

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

2-6-2001

February 6, 2001

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 6, 2001" (2001). *Minutes*. 1196.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1196

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.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR February 6, 2001 (Vol. XXX, No. 20)

The 2000-2001 Faculty Senate minutes and other information are available on the Web at <http://www.ciu.edu/~FacSen>. The Faculty Senate agenda is posted weekly on the Web, at 2540 Buzzard, and at 2107 Buzzard Hall.

I. Call to Order by James Tidwell at 2:04 p.m. (Conference Room, 2540 Buzzard Hall)

Present: W. Addison, R. Benedict, J. Best, M. Boshart (S), D. Brandt, G. Canivez, J. Dilworth, C. Eberly, P. Fewell, B. Fischer, F. Fraker, N. Greer, G. Kelly (S), J. Tidwell, M. Toosi, B. Young, and A. Zahlan. Excused: Absent: M. Toosi Guests: Ryan, Wall,

II. Approval of the minutes of January 30, 2001.

Motion (Zahlan, Fischer) to approve the minutes of January 30, 2001.

Corrections: Old Business, Section 8, Line 13, and p. 2, Zahlan: Add, "Were the grant recipients named?" **Yes:** Best, Brandt, Canivez, Dilworth, Eberly, Fewell, Fischer, Fraker, Greer, Tidwell, and Zahlan. **Passed.**

III. Communications

- A. Letter from Professor Bonnie Irwin concerning Senate technology recommendation #9--Feb. 1, 2001. Irwin questioned whether the statement as written specifically included all elements of the university.
- B. Minutes of Committees for the Assessment of Student Learning-Jan. 23, 2001. They continue to Review Software for portfolio management. A student forum is scheduled for Thursday, Feb. 22, 2001, on academic assessment in Carmen Hall.
- B. Letter from President Surles/VP SA Hencken concerning CUPB composition for 2001-2002--Feb. 12, 2001.

IV. Old Business

A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive Committee:

- a. Meeting with Acting Provost Wall and Acting VPER Nilsen on Feb 7, 9:00 a.m.
- b. Senate discussion about future Radio-TV Center. Meeting scheduled in early March 2001, to discuss digital conversion.
- c. The Financial Aid Review Committee appointment from last week was Judy Barbour, ECEMLE.

2. Elections: Faculty Senate elections will be held the last week of March 2001.

3. VPAA Search Committee: Best: References will be contacted for 12 applicants. The committee is working on a set of core questions, and questions for references. The committee will meet with a set of eight candidates in Indianapolis. Best revisited the issue of selecting three candidates whose strengths and weaknesses go forward to the President. The function of why five people are targeted for on-campus interviews is to provide the campus with an opportunity to give feedback to determine the three final names forwarded. It is hard to know how the proposed tenure statement will be read. Of the past four VPAA's who have come from the outside, two had tenure and two did not have tenure. On campus interviews may be in the last week of March and the first two weeks of April. We are trying to get interviews done ASAP.

4. VPBA Search Committee: Tidwell: Chair Davis said the number of applicants were in the mid-30s. No timetable has been set yet. The committee is currently reviewing applications.

5. CAA taskforce: Fraker: The committee met for a second time on Feb. 9, 2001. Fraker distributed a handout he plans to use as a set of issues to consider. He sees as part of their task coming up with a rubric for assessment of on-line courses.

6. Electronic Grade Book: No report

7. Academic Technology Advisory Committee: Tidwell distributed a list of structural enhancement grants. Those on the front of the sheet were funded, while those on back were not funded. Fewell: The

unfunded grants are an indication of how much need there is out there for such monies. Zahlan: These are not rejected, but they are on the waiting list. Tidwell: there was a total of 759, 000 and they had \$250,000 to distribute. Tidwell: ATAC approved a four-year computer lab replacement cycle several years ago. He distributed the list of labs and when the computers are being replaced, and the amount of money to be spent on new computers. Most computers will be replaced during the summer. Fewell explained the hierarchy of Lab classifications, level one, two, etc. The longer hours the lab is open, the higher is the level. Fraker: What happens to the older computers? Tidwell: We have a policy on that. I think the ATAC computers have a hand-me-down policy. Fewell: After four years they are beaten to death. When one is into level 3's and 4, there is a policy likely made jointly by the ITA and AA offices. Some computers are lemons from the get-go. Others are just worn out. We would be asking for trouble. They are state property, and by state mandate they go to Springfield for auction. In fact, there is a sale today. Tidwell: It is everyone's advantage to get on this ATAC list because it is a fairly efficient way to get new computers over a four-year cycle.

