

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1-9-2018

January 9, 2018

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 9, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1097.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1097

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
9 January 2018 ▪ 2:00-3:50 p.m.
Witters Conference Room 4440, Booth Library

The 2017-2018 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available at <http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>.

Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

Senators present: T. Abebe, S. Brantley, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, N. Hugo, K. Hung, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, J. Williams, B. Young, R. Cash

Senators absent: C. Wharram

Guests in attendance: Jay Gatrell (Provost), Jon Blitz (UPI), Newton Key (Faculty Development), Josh Awalt (ITS), Brooke Schwartz (DEN)

Session called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 2:01 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from December 5, 2017

Motion to approve by OLIVER, seconded by WILLIAMS

Discussion: none

Vote: 11 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions – motion carried

Executive Committee Report

ROBERTSON: We met with the President and Provost during Finals Week, after our last Senate meeting – At the last CUPB meeting of the [fall] semester we had a roundtable discussion about how to move forward with athletics; consensus was that we shouldn't move quickly with elimination of smaller sports teams, prefer to maintain roster instead of balancing books, strong desire not to hurt university's bottom line by cutting sports that bring in revenue or have high academic achievement – [*announces Peter Steiner recital tonight at 7:30 p.m. in Doudna recital hall*]

STOWELL: [*from meeting with Pres. Glassman*] IBHE representative is now and will continue to be fully funded

ABEBE: Senate has forwarded several resolutions to the President but we haven't heard anything; I assume the Executive Committee will follow up

ROBERTSON: He said he's been having conversations about renaming and he'd have more for us after the first of the year – we'll follow up on the administrator evaluation resolution

Provost's Report

GATRELL: We're in the push to get to the 10-day enrollment; nothing official yet – we're excited about the dual credit initiative; indicators that it's promoting increased applications as well as admits from partner schools – there are still challenges surrounding international student enrollments, but that's politics, changing visa practices; we're making adjustments to practices in OISS – we're also excited about growth in online programs – we're moving forward with the search for Dean of Library Services; interim dean Anita Shelton is serving as search committee chair; variety of junior and senior colleagues on the committee, mostly faculty but also administrative support staff; announcement sent to Booth Library leadership late last week; hope to have an advertisement in the next week or so, candidates on campus after spring break – Bill Minnis began his term as interim dean of LCBAS about a week and a half ago – Vitalization work continues, WG8&9 review committee is doing their work and making materials available to the public; I look forward to receiving their report beginning of next week [*HUNG states that second draft of report is in preparation*] – Student Success task force is moving forward; a lot of energy around the idea of a student success center, other themes are internships and undergraduate research; they've been working in subgroups, full group will meet on Friday morning; then they'll be reporting mid-February – for the last six months I've been looking at vitalization feedback, the 2009 strategic plan, President Glassman's 2014 Pathways to Excellence text, and trying to figure out how can we summarize our priorities in terms of everyday planning and practices so we can have a sense of where we relative to the broader direction of the institution; priorities document will provide roadmap between here and our next iteration of a strategic planning initiative; I anticipate a strategic plan campuswide initiative two or three Falls from now; important for Academic Affairs to make sense of our priorities for new program development as well as reorganization; asking for feedback

on document from deans and chairpersons; it's a summary of vitalization and an attempt to distill work already done but keep it front and center; vitalization is an ongoing process, not merely an event; we need to start establishing benchmarks; we've done a lot of low-hanging fruit, now it's time to start doing some heavy lifting – Pres. Glassman will be responding to Senate resolutions in the near future

CORRIGAN: What was your process in populating the committee for the library dean search?

GATRELL: Based solely on looking at roster for less familiar names (avoid the usual suspects), length of service and different roles

ECKERT: Were the members announced?

GATRELL: Yes, in an email to Library Services employees

ECKERT: Will the rest of campus find out, too?

