

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1-18-2000

January 18, 2000

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 18, 2000" (2000). *Minutes*. 1211.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1211

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 JANUARY 18, 2000 (Vol. xxix, No. 16)

The 1999-2000 Faculty Senate minutes and other information are available on the Web at <http://www.eiu.edu/~FacSen>
The Faculty Senate agenda is posted weekly on the Web, at 2504 Buzzard, and at 315K Coleman.

I. Call to order by Bonnie Irwin at 2:05 p.m. (2504 Buzzard Building)

Present: J. Allison, R. Benedict, J. Best, G. Canivez, J. Coons, C. Eberly, P. Fewell, B. Fischer, G. Foster, B. Irwin, G. Lockart, N. Marlow, J. Tidwell, M. Toosi, B. Young, G. Kelly. Guests: T. Abebe, J. Abell, M. Buerskins, S. Gustafson, J. Nilsen, K. Rush, A. Samuels

II. Approval of the minutes of January 11, 2000.

Motion (Allison/Fischer) to approve the minutes of January 11, 2000.

Yes: Allison, Benedict, Best, Canivez, Coons, Eberly, Fewell, Fischer, Foster, Irwin, Lockart, Marlow, Tidwell, Toosi, Young.

III. Communications

- A. Council on Academic Affairs minutes, 9 December 1999. CAA will begin to review proposals for general education courses in Spring 2000 semester. Proposals for courses currently part of revised general education curriculum must be on CAA agenda by the end of spring semester. New courses approved: PED 2104, Technique and Theory of Aerobic Exercise and Strength Training; PED 3800, Biomechanics of Human Movement. New requirements for PE major approved. New course proposal format for general education approved.
- B. Council on Academic Affairs agenda, 13 January 2000.
- C. Council on University Planning and Budget agenda and attachments, 21 January 2000. FY 2001 Budget Recommendation; Recap and Update on Planning.
- D. 1999 EIU Fact Sheet
- E. Memo from VPAA Abebe announcing the appointment of Dr. Augustine as graduate dean, 11 January 2000.
- F. E-mail from David Carpenter, English, regarding VPBA search, 12 January 2000. A VPBA was not hired. Search will re-open later. Dr. Carpenter still interested in serving.
- G. E-mail from Acting VPER Nilsen regarding BOT meeting, 14 January 2000. Because two board members cannot attend in person and because of a light agenda, January 24 meeting will be in 1895 room.
- H. E-mail from Acting VPER Nilsen regarding "Promoting Eastern," 14 January 2000. Office of External Relations would like to make a presentation to faculty and staff senates on how we can all be involved in promoting Eastern.
- I. E-mail from Bailey Young, Senate, regarding VPIA search firm. Katina Leodas will hold an open information-gathering session on campus on January 25 at 2:10 p.m. in the 1895 room.

IV. New Business

- A. University Planning
 - a. Presentation by Jill Nilsen and Julia Abell. Acting VPER Nilsen led the Senate through a presentation on the packet of planning materials. Institution-wide planning began at Eastern in 1993. During Jorns's 6 ½ years as president, planning enabled the University to establish institutional priorities and to move resources to fund these priorities: salaries, library, technology, and deferred maintenance. Two concerns expressed by the campus community throughout the process were that the process of writing plans was cumbersome and time consuming and the relationship between planning and budgeting was not always apparent. The planning process was under constant revision during the previous six years in efforts to address these concerns; the process did vary significantly during that time period. Both internal and external influences created a need to reconfigure the planning process. Internally, there was a new president as well as new leadership in vice presidential areas. Externally, there were changes in the Illinois General Assembly and in the IBHE. There were new legislators in both houses, and, increasingly legislators were emphasizing accountability and outcomes measures. Changes in the IBHE included a new director, new board leadership, the Illinois Commitment, and a revised budget process that was tied to the Commitment. The purpose of the Illinois Commitment is to guide campus decisions in setting priorities and allocating resources. It was developed as a result of surveys and focus groups. The Commitment has three focuses: partnership, opportunities, and excellence. Each of these focuses has two goals: economic growth, teaching and learning, affordability, access and diversity, high expectations and quality, productivity and accountability. The goals are important for two reasons: 1) all budget decisions will be based on institutions' contributions to the achievement of these goals, and 2) budget requests have to be tied back to the goals with an indication of how outcomes are to be assessed. The planning model has the President's six goals at the corners. Her goals tie back to the Illinois Commitment. Each of the vice

presidents is to look at the six goals and identify ways in which they can support them. Deans and directors will be asked to develop specific objectives to support the vice presidents' focus. At the heart are the units; this is the source of creative thinking and the initiatives. The arrows are always bi-directional. That means that communication is critical. We have to move together to move the institution forward. The timeline indicates that we have a more proactive budgeting process. The plans generated this year will build our budget for 2002. The question/discussion that followed raised the following issues:

