

12-6-2016

December 6, 2016

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "December 6, 2016" (2016). *Minutes*. 1062.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1062](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1062)

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](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

EIU Faculty Senate Session Agenda  
December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016, 2:00 – 3:50 PM  
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 PM
- \*Welcome – Chair J. Robertson
  - \*Senators – Abebe, Bruns, Corrigan, Eckert, Gosse, Hugo, Hung, Oliver, Robertson, Rosenstein, Sterling, Stowell, Waller, B. Young, L. Young (SVPAA)
  - \*Guests – J. Blitz (UPI), D. Klarup (COS), B. Lord (AA), J. Nusbaum (DEN)
- II. Approval of Minutes from Nov. 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016 2:00-2:05 PM
- Motion to Approve – Eckert (2<sup>nd</sup> – Sterling)
- Discussion – none
- Vote – unanimous with the exception of 2 abstentions (Rosenstein, Hugo)
- III. Committee Reports 2:10-2:30 PM
1. Executive Committee
- Robertson – I attended the BOT meeting on November 18<sup>th</sup>. I shared Faculty Senate resolution with the EIU BOT from November 15<sup>th</sup> (now posted on the EIU Faculty Senate website). President Glassman received approval for more control over tuition rates for international students. In addition, the provost search is in full motion. Send suggestions, questions, and referrals for consideration that can be forwarded to the committee.
  - Eckert – remind us of the timetable of how Pres. Glassman will react to the work group recommendations? And how will that effect the Faculty Senate’s ability to review and respond to the recommendations?
  - Robertson – when we learn what the final recommendations are, we need to stay flexible on scheduling a possible additional meeting to review and respond to the work groups.
  - Sterling – Pres. Glassman stated that he will make program elimination decisions before Jan 18<sup>th</sup>.
  - Hung – also mentioned in the meeting is that final work group recommendations will be made available on the EIU website by the start of Spring 2017 semester. I asked him about a process for formal solicitation of feedback? Pres Glassman did not specify, only speculated. He suggested that anyone could send him feedback at any time.
  - Eckert – individual communication may not be enough. We need to meet as a collective body sooner than 1/17
  - Robertson – we probably need to meet on Jan 10<sup>th</sup>
  - Eckert – what about meeting on Dec 20<sup>th</sup>? And do we have to wait until early Spring 2017 semester to view?
  - Sterling – it’s not clear after Dec 15<sup>th</sup> (workgroup recommendation deadline)
  - Hung – provides clarity on publicizing of work group final recommendations = publically available
  - Eckert – when is the EIU BOT meeting in January?
  - Robertson – January 18<sup>th</sup>
  - Robertson – we will request a copy of the final recommendations from Pres Glassman as early as possible, hopefully before they become publicized
  - Eckert – the timeline is highly questionable
  - Robertson – I will re-ask the president for access to final recommendations before early January
  - Hung – he did mention that he will talk to departments about workgroup recs. before his final recs.
  - Rosenstein – Pres. Glassman also mentioned a filtering process before publicizing – not sure we will see the recs before the filtering process
  - Abebe – the question raises ‘what’s the purpose for us to know the timetable’, except for information purposes – perhaps you can help clarify. The president in his public statements has clearly stated that the process does not call for any another body to be involved in the process. So what is our motivation for requesting the proposals and knowing the timetable earlier than public announcement/posting?
  - Eckert – depends on what the information is - if programs are at stake, the campus needs to be able to discuss this before finalization. We should have a right to discuss.
  - Abebe – and that is my point – he has clarified that the process does not call for any other input from other groups
  - Eckert – I don’t think it matters, we represent our faculty colleagues – we need to take a stand
  - Hung – although there is some advantage to try to meet as a Senate to solicit feedback and make a statement about final recommendations before finalization.
  - Waller – I don’t we need an invitation to involve ourselves – let’s try to involve ourselves

2. Elections Committee – Stowell – volunteer from CAH to fill semester vacancy on CAA – G. Aylesworth to serve for M Grundvoll for SP 2017 semester.  
Motion – B. Young (2<sup>nd</sup> – Sterling), Discussion – none  
Vote – unanimous
  
