

2-21-2017

February 21, 2017

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 21, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1057.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1057

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 21st, 2017, 2:00 – 3:50 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 PM
- * Welcome – Chair Robertson
 - * Senators in Attendance – Bruns, Corrigan, Eckert, Gosse, Hugo, Hung, Oliver, Robertson, Rosenstein, Sterling, Stowell, Waller, B. Young, L. Young (SVPAA)
 - * Guests in Attendance – J. Blitz (UPI), S. Brantley (LIB), C. Buchman (DEN), J. Jarmon (DEN), B. Lord (AA), D. Pierce (SVPSA), A. Shelton (CAH)
- II. Approval of Minutes from Feb. 7th, 2017 2:00-2:05 PM
- * Motion to Approve – Sterling
 - * Motion Seconded – Stowell
 - * Discussion – none
 - * Vote = all except abstentions
 - * Abstentions = Bruns, Hung, Robertson, Rosenstein, Waller
- III. Committee Reports
1. Executive Committee 2:05-2:20
- a. Robertson - Provost search committee is in progress – I am serving on it. Review of application right now - closing date is Friday, Feb 24th. Airport interviews will occur in early March (hopefully before Spring Break), on-campus interviews will occur in late March, early April.
 - b. Provost's Report: Provost Blair M. Lord
 - Lord = more students attended 'admitted student day' yesterday than last year (a positive). The search for interim leadership of the library is in the works. Hopefully interviewing candidates about the same time as the Provost search.
2. Elections Committee 2:20-2:50
- a. Referendum Results
 - Stowell – circulates results of referendum vote from last week. The number of faculty participating was 202/433 possible = 45.5% response rate. 'Yes' votes = 57 = 28%, 'No' votes = 145 = 72%.
 - Young = 'thank's to the election committee for their efforts to administer the referendum under a tight schedule. The response seems to be convincing.
 - Stowell = shares concerns shared to him by colleagues – related to the set-up/format of the vote – the vote seemed to be set up to dissolve confidence in the process just prior to the actual vote.
 - Hung = I share some of those concerns, but we had time constraints in trying to inform our colleagues and then have them vote. 'Timing' was an issue.
 - Sterling = adds concerns about how difficult it would have been to author a document in support of the process – could not think of a single reason to be confident in the process
 - Stowell = it relates back to how it was constructed – reviews steps taken.
 - Oliver = adds comments about the way the concerns and vote were 'packaged' together
 - Stowell = more about potential bias from a heavily weighted letter that preceded a request to vote
 - Hung = how will we distribute the outcome from the vote?
 - Stowell = adds suggestions – email to faculty, present to the president via a meeting, possibly a letter
 - Hung = supports sending out an email to all faculty with results, then discussion in a future meeting
 - Robertson & Stowell = reviews the process that the Senate used to inform faculty of concerns, followed by the option to vote.
 - Hung – based on response rate, there still be many colleagues who have not seen the letter yet – we should re-send it with voting results.
 - Waller = do we have info on those who chose not to participate? Where they are concentrated on campus.
 - Stowell = we purposely did not save info on this in the process – to maintain anonymity
 - Rosenstein = as a courtesy, we should inform the President of the results before the media
 - Robertson = I agree with that, I will notify him of the results.
 - b. Update on Spring Elections
 - Stowell – reminder sent out today, still receiving nominations – deadline is Friday, March 3rd

- Rosenstein – question about the scheduling of the nominated committees – when do you think we will be able to inform candidates of the results from the elections?
- Stowell – shares timeline for the elections – mostly in March – results confirmed by April 4th.
- Stowell – reminds the senate that we did not decide to reduce # of faculty senators in this upcoming election. We did not have that discussion.
- Robertson – correct, we discussed topic but not follow through with any action.
- Hung – would it be possible to send out college-specific reminders if we are short on candidates?
- Stowell – we can, typically occurs after the initial deadline has passed. We have had to extend the election period in the past.

3. Nominations Committee

* The Faculty Development Advisory Committee

Rosenstein – FAC DEV needed two new members, as two had resigned. The ones who resigned were in cycles that ended this spring. I had an alternate for the position to represent COS (Svetlana Mitrovski) but none for LCBAS. Jon Oliver sent out a call for nominations and 4 responded (Susan Longley, Angela Glaros, Rigoberto Chinchilla, and Candra Chahyadi). The randomized selection was Candra Chahyadi. Rosenstein – motion to confirm Svetlana Mitrovski and Candra Chahyadi for FAC DEV.

