

2-7-2017

February 7, 2017

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 7, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1058.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1058

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
February 7th, 2017, 2:00 – 3:50 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 PM
* Welcome – Vice Chair Stowell
* Senators in Attendance – T. Abebe, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, N. Hugo, J. Oliver, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, CC. Wharram., B. Young
* Guests in Attendance – J. Blitz (UPI), C. Buchman (DEN) D. Jackman (CEPS), B. Lord (AA)
- II. Approval of Minutes from January 31st, 2017 2:00-2:05 PM
* Motion to Approve – Young
* Seconded? – Eckert
* Discussion – no
* **Vote - Unanimous**
- III. Committee Reports
1. Executive Committee 2:05-2:20
- a. Updates
- none
- b. Staffing for Ad hoc Committee for the Review Workgroup 7 Recommendations
- Stowell – will attempt to populate later during today’s meeting
- c. Provost’s Report: Provost Blair M. Lord
- Lord – yesterday morning the call went out to Library faculty for interim dean nominees to replace Dean Allen Lanham, as well as an announcement in the university newsletter. Deadline is Wed, February 15th. Dean England and Dean Hendrickson will assist in the process. Hopefully process will conclude by April 1st. Academic Leadership Team meeting this morning – all-campus student research day will be March 31st – afternoon in the Grand Ballroom. Student research mentor awards will be given out as well. President Glassman and the President Council have started to review workgroup 1-6 recommendations.
- Oliver – question on the President’s day holiday (Monday) vs. Lincoln holiday (Friday)
- Lord – provides historical background – recruiting events on campus hosted on Monday – President’s Day so that high school students considering EIU can visit the campus.
- Stowell – question on admission cycle? Where are we at? Projections?
- Lord – we are currently behind on number of new freshmen apps received, new freshmen admits, and transfer apps received. Factors impacting slow rate include changes in standardized testing procedures in the state as well as changes in FAFSA registration dates. We are following up with high school students who have indicated interest in Eastern via sources like FAFSA. About 50/50 on those who have said that they will apply to EIU. Transfer influx occurs late spring, early summer. April and May are the key months for deposit submissions and impacting ‘yield’ for next Fall. Last year’s news cycle also did not help with this year’s recruiting efforts. Please stay tuned – Admissions staff are working hard towards ‘yield’.
- Stowell – any other questions on the academic calendar?
Lord - Provides additional background info on academic calendar – the registrar has compiled the 2018-19 academic year calendar in order to allow for summer school and summer camps to be planned in advance. A highly constrained system – difficult to integrate all suggestions/date proposals.
2. Elections Committee 2:20-2:40
- a. Finalize Referendum Time Frame
- Feb 15th identified at 31 Jan 17 Senate meeting
- b. Update on Spring Elections
- Received nomination - Kesha Coker from Marketing - LCBAS
- Stowell – motion to appoint her to UPC for Spring 2017 semester
- Sterling – seconded motion
- **Vote – unanimous**
- Stowell – finalizing upcoming vacancies with all elected committees for the Spring 2017 election. Will finalize with ITS. Plan is to run elections the week after EIU spring break.
3. Nominations Committee – no report

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee – no report
5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee – Corrigan – Staff/Senate meeting is tomorrow – will attend
6. Awards Committee – Hugo – DFA announcement re-sent out again today – deadline for nominations is Feb 24th.
7. Faculty Forum Committee – no report
8. Budget Transparency Committee – no report
9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics – no report

