

4-4-2017

April 4, 2017

Faculty Senate

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "April 4, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1054.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1054](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1054)

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  
April 4th, 2017, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.  
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 p.m.  
- Welcome = Chair Jemmie Robertson  
- Senators in Attendance = Abebe, Bruns, Corrigan, Eckert, Gosse, Hugo, Hung, Oliver, Robertson, Rosenstein, Sterling, Stowell, Wharram, B. Young, L. Young (SVPAA)  
- Guests in Attendance = C. Buchman (DEN), D. Klarup (COS), B. Lord (AA), K. Miller (Adm), J. Norman (EnrMg)
- II. Approval of Minutes from March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2017 2:00-2:05  
- Motion to Approve = B. Young - Motion Seconded = Sterling  
- Discussion/Comments = none  
- **Vote** = Unanimous (\*2 abstentions = Corrigan, Hung)
- III. Committee Reports 2:05-2:15  
1. Executive Committee  
a. Update on Provost Search and CUPB Executive Committee Meeting  
- Robertson – last provost candidate is on campus right now – a few senators are at the faculty session – will join us a little later  
- Stowell – is there a formal process to provide feedback on Provost candidates?  
- Robertson – yes, online feedback form available for each of 4 candidates. Closing date is later this week.  
- D. Klarup – forms available through April 7<sup>th</sup>  
- Robertson – search committee will meet next Tuesday after having a chance to review feedback on all candidates. Search committee comments will be forwarded to President Glassman, who will make final decision.  
- Robertson – CUPB Executive Committee – purpose was to discuss proposal to reduce the size of CUPB. We met last Friday to discuss the proposal in detail. Results/Summary = we have tabled the proposal for 1 year. Why? – the proposal probably did not have the votes to make it out of CUPB Executive Committee, as well as valid points were brought up in the meeting to possibly shifting the focus to adjusting internal sub-committee functioning rather than focusing on changing the size. The year waiting period will allow time to see how well the adjustments will function. Also – some concern expressed that proposal will diminish collegiality and enhance resentment towards faculty senate, and faculty in general. Significant discussion focused on who would fill the 15 seats of the proposed ‘new’ CUPB. Voting membership would have been reduced from 23 to 15 – requiring significant adjustments to CUPB bylaws. Also discussed the proposal to add an Athletics position on CUPB – was initially well received by CUPB ExComm. Two additional positions proposed affecting representation on CUPB: 1) Library/Tech Rep proposed for voting position on CUPB, 2) remove FacSen chair from CUPB, and replace with a college faculty rep to serve as a faculty-senate liaison with voting rights. In summary – proposal is tabled for 1 year. Comments?  
- Hung – requests more background on deciding on the proposed 15 seats?  
- Robertson – proposal would reduce to 15 seats, it remains at 23 because proposal has been tabled.  
- Hung – purpose was probably to make the voting process more efficient and streamlined. I am in favor of replacing Fac Sen Chair with a faculty representative. But I would like this change to be supported by a stipulation that the liaison be required to report on a regular basis to Faculty Senate. That would represent a realistic compromise.  
- Robertson – one another note - our proposal would have converted 6 voting positions to ex-officio (non-voting). We tried to promote efficiency and collegiality with the proposal.  
- Stowell – tabling the proposal for 1 year begs the question – ‘how will the new adjustments to CUPB committee functions be evaluated to know if they improved functioning of CUPB?’  
- Rosenstein – it’s important to consider that there are not many colleagues volunteering for open elected positions – so an ongoing concern is not having the Fac Sen Chair attend our meeting and CUPB. A limited number of colleagues would probably be willing to serve on CUPB and report to Fac Sen without receiving any CUs = time intensive. Time is precious for all of us serving on committees.  
- Robertson – a reallocation of the current six CUs from the Fac. Sen. chair position to this proposed representative would probably be appropriate.