Robertson – 2nd the motion

Discussion = none

Vote = unanimous

* University Union Advisory Board

- Rosenstein – Three individuals were appointed to the University Union Advisory Board last spring. (Thank you Rigoberto Chinchilla, Axton Betz-Hamilton, and Frances Murphy for volunteering).

However, I should notify you all of some changes in progress. The University Union Advisory Board voted to change their bylaws to reduce faculty membership from three faculty members to one member. Once the IGP (~Fall 2017) is altered only one member will be needed.

- Sterling – I am somewhat uncomfortable with implementing a change in an IGP that has not yet been changed. If they want to change bylaws, fine. But EIU BOT approval is needed to change an IGP.
- Rosenstein – agreed.
- Stowell – adds comments on IGP, and who has authority to monitor/change an IGP.
- Sterling – confident that EIU BOT has to approve any changes to EIU IGPs.
- Rosenstein – adds additional comments. In the meantime, all three faculty members will attend and vote until the change is official and the IGP is altered. A random selection process was used to select one of the three candidates to serve once this change goes into effect. That person will be Rigoberto Chinchilla.

* Apportionment Board

- Rosenstein – Faculty attendance has been sporadic and inconsistent. Absentee voting had taken place. Meetings are on Thursdays at 7pm – concentrated in Feb and March. Due to resignations from faculty who could not attend Thursday evening meetings.

- Rosenstein - email from Lynnette Drake reported on an approved resolution to change the Board bylaws from 3 voting faculty to 1 ex-officio faculty member (advisor). President Glassman wanted to get faculty senate opinion on the board change before moving forward.

- Pierce – usually Feb & March meetings = heavy ‘budgeting decisions’ time of year, occasional meetings in the Fall to introduce/discuss budget items. Faculty have historically missed Fall meetings, but would show up for the voting meetings in the Spring without background information gained from Fall meetings. Based on this, maybe a good time for a change in the Board and related IGP. \$ that Board distributes is 100% student fees for student-based programs and events. Student opinion = more sensible for an ex-officio faculty member to advise, rather than have faculty compose of 27% voting rights of the Board. Reviewing IGPs – some have not been updated for over 30 years – we feel it may be a good time to update the IGP for the Apportionment Board.

- Gosse – does the Board advise the President on final student fee decisions?

- Pierce – the Board votes on student fee-spending decisions, but actions still need approval by VPAA and President.
- Waller – I think since it is 100% student fee money, your argument for change is very reasonable
- Sterling – it is somewhat unfortunate that faculty members have not been regularly attending in the recent past – but on its own, that is not a great reason to cut faculty from the board. However, the better, separate argument that you have presented about is that students should decide how student fees are spent.
- Pierce – provides more background on both points he presented
- Bruns – no perceived value in faculty input on the Board?
- Pierce – adds comments about faculty typically questioning ‘value’ of activities funded by students = usually more criticism of how students are spending their student fee money.
- Bruns – considering the argument of students deciding where student fee money goes, the value of faculty involvement may lie in the additional perspective that is hopefully – asking additional questions that maybe students have not considered. That being said, I don’t have a problem with the proposed cut of 3 voting members, down to 1 ex-officio.
- Bruns – but it does represent a significant reduction in voting influence = ex-officio = no voting privileges
- Rosenstein – it is important to understand process that activity fees goes through, and relationship between Apportionment Board and IGPs – adds comments – even without faculty voting, there is a multi-layered monitoring system in place to receive final approval to spend fee money – Student Senate, VP Student Affairs, and the President. Therefore, I support the change of faculty representation on the Apportionment Board to only an ex-officio faculty representative.
- Bruns – were the faculty votes often contrasting to the direction the students voted?
- Pierce – sometimes – we allocate to 4 orgs based on projected budgeting – sometimes we have to ask for money back when shortfalls occur (caused by decrease in enrollment in the past few years).
- Rosenstein – when student activity fees were increased a few years ago, how did that process work?
- Sterling – the EIU administration sent a proposal to the EIU BOT -
- Robertson – I motion that we support the passed resolution to change faculty representation on the Apportionment Board (3 voting members to 1 ex-officio <non-voting>)
- Wharram – second the motion
- Discussion – none
- Vote = “Yes” – all except for Sterling and Bruns
- Resolution passes
- Rosenstein – Three individuals responded to a previous call this semester for nominations to fill the faculty voids on the Apportionment Board. (Thank you Claudia Janssen Danyi, Douglas Brandt, and David Grace for volunteering). Once the IGP is altered only one member will be needed. A random selection process was used to select one person to serve once this IGP change goes into effect. That person will be Claudia Janssen Danyi. In the meantime, all three faculty members will attend and vote until the change is official and the IGP is altered (~Fall 2017).