3. Nominations Committee – Rosenstein – updates – we filled the Library Advisory Committee – Dr. Mary Caroline Simpson (passed away), so Bailey Young will step in to replace through the end of her term this Spring 2017. Possible future conflicts because of maternity leave and class scheduling conflicts. Apportionment Board – Dr Brantley will not be able to serve. Current chair has asked for a replacement for Dr. Brantley. Intent is to meet every Thursday at 7 pm during Spring 2017. We will see how that meeting time will work for remaining board members. Possible the board may need re-appointments (repopulated) because we don't have replacements (back-ups).  
L. Young – concern from student government regarding Apportionment Board members not attending and only wanting emails about the discussion that took place but are still voting electronically.  
Rosenstein – that is an issue that needs to be addressed by the chair of the committee. It's a voluntary board – self-nomination. The bylaws may need to be reviewed or established to address this issue. Three voting faculty serve on the committee but faculty membership is not designated by college. I recently received an email from Dr. Brantley regarding the scheduling conflict of 7 pm Thursday meetings. The member of the Board can create policies regarding attendance by simple majority vote. Further reviews past communication with the chair of the board and meeting times, and implications of any existing board policies (specifically meeting times and attend.).
  
4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee – Waller – no report
  
5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee – Hung – no report – next meeting is next week
  
6. Awards Committee – Hugo – DAF monetary award issue from past award winner was resolved – Dr. Curry will receive \$1000 for the award. Revised language for the award on the website will be 'flexible' in terms of an actual monetary award, donated by alumni to the EIU foundation. Thanks to Brad Green at the EIU Foundation for helping us find the relevant information to resolve the issue. Previous staff member left the EIU Foundation  
Hugo – motion to approve updated 2017 DAF announcement and website language (2<sup>nd</sup> – Hung)  
Hung – seconds the motion  
Discussion - Hugo – adds additional commentary and clarifications on the DAF announcement and committee membership  
Vote – unanimous  
Corrigan –the Booth Library faculty awards panels have been updated
  
7. Faculty Forum Committee – no report
  
8. Budget Transparency Committee – Sterling - no report

Hung – we received approval of \$5million+ from IBHE. With that money included, do we know what our financial status is for the remainder of this fiscal year? Do we have contingency planning in place in case this is all the funding we receive this fiscal year?

Sterling – we are still waiting on MAP grant funding from the state for Spring 2017 semester. The state usually sent that money by mid-Spring semester. If the state defaults and does not send that money, we will have a serious problem and will need to employ a contingency to deal with that lack of funding.

Hung – we are roughly 51% funding average the last two fiscal years - we can't operate much further with what we have received the last few fiscal years – not sustainable at this rate, correct?

Sterling – true – last year EIU took extreme measures to save money because of the budget stalemate, which caused the financial crisis. My understanding right now is that the EIU admin is looking at the funding from the lens of 'funding that was received for last year was last year' –we need more funding earmarked for this fiscal year.

Hung – do we have a contingency plan? If no more funding is received?

Sterling – not sure – there has been some discussion – I don't know what CUPB has discussed

Robertson – I will bring that question up in CUPB, but Pres Glassman has been reluctant to discuss in the public in order to avoid a negative press cycle about the situation.

Sterling – Pres Glassman has to walk a tight rope – he can't say we are 'fine' because the legislature won't give us more money, or that we need more \$, which scares away students.

9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics – no report

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from Nov. 15th, 2016
2. CAA Minutes from Nov. 17th and Dec. 1st, 2016
3. Proposed Resolution Presented to Senate for Discussion by Dr. Kai Hung

