

Eastern Illinois University

## The Keep

---

Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

3-26-1996

### March 26, 1996

Faculty Senate

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 26, 1996" (1996). *Minutes*. 1344.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1344](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1344)

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).

Faculty Senate Minutes of March 26, 1996 (vol.xxv. no.24)

Called to order by John Simpson at 2:03 p.m.

Present: J. Allison, J. Craft, C. Eberly, G. Foster, F. Fraker, R. Gholson, W. Kirk, H. Nordin, G. Richard, J. Schmidt, A. Shelton, J. Simpson, J. Tidwell, D. Wolf.  
Absent: J. Ozier  
Visitors: B. Anderson, J. Anselment, T. Cenkaskas, B. Cole, L. Coon, F. Hohengarten, D. Jorns, J. Nilsen

I. Approval of the Minutes

**A motion (Richard/Allison) to approve the minutes of March 12, 1996 as corrected passed (8-0-3).**

- A. II.D.2. - J. Tidwell stated that normal liability issues and legal concepts didn't apply in this context, but need to be thought out.
- B. III. K. - Senator Foster, member of the Taskforce, elaborated on the report. He explained that he was more comfortable with a lean document which leaves opportunity for faculty with expertise to come forward and be part of the process.
- C. III.M. - Senator Allison pointed out the 90 day rule under article III of the Constitution and asked that the Senate and administrators agree to postpone action until after further campus discussion in the fall - as was the case with the library reallocation formula.

II. Communications

- A. E-mail from J. Ozier explaining absence due to professional commitments in Peoria. John Craft, Bill Kirk, and Deb Wolf will all need to leave early.
- B. Announcement from Chair Simpson regarding scheduling of the Spring Retirement Reception on Wednesday, May 1 in the 1895 Room of the MLK Union from 4:00 - 6:00 p.m. Retirees who missed the fall reception will also be invited. Plaques will be presented to unit A and B retirees. J. Allison reiterated if funding becomes a problem, a request for an increase in the Senate budget should be forwarded to the President.
- C. Report from Chair Simpson regarding the Faculty Forum held to discuss Constitution revisions. G. Foster, J. Simpson, and a reporter from the Daily Eastern News were the only attendees.
- D. E-mail from C. Merrifield regarding cancellation of the EIU Day in Springfield that was scheduled this spring. It will be rescheduled in the fall.
- E. Memo from K. Furumo and J. Nilsen regarding notification of CUPB meeting on 3-29-96. Agenda items include reports from the Vision and Bylaws Committees, review of 1997 & 1998 budgets, final rankings of priority requests.
- F. E-mail from L. Calendrillo, English & Writing Center, with concerns regarding consolidation of the Writing Center under the University College plan discussed in the March 12 Faculty Senate minutes. She requested that the Faculty Senate carefully review this proposal over the summer months.
- G. Circulation of President's Council minutes from 1-13-96 through 3-13-96. If senators desire copies, they are to request them from J. Simpson.
- H. Memo from J. Allison regarding omission of fiscal Budget Oversight Committee in the Bylaws revision proposal.

III. Status of Negotiations - Laurent Gosselin

- A. Contract was last negotiated in 1991 and represented the best thinking of the faculty and administration. Some flaws as we have worked under it for five years; also requires some major revisions based on governance changes.
  - 1. Completing an article-by-article review of the contract, including the preamble.
  - 2. Interest based negotiating process addresses a new attitude of trust.
  - 3. Designated study groups to study and draft revisions where substantial changes required.
  - 4. Intensive 2 day training last summer on interest based negotiation put EIU ahead of the other universities; grateful to President Jorns for sponsoring the training.
- B. Contract in place until August 31; goal to be finished by August so there is not a time period without a contract in place
  - 1. Compensation is one area where study group is evaluating faculty and staff preferences. A survey was mailed and **members are reminded to return them ASAP - by Monday, March 31.**
  - 2. Committee will review salary compensation issues that have been discussed over the past five years and bring options to negotiations.
  - 3. Study group looking at distance learning has completed their recommendations and they have been accepted and are in place. That aspect has already been resolved and good guidelines have resulted from the process.
  - 4. Mid-year salary increases were part of the positive results from negotiations.
  - 5. Evaluating step 2 in the grievance process, which was eliminated with the Board of Governors.
  - 6. Faculty Excellence Awards studied and options have been generated by that study group for consideration
  - 7. Study group evaluating criteria for accepting sabbatical leave
- C. Recommendations from study groups will be reviewed and then must be ratified by members and Board of Trustees
- D. J. Allison called L. Gosselin attention to a table of average salaries at comparable institutions that was published in the Chronicle of Higher Education recently. L. Gosselin agreed that a gap continues to exist, but we have done well the last several years.