- Gosse – in addition - moving CUPB members from voting to non-voting may remove an incentive to serve and be invested in the process. And is the ‘need’ bubbling up from the committee or coming from external influences?
- Robertson – these changes originated from last year’s perceived dysfunctionality of a very large CUPB size, as well as an inability of CUPB members to agree on EIU’s mission during Program Analysis . We mutually agreed to table for a year to better assess the weight/trust EIU admin places on CUPB. The real issue may lie in this assessment – how much the admin values the work of CUPB.
- Bruns – should we table our/your proposal for 1 year? But we can revisit?
- Abebe – CUPB seems to be telling us to go do/worry about something else. Concern – if PR objectives are key, the sub-committees are probably not the best way to achieve the stated objective. I will predict that we will submit another resolution 1 year from now – stating the same objectives.
- Brunns – more discussion is needed between now and next Spring.
- Robertson – this is technically a CUPB proposal (made as a CUPB member) that I am reporting back to Faculty Senate – it follows out of a resolution from last year, as well as originating from Program Analysis a few years ago.

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

- Provost Lord – interim dean searches continuing – hopefully resolved by the middle of next week – finishing interviews – will be finalizing with the President shortly – also discussing staffing for next year – I have encouraged President Glassman that we need to resolve next year’s contracts ASAP this year – ambiguity of enrollment and state funding puts him in a tough position – BOT meeting later this month – tenure, 3 new degree programs, Vitalization, work group #7 recommendations, recruiting activities to attract students – President Glassman, Paul McCann, and I recently went to Springfield to advocate for state funding, along with other reps from campuses around Illinois – a necessary but difficult challenge – he focused on the Vitalization process with the legislature = Result – a relatively benign session for EIU and potential future funding promises.
- Hung – any movement in terms of a state budget in Springfield?
- Lord – sadly, no movement. The ‘Grand Bargain’ has stalled. A few efforts to re-start, but it probably won’t happen. Madigan sponsored a ‘stop-gap’ budget resolution that is just sitting there, ready to activate. Prediction = Probably ‘stop-gap’ funding for a third straight year.
- Rosenstein – how is EIU’s financial situation?
- Lord – short answer = yes, we are ‘open’ and ‘we will stay open’.

2. Elections Committee

2:15-2:30

a. Ratify Spring 2017 Election Results

- Stowell – Faculty Elections have been run – 21/24 positions have elected candidates. 31% response rate from voters – comparable to past elections. Of all votes tallied, 85% before reminder email, 15% after = ‘reminder’ email was mildly helpful. Several positions had write-in candidates, but none received 10 or more votes. According to Faculty Senate bylaws, these positions (longer than 1 year) will need to be filled in a ‘special’ election this fall = specifically APERC, CAA, and UPC position for CEPS.
- Hung – thank you for Senator Stowell’s efforts
- Stowell – motion to ratify election results, Bruns – second
- Vote** - unanimous

3. Nominations Committee

- Rosenstein – now that Spring Election is completed, I will compile list of open Nomination Committee positions – will forward to J. Oliver a call to serve on nominations committees to faculty via email distribution. Can we nominate a new chair for the Nominations Committee for next year? This is my last term. Preferably someone with knowledge and experience of the process.
- Robertson – we could discuss this on April 18.
- Rosenstein – preferably today so that it is finalized before April 18<sup>th</sup>.

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee

- no report

5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

- Corrigan – at a meeting yesterday reps from Staff Senate and Faculty Senate developed the following proposal related to the poor maintenance of EIU campus/grounds = A significant concern that impacts first impression of

many upcoming visitors as well as negative impact on all employees and community. We are asking the President to take immediate action to improve the grounds. Significant credit to Senator Wharram for authoring the memorandum in front of you.