8. Steering committee for Technology Enhanced and Delivered Education: Tidwell: Grants were finalized today. On Monday, Dean Augustine will electronically notify the grant applicants of their success. The University release will be out on Tuesday, and in late March, there will be a reception for the awardees. Wall: If rejected applicants want to know reasons, that information will be available to them. Tidwell: We had five subcommittees reviewing the applications. We ended up not spending \$29,000 to hold in reserve for possible other professional development grants and/or equipment/software. Fraker: I thought there was three times as much money applied for as money. Tidwell: We did not fund everyone. Some of the proposals were not yet ready for funding. Fraker: If you have money that you did not give away, the implication is that there were not enough good grants to merit funding. Tidwell: Some of it was a quality issue, not just that we ran out of money. All the subcommittee members came to the same conclusion. A lot of general equipment proposals were turned down. A lot of requests about equipment, video cameras, servers, lap tops, etc., were not funded.

9. Search Committee for Chief Officer of TEDE: Tidwell will chair the committee, and he will be representing the Faculty Senate and the Steering committee. Committee composition will include representatives from CAA, COTE, CGS, the Structural Support Specialists, ITS, Media Services, the Deans Council, Chairs Council, and a student. It will be a ten-person committee. We have not yet determined the time frame. The search may be in the fall. We will have to wait and see. Fewell: Will the job description be put together after the model is established? Benedict: Is it unprecedented to bring administrative position applicants to campus interviews during the summer? Tidwell: Generally it is not done. There have been some exceptions.

10. Director of Housing and Dining Services Search Committee: Eberly: The initial meeting is Wednesday, Feb 7, 2001, 4:00 p.m.

11. Director of Greek Affairs Search Committee: Greer: The initial meeting is Wed. Feb. 7, 8:00 a.m.

12. Parking on Fourth Street: Tidwell contacted Chief Larson. The Parking Advisory Committee will be meeting some time this month. Larson thought this was a city/state issue. The parking committee has only a recommendation. Tidwell mentioned the Parking Advisory Committee recommended that parking in front of Buzzard Hall not be eliminated until the spaces were replaced, and that did not happen. It may very well be a city/state issue that we do not have a lot of say-so in. Best: The dirt space is not city property. There are other ways of dealing with this. If there are problems about safety, there are clearly things that we do control. Why was the University Parking Advisory committee not consulted at all on this? That seems to be poor communications if nothing else. Tidwell: They did meet once last semester. Wall: It may have been part of the campus plan, but I was not a party to that. Tidwell: There was some discussion that eventually those spaces would have to go. Kelly: You do have the Mayor's ear in the 1895 Room at the External Relations Committee tomorrow night. Tidwell: Benedict, you are on. Benedict: I have not been contacted about it. Brandt: There is the issue of the university space, and there is access to the space that has to be agreeable to the city or state. Best: I think the local media might be interested in seeing how many cars are able to be parked in the dirt space. I may go back to my 60s activism. Fischer: Then I will plant

grass on it.

13. Location of Communication Disorders and Sciences: Tidwell: I have heard there are space allotment problems with Communication Disorders and Sciences, and what will happen to them. Wall: They were included in the Student Health Center, but with the remodeling of Doudna Fine Arts Center, the clinical building will be destroyed. Someone forget to move CDS to another location. They were put into Weller Hall, but the remodeling apparently does not have money attached to it. It will take about \$1.2 million to put CDS in there. I do not know how to respond to that, it is on hold right now. Tidwell: They are supposed to go into the new science building in 2015. Canivez: Maybe they can rent out the old Wal-Mart building. Tidwell: That will probably be where some of the humanities departments are relocated. Fischer: There is plenty of parking.

14. International Programs: Zahlan: Sue Songer was delighted that Senate would like to participate. The date is Wednesday, April 25, in the 1895 Room from 2-4 p.m. A lot of what they want us to do is to promote attendance to encourage people to come. They want as many people as possible to meet our international students. If we would like to pay for refreshments, it will be about \$100-150. Recently Sociology paid \$200, and refreshments were much remarked upon. It was requested that Chair Tidwell pay for as much as the budget will allow. **Motion: (Zahlan/Benedict): for Faculty Senate to sponsor an International Tea on Wednesday, April 25, from 2-4 p.m. Yes:** Brandt, Canivez, Dilworth, Eberly, Fewell, Fischer, Fraker, Greer, Tidwell, Young, Zahlan, Addison, Benedict, and Best. **Passed.** Zahlan will call Songer and tell her we accept the invitation. Tidwell: We are in pretty good shape budget-wise this year.