GATRELL: Yes, it's public information

BRUNS: Sarah Johnson, Janice Derr, Bill Schultz, John Whisler, Kirstin Duffin, Arlene Brown (civil service rep in admin office); four of the five faculty members are unit heads – [to GATRELL] You looked at the roster and extended invitations to particular individuals to form the committee, correct? Because I don't remember a call for interest

GATRELL: Correct, I wanted to ensure broad areas of service and avoid potential internal candidates

OLIVER: Going back to dual credit, what quality control mechanisms are in place to ensure that partners are going to provide qualified instructors? Are we encroaching on junior college turf—how are we advancing into this initiative without damaging what others are doing?

GATRELL: We're intentional about not offering what junior colleges are offering; we're communicating on the front end, checking to make sure they don't have the capacity or staffing to offer those courses; we're cognizant that our partners are critical to our two-plus-two pipelines – I've been working with IGP 30 to make sure that our faculty qualifications are the same as HLC; the standard for a master's degree plus the required 18 hours in a content area (graduate coursework in the discipline) were not embedded within the IGP document (last revised 1988); our criteria are now in alignment; IGP revision is pending but will be 100% compliant with HLC – regarding quality control, step 1 was to align standards with HLC; all instructors are reviewed by department chairs; I've personally reviewed vitae for all instructors who are not EIU faculty – our model is different from Lake Land's, community colleges deputize; for D214, we do the same review as for any adjunct; we also have course coordinators, our faculty members who supervise the instructors and interact with the students at least once a semester; that differentiates us from community colleges – downstate it's 100% our faculty teaching those courses; going into the market we committed to value-add in quality, rigor, capacity to deliver; online delivery model; what makes the EIU contribution unique, not in competition with community colleges, is we can offer a course where they can't

HUNG: With dual credit rolling out, how is CAA going to play a role in that?

GATRELL: The courses are the same as we teach on campus, the content and learning outcomes are no different

HUNG: If a course is already on the books, then to make it dual credit you find a target audience and convert the format?

GATRELL: Partners approach us, then we determine if we have the capacity and expertise – we also have to align with graduation requirements in the K-12 environment, so they're always going to be entry level courses

ECKERT: How about our cohort of regional universities? Are they doing something similar, are we in competition with them?

GATRELL: We are the most innovative and active in this space

STOWELL: This is a new venue for us, not possible until a year ago

GATRELL: Until the dual credit act was amended by the legislature in Spring 2017

ECKERT: So then we should expect that the other institutions will jump in at some point

GATRELL: It's a lot of work, oversight, budgets – our price point is higher than community colleges, but we believe if we deliver a quality learning experience they'll enroll – IBHE has pending approvals for, or has already approved, Southeast Missouri and Indiana State to offer dual credit in the state – we need to be in the market because it's critical to our footprint in the region

GOSSE: How many credit hours can a student bring in?

GATRELL: No limit

GOSSE: What's the difference between AP and dual credit?

GATRELL: AP is a nationally-normed test, dual credit is based on curriculum and the Illinois Articulation Initiative

HUNG: If you're the instructor for a course with students from several high schools and you visit each school once a semester, how are CUs calculated?

GATRELL: CUs are the same as on campus; they get credit if it's a new prep; there's still a bump under the contract

HUNG: If you compare an online course that isn't dual credit, you're not required to visit the students

GATRELL: You're only required to visit for D214 where you're the supervisor of high school instructors

HUNG: So, not the instructor but the supervisor will visit

GATRELL: Someone goes to every school/partner site – there are non-instructional CUs assigned, varies depending on workload, because we do recognize there's an additional effort

Committee Reports

Awards Committee (HUGO): This semester we have the Distinguished Faculty Award; we're sending out the announcement this week; the deadline for nominations is February 23 at 4:00 p.m.; I'll be reaching out to Student Senate, Pres. Glassman, and the Alumni Association for representatives to fill out the review committee membership

Technology Update and Conversation with Joshua Awalt, Interim Associate Vice President for Information Technology Services