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

2:30-2:40 PM

- Lord – not too much to report on. Campus is occupied with ‘vitalization’ and ‘budget’. Bill Elliott is leaving EIU starting January 2017. Departures continue to create new ‘challenges/opportunities’ for EIU. CAA voted to change bylaws to shrink themselves by 3 seats (1 faculty at large, 2 students) – following your advice. Final exams have arrived. Graduation is Dec 17th – optimistic news for our students.
- Abebe – following up on contingency planning question – can you expound?
- Lord – our current operating budget was predicated or was supposed to match Rauner’s funding proposal in Feb 2016, which would include MAP dollars. MAP dollars is cash but not an additional asset. It’s already counted in the books. The additional IBHE \$5.6 million will continue to fill up the budgeted expectation. All institutions continue to lobby for the state to create a budget that would provide additional funding beyond the stopgap \$ received. None of us believe that we have received our last funding for the current fiscal year. If we don’t receive more funding, we will have to re-visit the current operational budget again and identify ways to save money.
- Rosenstein – question about funding from last year – did we receive all of what we expected to receive?
- Lord – we received all of the stopgap \$ promised, but we are way behind in terms of typical annual funding. Discusses vouchering process between EIU and the state of Illinois, and which year previously received \$26 million is being applied. The IBHE funding will have to be vouchered through the new comptroller, which it then will take time to receive.
- Waller – given current \$ that we have, plus assumed MAP grant funding, how long are we solvent?
- Lord – last time that question was answered it caused a very negative news cycle so I will resist answering it.
- Robertson – can you provide us an update on Redden Grants?
- Lord – they have been approved, forwarded to the department by the EIU Business Office – provides additional comments on the new process
- Eckert – adds comments on new Redden grant funding distribution process - accounts now managed at the department level and recipients have their own accounts. Seems to be somewhat counter-productive initially.
- Lord – recipients and non-recipients will receive notification in the near future

VI. Proposed Resolution Presented to Senate for Discussion by Dr. Kai Hung

2:40-3:15 PM

- Hung – resolution brought up from last Faculty Senate session. Background – U of I system president proposed certain measures of performance in exchange for AY2015 level of funding adjusted with inflation. As a response, I have authored this as a resolution. I am open to the idea of changing it to a letter as well. Feedback/Questions?
- Abebe – 3rd paragraph to the bottom – comments about the ‘condemning the cynical and self-serving maneuver...’. I applaud the wording...can you clarify/expound?
- Hung – provides clarifying comments
- Waller – that is my favorite part!
- Rosenstein – rather than being so negative towards U of I, why not emphasize the importance of the relationship between the regionals and the Illinois flagship institution. Many of our students feed into the U of I for graduate studies. Rather than ‘cynical and self-serving’, what about ‘short-sightedness’?, especially as they modify their educational standards to increase their enrollment
- Hung – I could add or change that particular part to new wording – focusing on ‘short-sightedness’ of their proposal as it relates to academic quality as well as the impact it could have on the regionals
- Rosenstein – add comments about the U of I system, and how this proposal will cut off funding to the southern parts of the state, and the suffering that the JUCOs may experience from this proposal as well
- Abebe – 2nd to last paragraph – if this stays as a resolution, the language may need to be adjusted to ‘plead’ vs ‘demand’. Also, a letter might be the better option with this type of statement because resolutions are mostly aspirational. Perhaps if we expressed this in letter form it may reach a wider audience.
- Hung – I agree, and a letter might be easier to distribute. I am willing to convert to a letter if you send me feedback. I fully admit that this issue upsets me greatly so I wrote it in that mindset.
- B. Young – there are a few other descriptive phrases that we could add to get our point across