15. BOT Regulation Change: Tidwell; Have anyone heard from constituencies? Fischer: I have, and they were worried that it might eliminate some people. Changing it so you didn't get it was worse than when it was left up to a decision. Fewell: My constituents also said that. Young: I have heard the same among my constituents. Zahlan: It would not hurt to have some sort of motion. **Motion (Zahlan/Dilworth) that the Senate supports that the current BOT regulation be continued.** Tidwell read the language of the BOT motion to the senate. Dilworth: It is unwise to change a policy that is already flexible. Fraker: The wording closes the door without people taking responsibility for making that decision. It is not just sort of a comfort issue. Those things really do get negotiated with the department. Tidwell: The timing could be better; those things usually get done at the last minute. Benedict: Will the current search committees be grand fathered in? Best: That is not the current thinking. Tidwell: The President could say she will not approve tenure for any person. She can do that now. Greer: Won't that affect the search now, though? Tidwell: The current EIU VPAA description is silent on that issue. Benedict: What is protocol? Does Faculty Senate traditionally comment on issues such as this? Tidwell: Faculty Senate can comment on anything they want to comment upon. Fewell suggested that Senate send a letter to the President and the Board members. This individual could be a faculty member, so that way, we do have a right to discuss it. Tidwell: The motion will be discussed at the next BOT meeting in April. Brandt: Could you clarify what is said about department approval? Addison: The administration makes the tenure decision, but the department still has to recommend the tenure. Wall: The recommendation goes to the Dean, Provost, and then to the President. Tidwell reread the regulation to the Senate. Tidwell: The motion is that we go on record as opposing any change in the regulations? Best: We don't think it is wise. Zahlan: My original motion was that we instruct Tidwell to communicate our view. Best: Those BOT regulations are not easily accessible, as they are not a part of the Internal Governing Procedures. **Motion: The Faculty Senate recommends that the current BOT regulation: II.B.3.c: be retained as it is in the interest of maintaining flexibility in the hiring process. Vote:** Canivez, Dilworth, Eberly, Fewell, Fischer, Fraker, Greer, Tidwell, Young, Zahlan, Addison, Benedict, Best, and Brandt. **Passed.** The regulation currently reads as follows (bold letters are the suggested changes):

At the time of initial employment by the University, an administrative employee, **except those in the positions of Provost, Vice President, Associate Vice President, or Assistant Vice President,** may be granted tenure only if so recommended by the department (or equivalent academic unit), the Dean, the Provost/Vice President, and the President and approved by the Board. **Administrative employees in the positions of Provost, Vice President, Associate Vice**

President, or Assistant Vice President shall be at-will employees buy may be granted up to a three-year contract.

- 16. Distinguished Faculty Award:** Fewell: We do need to consider the Distinguished Faculty Award that is coming up. Zahlan: That is usually selected right after elections. The announcement usually goes out with the elections materials. Fewell: I have that on disk when it is needed
- 17. Technology Enhanced and Delivered Education Models:** Tidwell provided a summary of the three models to the Senate. Model "A" keeps things basically where they are in terms of reporting lines in Business Affairs and Media Services with some additional people involved. In all three models, the instructional support specialists remain in the colleges. Model "B" moves Media Services into a new Technology Unit, and also moves user Services from ITS and includes it with Faculty Development in Adult and Continuing Education, and puts it all under one unit with an Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs for Technology, who would report to the Provost. The individual colleges would hire the hardware/software technicians in all three models. Best: Where would the money come from? Tidwell: If it is important enough, you come up with the money. That's what we did in our college. Model "C" keeps things where they are, but with a larger technology unit. The committee structure would change from the present in this model. There are two different committees that have to be involved here. Zahlan: I think we need something like the Faculty Research and Grants Committee to distribute the grants. Tidwell: Model "B" does have a faculty development component and a full-time trainer in the mix. Zahlan: I think we need a structure like the Faculty Research and Grants Committee to review grants. Best: Can we get that in the models, such as Model "A"? There is an overwhelming amount of information here. What are the upside/downside of each of the plans? Addison: Particularly the downsides, as the positives are listed. Fewell: I have reservations about "A" having been Coordinator of Distance Learning without any staff. Who gives them the teeth to say to Media Services, "I need to use your video streaming server for this class." Tidwell: That will have to be up to the Provost to make that determination. Fisher: We need to have user services under the VPAA and two models do not have that, so that eliminates them for me. Zahlan: I agree with Fischer. There is responsibility but no authority in two of the models. Model "A" is gone for me. Fewell: The models in other institutions that have failed are the ones that coordinate. They have responsibility but no authority. Fischer, I like some parts of "C", but not all. Fewell: Is it possible to take parts from one model and place it with parts from another? Tidwell: Yes. Fischer agreed. Fewell: I don't wish to create another vice-president, but there has to be somebody there who says we need these items in our classrooms at the VP level. There has to be somebody sitting at that provost's table that says that we have to have the technology in the budget. No one is currently responsible for the classroom technology. Benedict: Is one of the models any more cost efficient than the others? Can we do this, or is this something we would like to do? Fewell: We have a new Provost coming on board, and there is an assistant vice president open. There is a vacant position sitting there right now, but it all depends upon the new Provost. Benedict: Where does Dave Henard's position go within all this? Tidwell: The ITS director there is really that position. Canivez: Is there a need for a vice president at that level? Fewell: That vice president deals with telecommunications as well, so there is more than technology. Fraker: Fewell has the best idea of implementation, of getting the job done. Is there one of these models which seems the more attractive? Fewell: I made some calls when this came out, and any institution that is moving toward web-based issues is struggling. Some are vice presidents and some are not, but all typically report to the Provost. There needs to be a point person to make referrals. We need teams to develop instructional materials where you are the content expert, but not the WebCT expert. There has to be someone who monitors the workload for the unit. There are part of Models "C" and "B" that could work well together. We have a lot of people doing things across campus that we are not aware of, as we need to be. We are looking at teams to assist faculty. Who are the content experts? Best: Would model "B" be a way of implementing what you suggest, Fewell? My inference is that we are supporting Model "B". Fewell: The Instructional Coordinator needs to be moved up on the hierarchical chart. Take away the boundaries. There has to be some excellent communication between administrative computing and academic computing. The backbone has to be there. Tidwell: The University Technology Advisory Committee would be the coordinating group there. Fewell: Everything is a power issue when you really get down to it. Brandt: I would like to see a list of all the