- E. R. Gholson asked about the DAC and if departments would have an opportunity to seriously consider DAC changes. L. Gosselin responded that he suspected DACs would remain in place for the 1996-1997 year, with departmental revisions occurring in the fall of 1996 for final approval in the spring of 1997; then the new DACs would take effect fall of 1997.
- F. R. Gholson asked about summer school funding in light of comments made by the VPAA and VPBA. Gosselin responded that summer school funding is a very complex issue that is tied to salary.
  - 1. One months pay for one class is very good for faculty, but makes summer school course very expensive
  - 2. Some faculty strive to teach summer school for retirement issues with SURS calculations
  - 3. Probably more options need to be available or generated.
  - 4. Summer school budgets haven't increased, but salaries have, causing the decreased course offerings.
  - 5. A change in SURS policy might help, but then it becomes a political issue
  - 6. One survey question is if faculty would be willing to accept a lump sum for summer school teaching rather than pay tied to salary. Administrators fear that people won't be willing to teach in the summer at a flat pay rate
  - 7. VPAA evaluating issue with compensation committee. The initial feeling is that if the cost of faculty salaries could be cut, an increase in summer school courses could occur.
- G. C. Eberly asked about the University College concept introduced and the role of academic advisors in freshman seminar. Academic advisors often have the expertise and serve as frequent guest lecturers, but cannot receive credit to actually teach freshman seminar. C. Evans responded on March 12 that the issue was a union negotiation. Gosselin responded that Academic Support Personnel (ASP) have a determined formula for workload. Typically, teaching is not part of their responsibilities. The issue is one of giving new responsibility to one group without compromising work load options for faculty. It would need to be brought to the negotiations table for discussion. It was not an item that Gosselin had heard of previously from the ASP group, so he would need to hear their position.
- H. L. Gosselin reported that in his opinion, the union is healthier now than it has ever been. Interest based negotiations allow activists to work well together.
- I. Lobby Day is April 16 & 17. This allows us to talk to legislators and make them aware of our specific concerns.

#### IV. Old Business - Reports

- A. CUPB Vision Statement
  - 1. Concerns regarding wording within the document were raised and discussed:
    - a. Direct reference to teaching is not included within reference to research and service components;
    - b. "Having selected Eastern because of its commitment to teaching" implies a personal dynamic that shouldn't be part of speculation in a vision statement
    - c. There are educators on this campus who are not teachers; those individuals don't seem to be accounted for in this statement;
    - d. "professors who foster collaborative research and service" - what does that mean?;
    - e. "vibrant, traditional public university" - is "traditional" appropriate there? What does it mean?;
  - 2. Concerns regarding the process of revising the university vision statement were raised and discussed:
    - a. For whom or why is the vision statement being revised? J. Nilsen responded that the original statement encompassed until the year 2000 and CUPB decided to revise the statement to project beyond 2000. She explained that CUPB has 40 members who represent various constituencies. CUPB received the vision statement at the February meeting and should have shared it for discussion. The statement was adopted by CUPB at the last board meeting.
    - b. J. Allison and R. Gholson stated that the original vision statement involved extensive review and discussion in departments, at Faculty Senate, and other boards and councils. Allison stated that it would be outrageous if the vision statement is approved by CUPB without Faculty Senate or other constituencies review. CUPB is not the representative faculty body, the Senate is.
    - c. The process and channels for review of the vision statement seems peculiar based on previous experience. CUPB should not be unilaterally revising the statement, Faculty, Staff, and Student Senates need an opportunity to respond, as well as departments and other campus groups.