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from January 31st, 2017
2. Communication from Larry White – announcement about the Higher Education Funding Rally in Springfield on Wednesday, February 8th.
3. FY 2018/19 Academic Calendar – discussed in Provost Lord's report
4. CAA Minutes from January 26th, 2017
5. ISU letter to Governor regarding proposed health care premium increases
 - Stowell – emailed the letter to all of you – response to the letter?
 - Young – letter is strong and most appropriate
 - Stowell – should we endorse this letter? Or author a parallel letter?
 - Young – I would support endorsing the ISU letter
 - Corrigan – I would agree - it is well written and contains all of the important points
 - Oliver > Blitz – you brought this issue to us a month ago, any changes in the situation?
 - Blitz – nothing has changed yet – the numbers have not changed – the doubling of premiums for the same coverage – none of the actual details are finalized yet
 - Gosse – this usually happens in May, correct?
 - Blitz – yes, that's when it would happen. It did not change last year because the contract was not in place last May.
 - Stowell – I would feel confident in endorsing the letter. What would be our action if we endorse this letter?
 - Abebe – asks B. Young about his proposal to endorse the letter? What does this mean?
 - Young – reviews some of the comments he strongly agrees with in the letter. I think we can write an endorsement of this letter addressed to all of the parties mentioned in the letter, our representatives, as well as our constituents on this campus. Sending a congratulatory letter to ISU senate would also be appropriate.
 - Abebe – I suggest also a letter written from this senate to the Governor as well. It would be more powerful. Suggestion to ask for permission to utilize this letter within our own.
 - Wharram – I support that suggestion – writing our own letter – provides suggestions on how to write the letter citing ISU's letter in the beginning of the letter.
 - Eckert – points out the wording issue with 'instructional assistant professor' – do we have that position?
 - Lord –no, we have instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor
 - Abebe – the most important consideration is the that the numbers don't change regardless of the position title -
 - Stowell – motion = that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee authors a similar letter, including the introductory statement suggested by Wharram, and then utilizes the content from the ISU letter (with permission), then distributed to the Governor, representatives, and other key constituents.
 - Sterling – seconds the motion
 - **Vote – unanimous**

- #### V. Finalization of Language for Feb. 15th Referendum on Vitalization Project 2:40-3:10 PM
- Stowell – re-reads the language of the previously approved motion. Suggests that we might add choices to the referendum that might better capture the diversity of opinion on the issue – to avoid using the 'in-between' feelings, rather than just 'yes' or 'no'. Current form is a little bit too leading.
 - Young – I agree with J. Stowell on this, possibly leading in the wrong direction
 - Eckert – I agree with simplifying the statement
 - Stowell – suggestion is to add a few additional response options – likert type scale from a 1 to 5?

- Abebe – I want to stay with the previously approved language – this proposal provides an excuse for some. We want to judge if there is confidence or not. Yes, there are different scales with agree/disagree or confidence or no confidence. However, I believe the language of the referendum is properly constructed. Answer ‘Yes’ or ‘No’.
- Corrigan – can we remove the word ‘high’? Adds rationale.
- Sterling – either remove ‘high’ and make it yes/no, or add a 1 to 5 confidence scale. Adds rationale.
- Gosse – I like likert scales – ‘please rate your confidence’ in the process. – adds comments
- Oliver – makes comments about ‘confidence’ – different degrees exist
- Stowell – Re-reads the motion – “I have either ‘high confidence’ or ‘confidence’ in the program review mandated by the president’.
- Stowell – motion to remove ‘high’ – turns it into a ‘yes/no’ response
- Corrigan – seconds the motion
- Corrigan – a yes/no sends a stronger message opposed to the scale – want to avoid a scale
- Stowell – responses can be grouped to make conclusions – the dichotomous strength can still be identified
- Young – you have experience constructing these types of scales/questions - I would be happier adding a ‘no opinion’.
- Sterling – a 5-point likert scale does provide that option
- Corrigan – those that don’t participate are voicing that opinion, correct?