- It was indicated that the vice presidents are using their advisory subcommittees.
- The Faculty Senate will have some initiatives as a result of the faculty survey. Where is the Senate integrated into planning? The Faculty Senate is a unit of Academic Affairs. Some of the suggestions from Senate may go to the VPAA; others may go to Deans. Initiatives can also be proposed through CUPB.
- If departments are the heart of planning, shouldn't there be some uniform procedure to inform department members of the process? One of the facts that came to light at a previous Senate meeting is that some people in departments were informed and others had not been informed. There was significant variability. All along campus wide focus groups were held. That input was used to develop the new process. The new process was presented to the President's Council, the Deans, the Council of Chairs. It was assumed that the chairs would go back to their faculty. Each year there have been revisions to the process. This was another revision to the process. We also sent out letters to the campus.
- Earlier when the planning process was under revision, what was the role of CUPB? The revisions were brought to CUPB in the fall. They were also part of the focus groups.
- There is a distinction between planning governance. What Faculty Senate does has more to do with governance than it does planning. We have a chance to influence planning but not directly. Our job is to persuade the Provost of things to include in his plans.
- Are there ways that we can argue that this planning procedure is ahead of the curve? However we do this it has to be done better than someone else. Eastern has always done planning. In 1993 the President made it a University-wide process. We were the cutting edge when we did that. The rest of the state caught up with us. We are still ahead of the game with performance indicators and benchmarks. We have to show on paper our outcomes of our planning.
- In the focus statements we are asked to come up with assessment. The focus statements are good but the hard part comes back to the same group of people. We need to separate assessment from outcomes. In the area of outcomes, the state will ask us to justify how we spent each dollar and what we accomplished with it.
- When we look at the existing model and compare it with the new, it seems that the old model was more compatible with decentralized budgeting. We are told by the IBHE what things we need to do. We want to convince them that we are doing something useful. But we also need to do what the campus thinks is important. At a third level we have to convince the state legislature that what we are doing is useful for the citizens of the state. This process is more realistic. We are all accountable to someone.
- We need to consider other constituencies as well—Representative Righter as well as our students and their families (who are also voters). We need to be able to demonstrate that we are advancing and we need more resources to advance effectively. We do have a Student Action Team to get news out to the legislators.
- There is an appearance that the new model seems to have more of a top down flavor. How much of Eastern's planning is a result of the IBHE goals? Because it is a first year, it is more directed (top-down) because feedback has not occurred. Instead of a top-down approach, think of it as out-in because of the external influences. During the second year we should have more of a voice through the feedback process. Because of the changes in the budgeting process, we had to flip the process. It still filters back, however. What is different now is that the vice presidents are articulating their focus first. Initiatives will still come from the units.
- What is meant by unit initiatives? Are we talking about those that require new money? Initiatives can be two things—new money requests as well as our best practices.
- Really units are not at the heart of this. Ultimately, it is the IBHE that is driving this process. That is not necessarily bad as long as we understand the "game." We can still work to maintain meaningful involvement of the units.
- Looking at the timeline, as we go from the President to the Vice Presidents there is a 4-month time frame. To the Deans there are two months, and to the units only one month. This does not send a message that units are important—especially when that one month

comes in April. One of the things we tried to do in this process was to eliminate such strict deadlines. Planning is a continuous process. Ultimately the final deadline is when we build our budget. The demands of the process required that time frame for this year. Next year we can try to revise the time line. The planning focus statements have been sent to the directors so conversations should be occurring now.