- Wharram – I do fear that we may be coming across as ‘remedial’, for President Glassman is already aware of the situation, but I do think it is significant enough of an issue to encourage him to make it an immediate priority.
- Hung – true, President Glassman is already aware of this issue, but this memorandum can’t hurt, it may provide an additional impetus for him to ‘act’ and ‘invest’. This also represents one of the first successful collaborative efforts of the three senates that may promote/enhance collegiality.
- Corrigan – provides background about tension between different employee groups on campus
- Hugo – our recent meeting allowed Staff Senate to share their frustrations. It was productive.
- L. Young – I have discussed this memo with other students – the grounds are not well kept – students have made comments about it on a regular basis – I am confident that Student Government will endorse this memo.
- Rosenstein – yes, we want our Facilities personnel back – but I also think we need to evaluate our campus holistically. Is this campus as maintenance-free as it needs to be? Are there spaces on our campus that we can allow to grow freely/naturally? (natural prairie areas?) = A different angle or perspective to approach the issue of ongoing campus care/maintenance.
- B. Young – applauds the initiative – adds some editing suggestions such as ‘liability’ rather than ‘downfall’ – and also comments on using the term ‘transform’.
- Abebe – it the principle of various Senates on campus not to mix our work with union-based worked – so I suggest that we edit/adapt the wording to avoid an appearance of such a conflict = back off the 2<sup>nd</sup> line of the last paragraph (‘calling back some of the groundskeepers’). This is based on principle.
- Hung – a counterpoint to Senator Abebe’s point – there is the need for the work to be done, and those that were doing it were fired because of financial issues, not because of poor quality work. So they should be the one’s rehired rather than others being employed in their place.
- Wharram – adds comments/background – we are not trying to tell the administration what ‘to do’, this in front of you is the option that we selected - there may be other options that we are not aware of, but I hate not to be direct with this document.
- Abebe – facility management know what their job is and what needs to done – our job is to bring this concern to their attention – my concern is a ‘principle’ issue based on contracts, not whether or not this memo is effectively written or not.
- Rosenstein – I do agree that it is not our job to tell them (administration or facility management) what to do - this memo does seem to make an effective statement.
- Corrigan – adds comments about the focus of the document
- Wharram – we are trying to avoid any ‘hiring logistics’ – just to send a strong recommendation about this issue
- Robertson – can you make suggested edits to the memo and still send the same message?
- Corrigan – most likely – we support the staff
- Bruns – restates what he believes the ‘point’ of the letter is = student, staff, and faculty believe resources need to be invested in grounds maintenance
- Hung – there is more than one purpose/point to this letter – it also represents a vehicle for solidarity with other on-campus colleagues – this issue is important for our staff colleagues – those who were unjustly laid off due to poor funding from Springfield – we aren’t trying to revisit the layoffs – we are trying to express collective support
- Robertson – we need a motion to act on the memo with suggestions from Senator Young.

Motion – Hung, Motion 2<sup>nd</sup> – Hugo

**Vote** – yes = Bruns, Robertson, Young, Corrigan, Gosse, Rosenstein, Hugo, Hung, Oliver, no = Abebe, Abstentions = Sterling

(\*Notes – Stowell & Wharram left before vote, Eckert arrived after vote)

6. Awards Committee
  - no report
7. Faculty Forum Committee
  - no report
8. Budget Transparency Committee
  - no report
9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics
  - no report

10. Ad hoc Committee for the Review of Workgroup 7 Recommendations

- no report

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2017
2. CAA Minutes from March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2017
3. Learning Goals Infusion Proposal