AWALT: Wi-fi: we asked ATAC about areas of improvement for wi-fi in the academic buildings; over the holiday break we upgraded eight buildings to 10GB; yesterday I approved purchase of equipment to upgrade the rest of the academic buildings as well as administrative buildings – Banner 9: at the end of this calendar year we have to upgrade; tomorrow I'll start a technical call with a consultant from Ellucian, partnering with us for the next 4-5 months to get a test environment set up; goal is to have production environment for testing by end users in place closer to the beginning of Fall semester – Academic Partnership: we're going through the processes used to onboard a student, trying to skinny the enrollment timeframe down to 3-4 weeks; our staff is going to be leveraged to help automate in the different areas such as Admissions and Financial Aid, taking a manual process and reducing the time it takes while maintaining integrity and high academic standards – Banner 9 and academic partnership are our #1 and 2 priorities; I apologize in advance for any delays on other requests but I hope everyone understands we're trying to push enrollment, we'll do our best to address other requests as downtime permits – other initiatives I've been working on include a refresh cycle for all of campus; the financial situation has reduced our ability to replace equipment as frequently as we used to; we used to do a 25% rotation, now we're closer to an eight year gap; ATAC has focused on replacing classrooms, podiums, heavier usage areas; my plan would look at infrastructure, servers, network and desktop equipment, and put together a cycle—we've never actually had a cycle for all those components, it was up to each area to decide what to refresh; this plan would be more of a standardized cycle, all equipment on campus would be 100% refreshed within an eight-year window; it's becoming more critical for us to have a set plan and prepare for the future as we become more reliant on technology, also meeting student expectations – ITS has stopped charging fees to the different areas, still collecting only the student fee; I'm looking to see if we can consolidate down to one technology fee that would be used to fund refresh cycle; examples I've seen at other universities combine everything into one lump sum, then the total amount is divided among the areas and prorated based on headcount to fund the costs of IT for campus

STOWELL: What was our internet speed before?

AWALT: 1.8GB – we had to upgrade our external equipment; we can expand that as needed

STOWELL: Metered bandwidth or flat fee?

AWALT: We have a set contract based on megabytes used; annual analysis process to reassess – we just renegotiated for five years with Consolidated

STOWELL: Is ITS considering voiceover IP telephone service?

AWALT: We had a consultant two years ago; their recommendation for proceeding would have cost more than \$4 million

ABEBE: Many of us don't have desk phones anymore

AWALT: The consultant's plan would have put a phone on every desk – we've pushed the decision off for five years; we have some equipment in place that we're testing and working out kinks

STOWELL: Are there any significant improvements in Banner 9?

AWALT: There are definitely advantages from a security perspective; we'll no longer be limited to Java – the interface is more user-friendly; there will be single sign-on – more improvements on back end

GATRELL: From a student experience perspective, we'll be able to craft dashboards more efficiently; this will facilitate the creation and management of a virtual one-stop for a seamless user experience

HUNG: How's your staffing level?

AWALT: We're more focused on purposeful prioritization these days than when we had more staff and could spread out projects; we've filled two positions (database administrator and system administrator), and we're hoping with academic partnership to bring on one more developer to offset the extra work – so we're not where we'd like to be to handle all needs and requests coming in, but we're able to manage

GOSSE: Who is handling the webpage? We had an update of the department pages, I don't like the pictures—can we fix that?

AWALT: Ryan Gibson and his team in CATS oversee any changes to the website; Jay Grabiec also works closely with the academic departments – it gave the functionality to the departments if they felt comfortable, but you can put in requests for modifications

GOSSE: You mentioned tech fees – our courses hang on continuing ed, and we always had a tech fee...

AWALT: That's the student tech fee, which we're still charging and collecting

GOSSE: For all online courses?

GATRELL: We're assessing that fee structure; we need to make sure that the infrastructure of ITS and CATS is supported; continuing ed fee was designed to pay for instruction in the overload model; there needs to be a wholesale reassessment as the scope of online education has changed

GOSSE: EIU provides Microsoft Office apps, a tremendous resource that nobody knows about, with great potential for collaboration – how can we get the word out?

AWALT: That's all included within our education pricing; we're somewhat limited in what we can do because everyone has a different teaching style, a different way of using technology in the classroom, so one size doesn't fit all; Tom Grissom has talked in ATAC about baby steps in how to integrate that technology – at this time we can provide support if there are questions about some of the applications, but we're limited on staff to design anything more collaborative

GOSSE: Any statistics or data on how many people are using those apps?