- One of the big problems has been communication. The process has not been communicated to all units well. I would like to see some type of logistics to make sure that communication exists. Any suggestions would be helpful.
 - There has been a long frustrating history of never getting all we ask for. What happens under this system if that occurs? All initiatives that come forward may not be included in the budget process. That process does not change, and it makes it difficult for us. The planning process should include communication about what has been and what has not been included in the budget.
 - Planning should be looked at as a way of allocating resources not as a way of getting new money. That gives planning the proper focus. We need to decide where we want to go and what we want to do. In this way, planning is like writing grants.
 - In the past money pooled up and part of the problem was finding it. This process should eliminate that.
 - How do we assure quality of education across campus if some departments can write persuasive initiatives and others cannot? There are check points along the way to ensure this.
 - In the earlier model CUPB was on the flow chart. In this model CUPB is not included. What will be the function of CUPB? Under the old process CUPB became involved in setting priorities for spending new money at the end of the budget cycle. Under this process our governing policies defines CUPB's role as setting program priorities in the University budget. That typically happens in late April before the budget goes to the Board.
 - In the budget how specific are these requests going to be? They will continue to be broad in nature.
 - Several senators expressed better understanding because of this presentation and added that they would appreciate continuing this type of dialogue. There did appear to be a breakdown in communication at the department level in many departments.
- b. Discussion of VPAA's FY2002 Focus Statement. The VPAA's advisory subcommittee consisted of Rob Bates, David Carpenter, Hank Davis, and Mary Anne Hanner. The Subcommittee met five weeks. They worked very well together and came up with a good document. Carpenter will present it to CUPB on Friday, January 21 at 3:00 in the Arcola/Tuscola Room. Discussion included the following:
- There is a lot of attention to faculty development. That should be helpful. Will there be a systematic process for defining our core competencies? We will wait to see what the Deans' statements will be. This is a living document; we need to hear from the Deans and faculty.
 - Does the reference to investments in instructional equipment and computer replacement include the computer labs? They are currently funded with student fees.
 - We appreciate the opportunity to look at this. These are important and worthwhile goals. Is the Roman numeral organization also reflective of the degree of importance? This was not organized in priority order.
 - What does appropriate infrastructure mean in the reference to the improvement of investments in faculty and professional development? This refers to resources to allow faculty members to design their development plans as well as a development center if we decide that is the direction we want to go?
 - As the Deans, Chairs, Directors prepare their proposals, if the Provosts sees that all these points are not encompassed, will they be asked to include them? We are not going to ask departments to include items from this plan that they are not comfortable with. We want them to devote their resources to the things they feel are important. But there will be a connection with over-arching goals.
 - What is being planned in regard to distance learning? At this point there is not anything that we are planning. We are waiting to see what the Deans and Chairs will develop. There are some departments that are developing plans in this area; others are not.
 - Where do the values fit in with the four goals? None of the five values correspond directly to the goals. These are statements that characterize Eastern. Honoring our responsibility to prepare our students for lifelong contribution to a democratic society is something that

Eastern has been doing very well and will continue to do. We do not have to prescribe how faculty will do this. Each person has different ways of carrying out that responsibility.

- This could be a good opportunity to see if the system will work in communicating the focus statement to the faculty.
- Increasing grants and contracts awarded to Eastern and the development of other external funds is currently an initiative of the President. What are the expectations of faculty? When will we see a more streamlined process and assistance with writing grants? The Provost is working on this. We need to find someone to help us achieve that goal. It is very important for us.
- It was suggested that service be added to the first paragraph of the statement. One Senator suggested that service that is defined in terms of working with student groups is teaching rather than service.

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports

- a. University Counsel Search Committee. Candidates for University Counsel will have open sessions on Thursday, January 20 at 3:10; Friday, January 21 at 2:45; Tuesday, January 25 at 10:40, and Wednesday, January 26 at 2:45. All are in the Effingham Room.

VI. Adjourn at 3:55 (Toosi)

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Marlow, Recorder

Upcoming Meetings

- The Faculty Senate will convene shortly after 3:00 p.m. on January 25, 2000, in order to enable members to attend the open informational session with Katina Leodas of Isaacson-Miller (firmed hired to help with the VPIA search). All senators are encouraged to attend the session, held from 2:10-3:00 in the 1895 Room.
- Textbook Rental will be the topic of discussion for the January 25 meeting.
- The Faculty Forum and (tentatively) the Alcohol Coalition will be on the agenda for February 1
- Jon Laible and Dick Cain will visit the Senate on February 8
- Other future agenda items include the academic calendar, LANDesk, and "Promoting Eastern."