- Rosenstein – question about other Faculty Senates in the state...are they responding to this? Are they discussing this issue? If so, how?
- Robertson – I (we – COIUS) have not met since this appeared in the news cycle. The intent is to reach out to them as we determine how to respond to this.
- Hung – would it be wise to contact (ping) faculty senate reps at other regionals to promote discussion on this as soon as possible, and then bring it up the next time you hold your COIUS meeting?
- Robertson – yes, good suggestion
- Waller – my understanding is that this proposal is dead in Springfield. Maybe we should not spend too much time on this possibly ‘dead’ issue. And maybe converting to a letter may not be that advantageous?
- Eckert – comments on the state’s lack of commitment and support to higher education in the state. We need to respond when one of ‘us’ attempts to gain an unfair advantage against other institutions. COIUS needs to deal with this issue and respond.
- Hung – note – while the proposed legislation is ‘dead’, Gov. Rauner has publically supported performance-based funding. This initial proposal may be ‘dead’, but it will be re-born again. It’s not going away. What U of I is doing is not helping this issue or EIU. We need to address it every time we see it, because at some point, it may be embraced down the road.
- Corrigan – ‘dead’ at the moment does not mean ‘dead’ in the future
- Eckert – maybe we use this as a platform to be proactive and constructive with other faculty senates in IL?
- Hung – so strike a more optimistic approach with the resolution or letter?
- Rosenstein – add suggestions for a process to ‘make noise’ across the state to address this issue.
- Hugo – concern – with this current bill ‘dying’, maybe the timing is not right at the moment for a letter.
- Stowell – or maybe we push for performance-based funding because EIU does well with these types of measures? There is a tiny sliver of money available for performance-based funding.
- Hung – comments about the self-serving aspect of U of I’s proposal, what metrics are being considered, versus what metrics ‘should’ be considered.
- Abebe – I of U has clearly been dropping their standards to raise their enrollment –students that could have attended institutions like EIU.
- Gosse – I am not comfortable at this point to make a public statement about this issue. I need to do more research to see what U of I is proposing and if it might benefit EIU. Maybe we can talk to the U of I to find out more about this. Are they taking initiative to educate the legislature on a new funding model? I am in support of performance-based funding. However, more discussions with other Faculty Senates would be useful.
- Rosenstein – in terms of U of I, they are experiencing some of the same funding issues we are experiencing. They are starting at a similar vitalization process as we are. They just don’t publicize it as much. But the fact that they might be willing to ‘go alone’ on this funding proposal is concerning.
- Gosse – are we sure about this? That they are going about this proposal alone?
- Sterling – yes, one U of I metric is to strengthen their in-state enrollment, which would poach students from regional institutions like EIU. Reducing academic standards to increase in-state enrollment, and provide more scholarship dollars to do it.
- Hung – and with Illinois high school graduates leaving Illinois, the competition has become fierce for a shrinking number of HS graduates. And I have a problem with pure performance-based funding – it can be a lose-lose situation – compromising principles and values for funding. It does not consider other important qualitative aspects of the higher education experience.
- Rosenstein – performance-based funding is entirely dangerous, but we are having this larger conversation right now at EIU and beyond in other sectors of higher education. It’s happening right here. The fact that we are being forced to do this locally, it may be a prediction of what is coming on a larger scale.
- Sterling – this is exactly my concern. When the state or other agencies use performance measures they virtually never include elements of educational quality – they want #s of students and degrees– not anything about the ‘value’ of the degree. In addition, our own president came here and reassured us that qualitative variables and centrality would be included in the vitalization process – but quality was not a consideration at all of work group seven’s recommendations (‘all programs have quality’) - Glassman reassured us, but then it did not happen.
- Hung – would I be accurate to say that we want to convert this proposed resolution into a letter, with distribution channels to be determined in the future?
- Robertson – yes – let’s table the motion until the doc can be reworked into a letter
- Hung - agreed
- Waller – compliments to Hung on the organization and wording of the resolution
- Robertson – I will reach out to other COIUS faculty senates on this issue
- Hung – more campuses and voices involved will strengthen the message
- Waller – adds final comments on performance based metrics – not opposed, but opposed to U of I approach