V. Karla Sanders, Executive Director, Center for Academic Support and Assessment

1. Learning Goals Proposal and Discussion

2:30-3:00

- Karla Sanders – Learning Goals Infused into the Undergraduate Curriculum – started in 2011. Took hiatus due to budget turmoil. Picked back up this past year. I sent the catalog copy to your chair – I am here to receive your feedback on this ongoing project.
- Abebe – this is a very important document, a highly sophisticated approach to the general education experience. All involved should be commended. However, the more I read it, the more difficult it becomes to fully understand, even though I was actually involved in the development. For example – critical thinking – faculty find this concept difficult to fully understand. Any way to simplify? Also – could someone review my senior capstone course to help me with the integration of these learning goals into the course?
- Sanders – we have considered having faculty (general education committee members <subcommittee of CAA>) who are skilled in this area become available to provide support to faculty that are trying to infuse the learning goals into course outlines. There is also support in the general education handbook with examples, samples, ‘how to’ instructions, etc. We will make it available to all faculty. This is approximately ‘step 4’ in a 10-step process.
- Abebe – we also want students to understand this as well, correct? If faculty are having difficulty understanding it, it may be difficult for students to understand it. It is written as if for a scientist.
- Rosenstein – from a user perspective, it would be helpful to provide a list of prompting questions/checklist to help faculty to infuse the learning goals. Maybe in the handbook? Hate to reduce to a minimal checklist, but something comparable that would simplify the process to integrate the learning goals.
- Sanders – we are also revising the course proposal format – we will have 1 for general education and 1 for a major course. We will also provide useful tips/checklist for this process.
- Rosenstein – I think if this was more of a public document, it would boost students’ confidence as they graduate from EIU and entering the professional workforce.
- Sanders – we are trying to make this more explicit – skills that will benefit students in career and in life.
- Rosenstein – I see that as being a strong recruitment tool
- Abebe – schedule of ‘deadline’ to integrate into courses? Status of that schedule?
- Sanders – that will be changed – foundational courses will be edited during AY 17-18. In AY 18-19 go up one level with courses to infuse the LGs into. Then AY19-20 = infusing into capstone courses.
- Hung – question on quantitative reasoning (QR) – typically recognized within natural sciences and in foundational math courses. Discusses other courses with quantitative reasoning. \*Suggestion – branch out QR to ‘Natural and Social Sciences’ to fulfill requirements for general education.
- Sanders – provides additional background on quantitative reasoning being infused into specific courses in the curriculum
- Hung – I understand why we are streaming the segments, but many general education courses can fulfill multiple streams. Adds comments about a general Botany course – multiple learning goals could be satisfied within the course. It really depends on if the instructor wants to take on more than one learning goal.
- Sanders – agreed, and we have left responsible citizenship open and flexible – there are three main components identified – the instructor can choose how many components they want to integrate.
- Abebe & Hung – very impressive and valuable to our general education curriculum.
- Gosse – the essentials of a B.S. in Nursing are embedded in this document – these are the ‘essentials’ for future nurses – it’s a great initiative.
- Sanders – thank you for the feedback

VI. - Kelly Miller, Director of Admissions

- Joshua Norman, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management

3:00-3:50

1. Admissions Update

- K. Miller – started the day with a walk around campus with Facility Management personnel. The previous topic discussed is definitely on their mind as well. They worked on Old Main today. I think your recommendation is timely and needed, but they are also already aware.
- Rosenstein – is the route of the campus tour published somewhere online?