**It was moved (Allison/Gholson) that the Faculty Senate formally request CUPB to grant the university campus time to carefully consider this vision statement and forward recommendations and advice that would be helpful to CUPB. Motion passed unanimously with roll call vote.**

**Yes: Allison, Eberly, Foster, Fraker, Gholson, Nordin, Richard, Schmidt, Shelton, Simpson, Tidwell, Wolf**

- B. Elections Committee - Senator Foster
  - 1. Voting scheduled for Thursday and Friday, March 28 & 29 from 8:00-4:00.
  - 2. A work schedule was distributed and revisions made based on schedule conflicts.
  - 3. Elections not contested will result in appointments or special elections in the fall.
  - 4. Good coverage in the DEN thanks to Betsy Cole.
- C. Enrollment Management Committee - Joan Schmidt
  - 1. New draft of admissions policies has been drafted and will be forwarded to CAA.
  - 2. J. Simpson will make copies and distribute to Faculty Senate members.
- D. Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting - Chair Simpson
  - 1. Discussion with President Jorns regarding Fiscal Budget Oversight Committee

- a. Search of minutes produced no official documentation formulating the committee
- b. President Jorns recalled the discussion several years ago which grew from a concern to provide budget with as much exposure to as many people as possible. He feels revised CUPB has accomplished this.
- c. Doesn't see present need for the subcommittee unless Faculty Senate does.
- 2. Search for legal counsel is finalized; offer has been made; should have closure shortly.

E. Bylaws Revision

**A motion (Eberly/Richard) to accept the report of the Faculty Senate Bylaws Revision Committee passed (11-0-0).**

- 1. J. Allison stated that the Fiscal Budget Oversight Committee has more responsibilities than those represented currently on CUPB. The clearest evidence that the committee exists is that members of the committee have been named. Colleagues who served on the Senate (G. Aylesworth, E. Marlow, L. Walker) would be willing to visit the Senate and explain its purpose.
- 2. G. Richard stated that no record could be found in the minutes of the committee being formally proposed and accepted as a Senate subcommittee. The Senate this year has functioned by requesting individuals visit the Senate to present information and address questions directly rather than going through a subcommittee. The committee seemed redundant and unnecessary to the Bylaws Revision Committee, as well as no documentation formalizing the committee could be found. Therefore, it is not included in Bylaws revisions.
- 3. C. Eberly asked that further discussion be held until next week when more senators are present.

F. Taskforce on Lower Division Student Academic Services - Minority Report by F. Hohengarten

- 1. Shared primary concerns regarding report of the subcommittee
  - a. Enrollment Management unit was hoping for a broader based concept of enrollment management rather than consolidation of units
  - b. Need input to develop and enhance the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs
  - c. Everything done is related in some way to Academic Affairs, but that doesn't mean it all has to be housed under that area (Academic Affairs)
  - d. Move to create University College doesn't consolidate; just takes existing units and moves them around while maintaining status quo
  - e. Does not believe University College is way most universities have gone; and Enrollment Management model is the higher frequency model on universities across the country
  - f. Moving Records and Registration will not smooth the student's transition into the university
- 2. Questions and discussion regarding Hohengarten's position were as follows:
  - a. Allison asked if the proposed changes would increase or decrease managerial requirements and complexity in regard to numbers of people involved. Hohengarten responded that it would probably have no impact.
  - b. Fraker questioned what the broader vision might entail. The reply was an enrollment management from recruitment to graduation on a continuum. While different units are involved, a more direct line would enhance this, e.g., the relationship between Admissions, Records, and Financial Aid. When these three department were moved under one area, enhanced communication created a more complimentary functioning between them.
  - c. Eberly expressed concern regarding a perception that the Counseling Center was involved primarily in career advisement, as well as the Academic Assistance Center and Placement Center. He felt this was a limited vision of what the Counseling Center's primary role is, which certainly encompasses more serious issues than career counseling. Certified clinical psychologists cannot be replaced by career counselors, even though some of that does occur in the Counseling Center. Hohengarten and Foster emphasized that a perception of compromising or minimizing the importance of the counseling center's role was never intended.
- 3. Clarification of timelines for the process was discussed. J. Allison requested that the opportunity to continue discussing and perhaps sponsor a forum which could involve the entire university community would be advantageous. J. Simpson stated that minutes of March 12 reported C. Evans as saying the process would not be completed this year and councils would have opportunities to address the issues.
- 4. C. Eberly requested a bibliography of research/literature which the subcommittee reviewed to generate the report. C. Simpson will forward the request to C. Evans.
- 5. G. Foster stated that the subcommittee never had a sense that something was broken and needed to be fixed. The charge to the committee was not a process of consolidation, but one of reorganizing; to create a new package for existing units.

Senator Allison moved to adjourn at 4:00 p.m.

Tentative agenda: Faculty Elections; Bylaws Revision; CUPB Vision Statement; Taskforce on Lower Division Student Academic Services

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Richard, Recorder