AWALT: I believe we can run some reports

HUNG: Faculty Development has been pushing out small workshops but it's going to take more partnership; it's more effective than a training workshop when a colleague uses it and can show others how it works

OLIVER: Are these tech-based workshops offered by Faculty Development a series? Offered how often? Develop a strand of workshops, find the users on campus and recruit them to present, promote more integration and adoption of the technology

KEY: We don't have a clearinghouse; there's somebody in every department who knows a lot of this stuff, but we don't know who or where they all are – Tom is pushing Office 365 – we also have certain capabilities in D2L and Kaltura; ATAC and CATS are working on that – it's hard to offer a lot of workshops; you have to judge how much you can introduce; the number we offer is a sense of how much the market will bear – we'll keep working with CATS – we'll be introducing some new workshops in Spring

HUNG: We did one on clickers, student response systems; it was a small workshop, about eight people – it's hard to figure out what is needed when for who; we rely on faculty requests, if you talk to us it's more likely to happen

KEY: Microsoft is using the education world to roll out stuff

STOWELL: Our department had a technology workshop maybe twice a month; having something at the department level was pretty effective because it was customized to our needs

HUNG: What's happening with the Workgroup 2 recommendation of having a centralized version of ITS and CATS together, a bigger umbrella to address the larger directions on campus?

AWALT: From my conversations with the VP, cost savings decreased as we reduced the size of our staff – we reduced the licensing model to fit our existing enrollment; we consolidated a lot of different resources; CATS got rid of Panopto and went to Kaltura, Mark Johnson was able to get better pricing and expand it to students) – some recommendations have been addressed; they're still talking but not ready to put anything else in motion at this time

GATRELL: This will be part of a broader discussion about structure and organization in Academic Affairs; I'm committed to the academic piece, the direct faculty support residing in Academic Affairs – I see the value of having distinct roles on campus; I also see the value of having a strategic leader coordinating IT enterprise-wide – we still have a lot of redundancies out there because it meets the needs of our faculty – there's an academic side but there's also infrastructure; they have to talk to each other, we can do better at that

Committee Reports (continued)

Elections Committee (STOWELL): It's Spring, so it's time to start thinking about who needs replacements on committees – we need to know which positions by mid-February, voting done by end of spring break

Nominations Committee (OLIVER): We tend to wait until elections are completed, then see what vacancies are going to be open in Fall

Faculty-Student Relations Committee (BRUNS): Student Senate meets next Wednesday, I will try to attend and give you a report

Faculty-Staff Relations Committee (HUNG): I missed the last Staff Senate meeting on the Wednesday of exam week; I will go to the next meeting

Faculty Forum Committee (ABEBE): Forum on Tuesday, February 13 at 3:00 pm; we're preparing a poster to distribute around campus; Provost has been very supportive; we've been trying to contact Chapin Rose

Budget Transparency Committee (STERLING): No report

Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics (ECKERT): No report

Other Business

ROBERTSON: Stacey Ruhoff from CAA will join us at our upcoming meeting on the 23rd; location still needs to be determined – Danelle Larson will be coming in March – potential guests for February?

YOUNG: Ask Dean Shelton for an update on Arts & Humanities plans for the 10th anniversary of Doudna opening

ROBERTSON: I know they have a planning committee for events during the 2018-19 academic year; please email me with any other ideas so we can book some conversations – Sen. Stowell and I will resume our attempts to communicate with other constituency groups and have a sit-down meeting to begin looking at keeping shared governance lines of communication more open, streamlined, immediate

BRUNS: On the WG8&9 review committee as we've been drafting our report, the concept of 'are we going far enough' has come up in discussions; Dr. Gatrell pointed out that vitalization is an ongoing process, so perhaps there should be an ongoing vitalization committee that would keep looking at these issues – should Faculty Senate look into a resolution to make this suggestion

HUNG: The review committee sees a need not just to make recommendations but to assess their implementation and to address areas that the workgroups identified but couldn't get into due to the limitations of the current budget environment; the workgroups were charged with what we can do feasibly, but there are strategic levels we should be discussing – faculty voice should be important in developing institutional direction in these changing times