- Blitz – circulates a handout - Common and ongoing UPI issues to discuss. Nothing to add to your discussion. With MAP funding, EIU is fronting the money to students to keep them, hoping to be reimbursed by the state of Illinois. I have cards to send to Rep. Phillips and Righter to communicate our concerns regarding poor funding to EIU. Also – tuition waivers for state employees are going to be a target in the legislature in the Spring. Be prepared to make a response. This has become an annual battle. Pensions – expect future legislative challenges regarding current benefits. Our position has and always been that state employees should not be penalized for previous legislators not funding the system.
- Blitz – primary reason for visit regards healthcare. A developing issue that not many people are aware of - 28.1 in the current ‘Agreement’. AFSCME bargains with the governor regarding healthcare. They are the largest state union. Based on the terms that they finalize with the governor, those become our healthcare provisions through CMS. But right now AFSCME and Gov. Rauner are at a standstill. \* Note - Reggie Phillips sided with Rauner on this issue. The Illinois Labor Relations Board sided with Rauner – so the last best offer from Rauner to AFSCME can be imposed. Result - Insurance premiums will double for the same insurance = representing a significant pay cut for each of us.
- Blitz – so what are we willing to do to voice our displeasure with this? How do you want to get involved?
- Waller – what are the next legal steps? What is the timetable for this to be enacted?
- Blitz – the AFSCME lawyer says it can be delayed for a bit, but we need to take action soon. We need to create some momentum for our side.
- Gosse – provides comments about the State of Illinois not paying bills – lack of responsibility and accountability, + penalties that the state will have to be paid. We are paying our premiums, but they are going to go up because the State is not paying bills on time. It’s exasperating! I am willing to get involved.
- Rosenstein – what is the process? Is CMS the insurance company? Is Health Alliance different? Provena? Is CMS/or the state doing their job in shopping for insurance for state employees?
- Gosse – the state is self-funded
- Rosenstein – asks more questions and share frustrations regarding the health insurance issue
- Blitz – this is Governor Rauner trying to save the state money on the backs of state employees
- Abebe – this is a political issue with financial dimensions – what are proper actions for the Faculty Senate to take?
- Blitz – I don’t want to dictate ideas, I want ideas to bubble up from the faculty. Probably a bus to Springfield at the minimum to have our voice heard.
- Hung – one of the 1<sup>st</sup> steps to consider is to condense it into a statement for to distribute to our colleagues regarding this issue, encouraging them to talk to our representatives
- Blitz – another helpful step would be to make sure our administrators hear from us – they have the ear of Rauner
- Rosenstein – when this is implemented – will we be responsible for back premiums from the start of the fiscal year?
- Blitz – probably not but not completely out of the realm of possibility – our lawyers would fight this.
- Gosse – when premiums go up, what is the notification requirements in the contract or for CMS?
- Blitz – notification requirements are not a part of our contract, although we usually get 30 days to make changes
- Waller – would it be helpful to bring Rep. Phillips to Faculty Senate to discuss this?
- Blitz – we have no leverage over Phillips after his election victory – probably nothing to be gained
- Hung – this is a very cynical ploy by Rauner’s administration – replicating the publicized doubling of medical premiums in the private sector.
- Bruns – and in reality it was only 3% of those covered by Obamacare – that message from the media needs to be corrected as we push back against this maneuver
- Rosenstein – this is not just university employees, it’s every school K-12 school teacher, county worker, state workers, etc – 360,000 workers. If we invite Rep Phillips, let’s invite every state worker affected by this to a meeting w/Phillips.
- Blitz – we can invite Rep Phillips to speak on this, but not sure he will follow-through. Not opposed to it.
- Hung – I’ll type up a short paragraph with hyperlinks to related content, maybe followed by a faculty forum on what to do in January.
- Sterling – maybe he will show up?
- Gosse – maybe a health care official to speak on healthcare crisis as well.
- Hung – motion to write up item of concern to circulate (Abebe-2<sup>nd</sup>)
- Vote - unanimous

- Robertson – with the limited vitalization schedule and with the potential that President Glassman offers proposals to EIU BOT in mid-January, I suggest we meet a week earlier to start the Spring 2017 semester on January 10<sup>th</sup>. Not a replacement meeting, an extra meeting.
  - Eckert – can we meet on Dec 20<sup>th</sup>?
  - Senators – numerous senators will not be in town to meet
  - Hung – maybe electronic circulation of the workgroup final recommendations?
- Motion to hold Jan 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017 meeting – Stowell (2<sup>nd</sup>-Eckert)
- Vote – 13, No – 0, abstentions (\*Note - B. Young left early, T. Bruns arrived late – maintaining 13 senators)

IX. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

Fall 2016: Possible Meeting to be scheduled subsequent to the publication of the Dec. 15<sup>th</sup>  
Vitalization Workgroup “Final” Recommendations

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