

8. Budget Transparency Committee

- Sterling – no report

9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

- Wharram – no report

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from Nov. 1st, 2016
2. CAA Minutes from Nov. 3rd and 10th, 2016
3. Email and document from Marita Gronnvoll regarding potential CAA bylaws revisions
 - Robertson – proposal to make CAA more streamline, reduce membership, future discussion may be needed

V. Provost’s Report: Provost Blair M. Lord

2:30-2:40 PM

- Lord – update on search for A V P Enrollment Management – committee still working towards fruitful completion of the process. November EIU Open House attendance – data from Kelly Miller = 282 attendees compared to 305 last year. 100+ more than the first open house in October 2016 – positive result based on current level of ‘consumer confidence’ in higher ed in Illinois right now. EIU BOT meeting this Friday. Chair Robertson will provide remarks. New Academic program – Health Communications - collaborative degree program – we think that will recruit new students. Next IBHE meeting – Dec 13th – new master’s program from School of Technology slated to be voted on.
- Gosse – any help coming for transfer programs? – to design programs for transfer students?
- Lord – discussions occurring – we need to get more intentional about this – a group is in the works to more effectively market to transfer students – President Glassman is anxious about this – working towards a comprehensive

marketing plan – consultant on campus last week to provide advice – we need to ‘spin’ negative perception on EIU that was created last year - Without a VP for Advancement this falls under the President Glassman.

- Gosse – small tasks should be able to completed internally – but help is coming for bigger tasks, correct?
- Lord – we are aware and hopefully support is coming
- Abebe – we will be discussing/communicating on campus the sensitive EIU Vitalization topics and happenings – I appeal to you personally to help us in this process (influence these conversations) specifically to the external community – a few words can do a lot of damage.
- Lord – I am aware of the challenge and we will share your concerns with my colleagues. Just a few words created a negative news cycle last year.
- Stowell – where is the digital channel (WEIU/PBS) process at as of today?
- Lord – the ‘spectrum’ auction – it is still ongoing – since we are participating, we are required to not make comments. If we do not get sold, we will have to repackage our station. If we keep our license and repack – we will have a small window to request federal funding support to help pay the costs of upgrades – \$1,000,000+. No final decisions made yet. The auction is still open. Once we can speak freely on EIU’s status, we will share the details.
- Stowell – estimated timeline?
- Lord – no specific details to share at the moment.
- Waller – based on your understanding of the EIU Vitalization process, is the administration committed to transparency? If so, does that extend to deliberations of committees?
- Lord – the President responded to some of this yesterday with the executive committee - there are two places where there are open-discussion opportunities – ‘draft reports’ and after ‘final draft of recommendations are submitted’.
- Bruns – is that period of open dialogue after Dec 15?
- Lord – yes
- Bruns – maybe the term ‘final report’ due on Dec 15 is causing unnecessary anxiety?
- Lord – maybe – the work group is done working on it by Dec 15, but not the institution
- Sterling – concern – no one will be on campus on Dec 15th
- Lord – no final decisions will be made around Dec 15th – months of discussion to come
- Waller – ‘timing’ of the discussions is critical – especially if the decision to ‘terminate’ a department
- Lord – referring to J. Robertson – you heard the president reinforce this – any comments to share
- Stowell – I actually asked the question at the meeting with the President – as a work group chair, we have other steps to complete after we return in January and February – to receive input on ideas that we are developing.
- Sterling – the concern (fear) is if work group #7 recommendations will actually become ‘finalized’ at the EIU BOT meeting in January.
- Eckert – according to UPI contract terms, there is a Jan 20th deadline for proposals submitted to the Program Elimination Review Committee. That is not a deadline that these reports have been targeting?
- Lord – correct, that is my understanding.
- Robertson – Fac Sen input will be valued after the Dec 15th deadline of final recommendations. I also raised the issue/concern of the timing of the January 18th EIU BOT meeting.
- Abebe – the issue is that when our (Faculty Senate’s) opportunity comes to give feedback, the opportunity will have already passed. Our suggestions have not been considered. I feel like we have been dismissed in this process.
- Lord – I do believe that Pres Glassman wants the input from the Faculty Senate before he finalizes decisions.
- Bruns – the departments now have the opportunity to respond to work group recommendations – where is the chance to ‘respond to the response?’ (Work groups responding to department responses)
- Lord – between Dec 15 and Jan 15th
- Hung – a specific timeline would be helpful for when ‘concrete decisions’ are to be made – lack of clarity may be fueling ‘speculation’ and causing anxiety/concern.
- Robertson – we will carry these concerns forward to President Glassman again to seek greater clarification
- Hung – as a member of the work group (speaking as myself) – I am looking forward to getting response from the departments/units – but I am not sure who actually received the recommendations and not sure who is planning a response. I have talked to the work group chair – requested an answer from the liaison committee, but not sure I have received a significant answer to this question. Ideally, any feedback received will hopefully make our work group recommendations stronger. Still in a ‘wait and see’ position...