ROBERTSON: During the vitalization process there was frustration that faculty had less of a role or voice in how the process was initiated and carried out – this might be an ongoing way for us to be at the front end of the conversation, take more of a leadership role and have it be more faculty-driven

ABEBE: There's quite a bit of merit to what you're saying; perhaps the shortage of time or the environment doesn't allow you as a group to do this, but there hasn't been discussion about imagining the future in a thorough, deliberate way – we feel threatened and see transformation taking place around us, but transformation doesn't necessarily mean that jobs will completely disappear, jobs change – as professors and as an institution we need to be able to imagine what our students are going to do 30 years from now, because if what we are teaching them won't exist in 30 years, it will be difficult for them to change careers at that time – to accomplish this: have a faculty discussion in an enabling environment (i.e., not required to make a report within a certain number of days) – I am supportive of the idea, but we need to provide a useful environment to be able to express things without being constrained by time

STOWELL: I think it's a great idea in principle; I'm trying to mesh it with other things that are happening, the Provost mentioned a strategic plan in a few years – I've also been thinking about the role and structure and size of committees; could Faculty Senate grow and become the ongoing vitalization body

HUNG: Ostensibly part of CUPB's role is to do strategic-level planning; the composition of CUPB has stakeholders all over campus – another factor is we need another committee like a bird needs a bicycle – we need to be sure that the work being asked of faculty is going to be of value – what channels do we have to promote that faculty ideas are given serious consideration; we have to accept that if this is a faculty initiative, all we can do is highly recommend – if we don't know where it goes, then it's hard to justify asking people to spend time to do it

BRUNS: Sen. Abebe hit the nail on the head with his assessment of the intention here – committees like CUPB and CAA do great work, but it's day to day, it's not vision – we need ongoing, long-term, forward-thinking

ABEBE: What we've been doing is efficiency-oriented, not oriented toward doing things better...

BRUNS: The review committee has gone a little beyond what WG8&9 proposed, but we're also somewhat self-constrained; we realized that there's a need for a group to go expansive – I like the idea of it being generated from Faculty Senate, faculty in the interest of shared governance starting this conversation about ongoing vitalization

HUNG: Workgroups 8 and 9 were under the same timeline, a semester and a half to do this work; you can only do so much given a limit – we see value in what those workgroups came up with; their work is valuable, whether or not I personally agree, because it was consulting stakeholders on campus; these are the outcomes of a conversation we had as a community – what can we do to make this more of a component of our lives at EIU – as elected representatives of the faculty, this is an appropriate venue to launch a faculty-led initiative

GOSSE: The report is prioritized, but the President and the Provost are the decision makers

HUNG: Yes, we are advisory

GOSSE: Can we build a partnership with the Provost for items that particularly impact faculty, to do ongoing monitoring?

HUNG: It needs to be a process with a product at the end, something that is actually used and taken seriously

ABEBE: I'm going to put a controversial idea on the table, the idea of really transforming shared governance on this campus – when a committee is appointed by the President or the Provost, the committee does its job and sends its recommendation to the Provost—that's it, it's done, no follow-up – what if a few of us from this group got together and conceived of an idea where every academic initiative reports to the Senate, and the Senate becomes the center of where things are done, followed through, etc. – Senate is ongoing, continuous, elected by the faculty – if all decisions we make as faculty were channeled through Faculty Senate, it would change shared governance completely on this campus

STOWELL: That's part of the model we're starting to look at with curriculum bodies, the recommending body to the Provost, though we haven't had those discussions yet

BRUNS: So, in this model a report would be submitted to the Provost and to Faculty Senate

ECKERT: It is really decentralized; we rely on our administrators giving up morsels of information – this way we would see more of the big picture

ABEBE: If I were an administrator I would welcome that because I would know where to go, I'd know who has blessed this particular decision and who is accountable

BRUNS: I would suggest we have further discussions, continue this next time – one of the questions I have is: we're partly talking about assessment of current plans, partly about long-term strategic thinking; should those be the same body or separate?

ROBERTSON: I'll create an agenda item to follow up with budgeted discussion time on this topic

Session adjourned at 3:31 p.m.