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee

- * Waller > L. Young – I shared Faculty Senate concerns of workgroup 7 recommendations to the Student Senate for their review. The following week we discussed the vitalization recommendations. The majority of members were in support of the vitalization process. Additional discussion may follow.
- Hung – was it a discussion about all of the workgroups, or just workgroup 7?
- L. Young – it focused on workgroup 7, and we will continue to discuss other workgroup recommendations in future meetings/sessions.

5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

- Corrigan - Update from February 8th Meeting – many topics were not directly relevant to Faculty. Josh Norman will speak at March 2017 meeting. Vitalization was discussed a few times. Paul McCann made additional comments – referred to workgroup #7 as ‘program elimination’ in his comments = disheartening. Discussion took place on ‘why not eliminate athletic programs?’. Still being analyzed. McCann suggested that athletics teams help recruit students = increase tuition revenue. He also suggested that the teams that would actual save EIU money if dropped would probably never be considered for dropping. Adds other comments about marketing and advertising consultancy activity.
- Hung – workgroup #4 did review that topic, but no recommendation to eliminate followed.

- Sterling – adds additional comments – this could never be football and basketball, even though they are the big money ‘losers’ at this level.

6. Awards Committee

a. Distinguished Faculty Award Nominations due February 24th

Hugo – deadline is approaching. Recipient will be announced at Faculty Senate meeting on March 7th.
Oliver – I will send one more announcement via email

7. Faculty Forum Committee

- Bruns – no report – but comments on recent quote by Mark Cuban (well-known billionaire in the sport industry) – Cuban shares a prediction that more majors will be needed in arts and humanities within the next 10 years – not necessarily in business and finance (automated industries). Will share article with you.
- B. Young – maybe worthy of a faculty forum topic?

8. Budget Transparency Committee

- Sterling – no report

9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

- Wharram – no report

10. Ad hoc Committee for the Review Workgroup 7 Recommendations

- Wharram – we met last Tuesday, and will meet again next week. Seeks clarification on Senator Sterling’s involvement on this committee?
- Sterling – will serve but have reservations related to his participation based on the current situation and his position.
- Wharram – current membership – Young, Eckert, Hugo, Wharram
- Hung – I gracefully declined the invitation
- Bruns – I not-so-gracefully decline
- Wharram – adds comments about attempting to defend 3 of 4 academic programs fighting for survival
- L Young – MS in Adult and Continuing Education program – presented to CAA last week – program will not be eliminated, but will temporarily be ‘frozen’ until enrollment increases.
- Wharram – we will analyze important points to consider outside of what workgroup 7 already brought up
- Bruns – there is significant value in more closely analyze these points that we thought workgroup 7 should have brought up – Senator Sterling has been a big part of this - Sterling should serve on this committee.
- Wharram – the only question about Sterling serving was that he is directly in the line of fire of recommendations
- Robertson – I am willing to serve as well if Sterling does not feel comfortable serving due to the circumstances
- Sterling – Robertson should serve in my place
- Wharram > to all senators - please send input on points this subcommittee should make that might disagree with workgroup 7 findings/recommendations
- Hung – suggestion - please try to review P/L data for some of the departments that are not slated for elimination – there are some errors/inconsistencies in those P/L data sheets – if a pattern exists, that needs to be highlighted.
- Wharram – concern - we don’t have access to all department responses – we only have responses from the 4 groups that were affected. Please send me your dept responses to workgroup 7 recommendations.
- Wharram – can we ask for the President for those responses?
- Robertson – I think we can ask – he may or may/not agree to share
- Wharram – those document were important responses by individual departments
- Hung – I think it is very pertinent – especially for credit hour accounting for each department – and definitely if there are inconsistencies across departments in how those hours were calculated
- Robertson – any further discussion? Seeing none – we are adjourned.

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from February 7th, 2017
2. CAA Minutes from February 2nd and 9th, 2017

VI. Ad hoc Committee for the Review Workgroup 7 Recommendations Meeting

3:00-3:50 PM

VII. Upcoming Dates for Spring 2017 Faculty Senate Sessions: Mar. 7th & 21st, April 4th & 18th