VI. Other business, if time allows

- Wharram – there is a resolution that has been authored regarding how Faculty Senate should respond to the work group reports/recommendation – where we fit in on this process. We want to carefully express our position on this.
- Young – speaking as one of the authors of the resolution, we want to acknowledge all volunteers serving on the work groups, and to thank President Glassman for taking time to address us about the process. We still have questions but I suggest we acknowledge what has occurred.

- Abebe – a few questions...I have talked to CC. Wharram about this resolution. 3rd paragraph – 1st sentence – The term ‘endorses’ may be too strong, and I am not sure I am comfortable using it. Also, I’m not clear on what the President’s charge to the work groups is? Can we refine this statement?
- Wharram – the President’s charge was for the work groups to consider ‘centrality’ of each program to the overall mission of the university
- Young – the language of the resolution comes from the Vitalization document/website. And we have accurately expressed to the President that P/L statements are only 1 measure in the process.
- Corrigan – charges are on the Vitalization website, separate charges for each work group listed, centrality only listed for one work group, and the P/L discussion was here with Faculty Senate
- Eckert – clarifies on the intention of the charge for work group #7
- Bruns – maybe the intention of the resolution is to ‘remind’ Dr Glassmann and work group members that the process should be focused around central mission of the university
- Sterling – work group members probably need a ‘reminding’ as well
- Abebe – maybe change the word ‘endorses’ to ‘notes’ or ‘reminds’ – I am not comfortable endorsing anything at this point. A reminder of how we declined ‘endorsing’ candidates for each work group. If we had done that, we would have no recourse today.
- Wharram – I will consider that as an ‘important’ friendly amendment. I see why the change in terms is important.
- Young – we are affirming, but no problem in changing the word to accept Abebe’s caution.
- Wharram – what about ‘affirms’?
- Waller – I dislike the tone of the resolution – I don’t like 1st or 4th paragraph – thanking my executioners? I am not happy with the process or work groups – paragraphs 2 & 3 are well written – but I have not seen evidence of work groups ‘remembering’ their charge in this process.
- Young - I would point out that ‘thanks’ are expressed to everyone concerned, not only work group #7
- Gosse – we need to avoid mixing messages – this looks like two different messages (resolutions) – a positive & a cautionary message. I reviewed work group recommendations for our department – there were positives in the recommendations, but we seemed to focus on the negative. However, I don’t think we are close to a decision point. The President is creating ‘chaos’, I have been in chaos with several organizations, but out of chaos we should see some significant progress as on organization.
- Hung – the concern is that the data driving decisions is inaccurate – that is difficult to respond to because it seems like we are not sharing the same premise – we are being forced to respond in a one-page respond - a very narrow ‘bandwidth’. We have more to discuss than can actually fit on a 1-page response.
- Robertson – maybe we could break this into two resolutions – paragraph 1 & 4, and then paragraph 2 & 3
- Bruns – I am not against splitting this into 2 resolutions – but I am curious why we are thanking Dr. Glassman for something he should be doing? This is shared governance, this is transparency-we appreciate this but didn’t we expect this?
- Sterling – there have been times that I would have loved that someone would have read my concerns and replied
- Abebe – foundational question - why is this resolution necessary?
- Corrigan – going on ‘public record’ to make a statement about this process
- Waller – because paragraph 2 & 3 are important – reminding committees of their charge
- Abebe – so let’s stay with one resolution – not two
- Robertson – let’s have a vote on either keeping 1 or 2 resolutions
- Robertson – motion #1 – ‘All in favor of dividing Wharram’s statement into two resolutions’
- Hung - second
- Favor – 4Opposed – 6.....Abstain – 3
- Robertson – Opposition carries – resolution will not be divided into two separate resolutions
- Stowell - motion to approve resolution as a whole
- Hung – second
- Discussion – Bruns – proposes edits to the resolution – cutting a few sentences and melding paragraphs
- Abebe – I second it - the last sentence is the most important in that paragraph
- Bruns – add more editing suggestions
- Stowell – why are we opposed to thanking people for their efforts?
- Wharram – true - we are actually just acknowledging them
- Sterling – because there is the perception that work group #7 did not put proper effort/due diligence into the process
- Eckert – I don’t think we can be that judgmental about work group #7
- Stowell – and some did not volunteer – they were assigned
- Sterling – I don’t think you can justify making decisions about cutting programs without meeting face to face as a work group. Recommendations for departmental eliminations were made without meeting in person.