problems that these models are aimed at solving. Fischer: The one in thing in "B" that bothers me is the placement of Faculty Development. There are lots of non-technology people in faculty development. Best: I don't like the current placement, and this is an improvement. Tidwell: We had those discussions in TEDE. The question is where you put it. Addison: It seems to be buried now in the School of Adult and Continuing Education. Fewell: Instructional design does not always involved technology. It is a process. Faculty development is also a process that does or does not include technology. Best: Part of my interest is in looking at the seniorization of the faculty. Soon the majority of full time faculty will be over age 50 in the USA. We must keep those folks attached, dynamic and vital. Tidwell: Right now Faculty Development is not very well funded, and the Director is retired. Best: Model "B" has a lot going for it, but not this part of it. Zahlan: Maybe we need to see this imposed on the large, non-technical structure? Fraker: I think we are giving into the paranoia that in putting it there, it will be pidgin-holed. If it is given clout, we have to trust somebody in there to do so. Canivez: The notion about faculty development is sidetracking the issue. Maybe we should consider the major focus? There is a certain component that can be helpful for faculty development, but.... Addison: The location of the faculty development office might be a good topic of discussion for the Executive Committee in the meeting with the Provost tomorrow. Tidwell: There is a technological component to faculty development, but there is a lot more than that. Fewell: It cannot stand alone by itself, and it has to have a support staff. In other areas there are Teaching/Learning Centers. Tidwell: There are several open for a later this month for discussion about these models, and faculty are encouraged to attend. Zahlan: We have to go to one of these to complete a bubble sheet, but we can also provide e--mail reactions, and we can comment as a Senate. Tidwell: We plan to have a recommendation to the Provost by March 20, 2001.

V. New Business

A. Restructuring in the School of Adult and Continuing Education: Fraker: The School of Adult and Continuing Education is proposing some restructuring. I would like to invite Dean Hine to speak before the Senate. Tidwell: I will put that down.

B. Honorary Degree Committee: Tidwell: John Emmett, Chair of the Honorary Degree Committee, will be at Senate this next week. He wants some more recommendations.

C. EIU Foundation: Tidwell: There is nothing specific for the agenda next week. I have not yet nailed down a time for the EIU Foundation.

D. Parking on Fourth Street: Best: What about the parking situation? Canivez: I am concerned that the present administration of the city has railroaded things through without other groups having been consulted. Canivez mentioned the issue of Heritage Homes and Route 130, where he said the Mayor gave assurances that everyone had been consulted on the matter. Best: Furthermore, the cities' and universities' master plans both conflict on several major points.

VI. Adjourn: Canivez, adjourned. 3:55 p.m.

Future Agenda Items

- A. Radio/TV Center
- B. EIU Foundation
- C. Honorary Degree Committee

Respectfully submitted,

Charles G. Eberly, Recorder