- L. Young – I am a tour guide. It depends on what you want.
- Norman – there is a tour guide manual that we use. We can share that with you. Very helpful resource.
- Rosenstein – it would be useful for some visitors and situations.
- K. Miller – update on admissions – filling admissions recruiter position – Chicago suburbs – filling 2 temporary recruiter positions. Luke Bryan scholarship – 11 applicants – will go to student(s) with connection to agriculture – we added 8 new events to our recruiting calendar this Spring semester – feedback was very strong - State of Illinois switched from ACT to SAT this year = caused disruption to normal recruiting cycle - we have late ACT results coming in = some high school seniors taking ACT for first time on April 8<sup>th</sup> = change will create a wave of late applicants = this significantly impacted low-income students who typically have fewer support staff advising them. Adds additional comments on ‘themes’ of the added Spring student recruitment days/events – discussed transfer student day – discussed admitted student events in Chicago and O’Fallon.
- Hung – comment on ‘open days’ – in BIO we organized activities in a biology classroom to experience BIO, not just discuss it – we are requesting more coordination with your office to involve the faculty in these efforts – more info on the schedule of these recruiting days will assist us in collaborating.
- Miller – yes, we need to collaborate more closely – enhance planning and organizing
- Norman – maybe less of issue on admitted student days vs the ‘open days’ to visit campus. Recent data from last year’s college choice survey pointed to ‘quality of major’ as one of the most important variables why students selected a campus. So yes, we are willing to better coordinate with you because this is critical.
- Hung – outreach in our discipline is critical - we can package small BIO activities and convert it to your scheduling format to maximize the visit
- Bruns – vital for faculty to be involved in this process – \*suggestion – focus on what you need from each department within certain time blocks – be as specific as possible and distribute to departments.
- Miller – we appreciate the faculty involvement. April 10 through 21 – ‘hosting preview EIU days for sophomores and juniors in high school as well as freshmen at community colleges – calendar is on our website. Summer open house will be scheduled – working on logistics to see what facilities are available.
- Stowell – admissions timeline – how long does it take from application to acceptance? Specifically transfer students?
- Miller – within a couple of days – once the full package is complete, it really is pretty quick
- Stowell – ask questions about late admission students – how late can they still get into class?
- Miller – can be within a few hours if they are local – shares an recent experience/example – we are willing to work with the late-deciding student. If the student is qualified we try not to turn them away. Also mentions summer camp marketing initiatives (IHSA Badminton, IHSA Track & Field, summer camps from various depts.)
- Norman - introductory comments on enrollment data, mentioned hiring of the Thornburn group to sharpening our brand = professional marketing insight combined with in-house initiatives, we need to invest closer to 2% of annual budget to marketing efforts (industry average), comments about offering in-state tuition to all domestic students in the US – good idea because our out-of-state inquiries have grown = significantly – 1,100 inquiries this year = more than doubled in the past few years. Only takes 4 months to earn Illinois in-state residency.
- Hung – something like that could help us recruit students – mentions recent U of I multi-year funding proposal = their strategic enrollment pitch to the Illinois legislature = goal is to increase in-state student enrollment.
- Rosenstein – question about Illinois students – where are EIU students coming from? Where are our concerted recruiting efforts? What about our region? Are we marketing to potential students in our region?
- Miller – 50-55% of EIU students coming from Chicagoland. We lost some suburban market share during the past 5 years, while mildly increasing Chicago Southside enrollment. Some progress in Indiana as well. Online programming and out-of-state competitors are taking Illinois students.
- Oliver – ask question on marketing efforts to high school juniors – shares experience of child who is a junior but has not heard from EIU, but has heard from most every other in-state and regional competitor. Shows stack of direct mail child has received from higher ed. competitors.
- Norman and Miller – provides background information on how EIU and competitors acquire contact information for college-bound students.
- Eckert – adds comments on local high schoolers not hearing much from EIU
- Norman – mentions briefly admission data for 2017-2018 - National Decision Day is May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017. As of today, up on transfer student orientation reservations and down on freshmen deposits. We continue to focus on these two important student groups.
- Miller – most Illinois universities are also seeing a reduction in those pools. Also – will be purchasing SAT results from the upcoming test date next week. Had to be more strategic with purchasing based on financial situation.
- Rosenstein – Do you purchase S-SAT and 8-18 data? Describes the programs.

- Norman – talks about expense per student for ACT and SAT data – 42 cents per student – not cheap. Discusses strategy for future direct mailing from EIU to prospective students.
- Oliver – reminder - in the mind of the junior/senior, receiving direct mail from colleges/universities does make an impact = the earlier the better.
- Norman – re-states the importance of a stronger marketing budget for enrollment/admissions
- Hung – adds comments on the BIO recruitment committee and their strategic plan – hopefully we can partner with your office in these recruitment efforts, trying to make it as efficient and productive as possible.
- Norman – discusses high school collaborations/articulation agreements with community colleges
- Bruns – any benchmarks being established in terms of ‘return on investment’ from your initiatives?
- Norman – August 2017 is probably when we will be starting ‘return on investment’ benchmarking for 2016-2017 recruiting/admission efforts.

VI. Other Business

VII. Adjournment no later than 3:50 p.m.

Final Spring 2017 Faculty Senate Session: April 18<sup>th</sup>

Summer Date to be discussed at April 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Provost Candidate Interviews:

Candidate 4: April 4<sup>th</sup>, 11:00 - 11:50 a.m. Faculty Senate and UPI, Arcola-Tuscola Room

Annual Faculty Retirement Reception:

May 4<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 p.m., Tarble Arts Center