- Bruns – by striking the ‘thank you’ sentence, we still are not ‘slamming’ any work group
- Hung – if authors accept these proposed edits, it would only be a friendly amendment
- Bruns – 1st paragraph – suggestion is to cut 2nd sentence of 1st paragraph, and then combine 1st sentence of 1st paragraph with 2nd paragraph. End result is 2 paragraphs...adds additional editing suggestions (‘friendly amendments’)
- Robertson – do authors accept friendly amendment?
- Young and Wharram – no objections
- Robertson – reads amended resolution
- Abebe – suggestion - add a comma after the word ‘whole’
- Young and Wharram – accepted
- Gosse – how about the word ‘being’ – still applicable? – are the work groups still meeting? –
- Sterling – yes, so the data is still ‘being’ used
- Many senators – provide additional editing comments/suggestions
- Resolution authors – accept proposed edits
- Robertson – vote on amended resolution: (Bruns & Hung)

The Faculty Senate appreciates President Glassman for presenting to Senate a review of the Vitalization Project at the October 18th session of the Faculty Senate, noting the principles guiding its overall methodology. Given our ongoing concerns about the data being used by the work groups, Faculty Senate relies upon the President’s assurance that departmental P&L analyses are to be understood as only one measure, and not necessarily the most important, of the value of that unit to the University as a whole.

Faculty Senate further affirms the principle expressed in the President’s charge to the work groups as a whole, and stressed by him at Faculty Senate, that the quality of our academic programs and their centrality to the overall mission of the University are vital to any assessment of their value (actual and potential). Faculty Senate takes note of and emphasizes the crucial function of every final report in determining the long-term vitality of Eastern Illinois University

EIU Faculty Senate November 15th, 2016

Yes – 12, No – 0, Abstention – Gosse

- Robertson – finalized copy will be emailed to faculty, DEN, posted on website

-
- Hung – discusses U of I resolution for 5-year funding proposal - a model for guaranteed funding starting at the 2015 AY funding levels in return for reaching some performance standards – including scholarships to under-represented students in Illinois, a % of students from Illinois, % of international students, etc. The bill has 2 sponsors – they are trying to generate support in Springfield at this time. (* refers to article from Chicago Tribune)
 - Eckert – what happens after 5 years?
 - Hung – will probably ask for 5 more years of funding
 - Robertson – brought up by the Executive Committee yesterday – he liked the idea in that it promoted discussion about funding for higher education across the state, although he did not endorse it. A 5-year funding plan extends beyond the life cycle of legislators.
 - Oliver – also mentioned that never has one institution received separate funding from other institutions – this would set a new precedent
 - Robertson – except for Chicago State emergency funding last year
 - Hung – adds more comments about troubling metrics that U of I is proposing – in particular undergraduate admissions of Illinois students – that would be a ‘killer’ for all other Illinois campuses
 - Abebe – very concerning because this would represent a ‘funding guarantee’ for U of I
 - Stowell – read the next line about how U of I is already meeting some of these performance standards
 - Hung – I am very concerned about this proposal, and I believe we need to respond to this in the near future – Uthis suggests that the U of I is not at all concerned about other campuses across the state - reads a few comments from a developing resolution he has authored.
 - Bruns – this could lead to a recommendation for Dr. Glassman that he works with other regional institutions for a counter offer of funding for Illinois regional institutions.
 - Senators – offer initial reactions to the U of I proposal, as well as recommendations for Hung’s resolution
 - Hung – I will forward you the Chicago Tribune article that reported on it

- Bruns – continue with the resolution, and once refined, send it to Dr. Glassman as well as the Faculty Senate at the other regional universities
- Corrigan – a collective response to the U of I, or a counter-response?
- Hung – I will leave that up to Dr. Glassman. I will edit resolution and bring it to our next meeting.
- Abebe – our voice needs to be heard as this is a power-play by the U of I – and I imagine there are some legislators who will like this idea.
- Hung – adds more comments about performance-based funding, an idea that Governor Rauner likes, and an idea that we need to evaluate more closely. The U of I is taking a proactive approach to this issue. We need to as well.

VII. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

Fall 2016: Dec. 6th

Spring 2017: Jan. 17th & 31st, Feb. 7th & 21st, Mar. 7th & 21st, April 4th & 18th

Robertson – we may need to add another meeting during the first week of classes in January to give us time to ‘review’ and ‘respond’ to final recommendations from each work group