Stowell – motion to remove ‘high’ – turns it into a ‘yes/no’ response

* Vote *

- Yes – Young, Eckert, Corrigan, Hugo, Oliver
- No – Stowell, Sterling, Abebe, Gosse,
- Abstain - Wharram
- **Motion Carries – 5 to 4 (1 abstention)**

- Stowell – the referendum is ready to go – we need to send a summary of concerns attached
- Abebe – Billy’s letter has been drafted – we could edit/finalize that letter and possibly use it for the stated purpose
- Stowell – time to discuss Hung’s letter (draft) regarding concerns related to workgroup 7 recommendations
- Abebe – very effective draft – we need to finalize who we will address the letter to – the faculty vs the president
- Young – we need to edit if authored to the faculty – but shouldn’t this be addressed to the APEC committee and/or workgroup 7?
- Abebe – we need to protect our colleagues – addressing the letter to workgroup 7 would put them in an unfair ‘line of fire’ – we want to avoid this.
- Eckert & Young – we could simply address it to the faculty as a whole
- Stowell – parts of the letter to change?
- Abebe – 3rd paragraph – add ‘choice’ to ‘practice’ = ‘choice and practice’
- Abebe – 3rd paragraph – ‘clearly financial quagmire’ = imposed on our university
- Sterling – proposes edits regarding ‘past 2 fiscal years and ongoing’
- Young – proposes edited use of ‘harbor’
- Stowell – suggests additional small editorial edits be made via ‘OneDrive’ and use the rest of our time today to make any substantive changes.

VI. A. Ad-hoc Committee for the Review Workgroup 7 Recommendations Meeting 3:10-3:50 PM

- Stowell – we need to populate this committee – volunteers? Need at least 3, maybe capped at 5
- Sterling – makes a proposal of population – everyone who is not in attendance today (smile)
- Abebe – makes a proposal – those who voted in favor of the committee should be the first to volunteer
- Sterling – I am willing to serve but would it better for this committee to consist of individuals from departments not affected by workgroup 7 recommendations?
- Hugo, Wharram, Eckert, Young
- Hugo > compliments Sterling on his analytical ability – but shares concern about Philosophy Dept. faculty serving on the committee dealing with recommendations that would affect Philosophy Department.
- Wharram – makes comment regarding the reality that the committee will seek input from other senators
- Stowell – next step for committee is to establish scope and timeline of your work – deadline is March 15th
- Blitz – APERC’s deadline is March 15th – that will not change.
- Sterling – adds comments about the deadline for March 15. The Monday after March 15th might be ok but completing the task before Spring Break is encouraged.

B. Other Business –

- Gosse – adds comments about health care insurance crisis. State of Illinois is 18 months behind on paying health care bills. Some providers require patients to pay in advance. Get in writing a promise from providers of ‘eventual reimbursement’ once they get paid.
- Stowell – shares in the concern
- Sterling – predicts it will get worse before it gets better
- Gosse – adds comments about Medicare (secondary) vs CMS
- Abebe – Provost has provided structure to academic affairs during his tenure - it has worked relatively well over the years. However, I fear that some of that structure is being lost on campus during these challenging times. Example - what responsibility does a faculty member have with institutional failures, as it applies to individuals with disabilities - ADA in particular.
- Abebe > To Provost Lord – what is the responsibility of faculty with potential failures to ADA at the institutional level? Faculty members should not have to take funds out of their pocket to meet ADA obligations at this institution.
- Lord – talking ‘blind’ because I don’t know the details of your specific case – the ADA imposes employee and student accommodations – HR director for employee accommodations and Disability services for students. Judgments have to be made, based on the law, to determine what a ‘reasonable’ accommodation would be. Sometimes faculty members have to make judgements as well to determine appropriate accommodations. Disagreements sometimes occur between parties involved. Chairs sometimes are recruited to find compromise in respect to accommodations. New situations are emerging that are difficult to accommodate – attention deficit being one of them. The budget crisis has also caused me to have to ‘strip’ the ADA office of some of their human resources. That has not made the challenge any easier. With fewer staff, more responsibility has shifted back to faculty to accommodate, but that should never include out-of-pocket costs.

Stowell – meeting is adjourned. The committee for workgroup #7 is invited to meet during the 2nd half of the meeting.

IX. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

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