

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

12-16-1993

December 16, 1993

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "December 16, 1993" (1993). *Minutes*. 1401.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1401

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 of December 16, 1993 (Vol.XXIII, No. 15)

Called to order: by Chair Bill Addison at 1:00 p.m., BOG Room, Booth Library.

Present: W. Addison, J. Allison, G. Aylesworth, D. Carpenter, G. Foster, R. Jorstad, J. Lasky, E. Marlow, J. Miller, J. Simpson, L. Walker, R. Wandling.

Absent: J. Dennee, R. Gholson, G. Mason.

Visitors: President Jorns, Dr. A. Baharlou, Dr. D. Bock, Dr. P. Church, Dr. K. Shank, Dr. J. Simpson.

Minutes: A motion (Carpenter/Allison) to approve the Minutes of December 7, 1993, as amended, passed unanimously.

Reference throughout the minutes to Ms. Susan Kaufman should read Dr. Susan Kaufman.

I. COMMUNICATIONS

- A. From President Jorns, minutes from the 11/17/93 meeting of the President's Council, 11/30/93.
- B. From President Jorns, minutes from the 12/1/93 meeting of the President's Council, discussing Quality Indicators for Vice Presidential areas, 12/1/93.
- C. From Terry Weidner, a memo explaining that computer installation for senators is delayed because of bids on power supplies and hard drives, 12/9/93.
- D. From Lewis Coon, a memo calling attention to the failed efforts of the administration of the University of Washington, D.C., to abolish either the Faculty Senate or the Faculty Union, and calling attention to a news article concerning the academic union at the U of I cutting ties with the AFT because of dues, 12/13/93.
- E. From Lou Hencken, 12/13/93, a memo noting that as of 11/30/93, EIU had received 4180 student applications, ahead of last year. EIU is one of a few institutions with more applications for the fall of 1994 than for the fall of 1993.
- F. From President Jorns, minutes from the 12/8/93 meeting of the President's Council, discussing the budget and the entrepreneurial bank, 12/13/93.
- G. From Lankford Walker, a memo concerning the approved Mission Statement's omission of research/scholarly activity. The revised mission statement, dated 3/11/93, was sent to the Senate and appeared in the minutes of 3/31/93. VP Hill noted that the President was soliciting input from university committees. However, it was approved by the President's Council 3/26/93, and the Senate did not receive minutes of the President's Council meeting until the July 20 Senate meeting. The approved mission statement next appeared in the University Newsletter, 11/19/93, and it has been published in the new university catalog. With the omission of research, the statement is not consistent with the vision statement. Senator Carpenter noted that the campus was embroiled in restructuring when the mission statement was being revised. Senator Allison asked if the mission statement could be revised for the next catalog. President Jorns said that if the statement is to be reviewed for possible revision, all of the steps should be replicated, and he noted that it was a vast undertaking to come up with one paragraph, but that could be examined again. Senator Aylesworth said he was told by several members of the Mission Statement Committee that there was such disagreement that only a minimalist statement received consensus. He felt that this raises questions about the process if consensus is on the lowest common denominator. Senator Carpenter, who served on the drafting subcommittee of the missions statement committee, recalled that it was the product of compromise and consensus, based on campus feedback, and noted that the one hedge they had was that there would be greater specificity in the vision and focus statements. Senator Lasky noted that the focus statement does include research. Chair Addison noted the irony that the mission statement we produced

does not include research, but the IBHE's focus statement does include research, despite its criticism of research. Senator Allison noted that if the mission statement is the one that most represents EIU at this time, we should add the few words, "research and creative activity." President Jorns noted that producing the mission statement is a negotiated process and that makes it political. Senator Aylesworth agreed that it was political, yet research was not included, despite the political fact that the majority of faculty would support its inclusion. Senator Walker said that we should re-open a process, but not this particular process, because it was long, cumbersome and excluded the senate. Chair Addison will send a letter to the President, requesting that the mission statement be re-examined. Senator Miller moved (Carpenter) that during spring elections, faculty be polled to see if they favor adding "research/creative activity"; results to be included in the request to re-examine, passed 11/0/1.

- H. From Tim Shonk, a suggestion that senate minutes include the Mission, Vision and Focus Statements, with distinction and purpose of each. President Jorns noted that the Focus Statement is imposed by the IBHE, per its responsibility. The Mission Statement articulates what we are doing and will change as we grow into our vision. The Vision Statement is a statement of aspiration. The President's Office will disseminate the statements and their purposes through the University Newsletter.
- I. From John Best, a concern that an EIU faculty member was teaching full time at another university. The President said they were aware of the matter, and it was temporary.
- J. From Chair Addison, a phone conversation with Chancellor Layzell. The internship contracts that Senator Wandling asked about are not required by board policy, but are recommended by the board attorney. The self-insurance liability fund increase is still being examined.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. TABLED RECALL MOTION

Senator Aylesworth said the drafting committee wanted to give the full senate a chance to discuss the Chancellor's visit before offering anything specific, but he felt something should be sent to the trustees and there should be a campus-wide referendum concerning board staff and policies, vis-a-vis this campus. He noted that we have no picture of where the campus stands. Senator Allison noted the subcommittee had discussed the possibility of a campus survey. Senator Carpenter noted that in the questionnaire on the North Central self-study, there was a question about the governing board and that we could, perhaps, get those results. Senator Foster felt that question was too general to be of value and favored something like a referendum to get a sense of campus sentiment. Senator Marlow asked if the motion should not be removed from the table before further discussion. Senator Wandling moved (Allison) to take the motion off the table, passed 7/2/3. Chair Addison stated that he felt the meeting with the Chancellor was productive, a move in the right direction, and the no-confidence vote would damage communications. Senator Marlow said it was unclear what we seeking from a no-confidence vote. Since the original motion expressed lack of confidence in the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, Senator Carpenter asked Senator Walker if he would consider withdrawing the motion so that a new tact could be crafted. Walker agreed and Foster (second) consented. Senator Allison moved (Walker) to ask the drafting committee to draft a letter to the Board of Trustees, expressing our most serious concerns about the BOG, and draft a questionnaire to gauge faculty perspective of the BOG. Senator Jorstad asked that the motion be split. Senator Allison withdrew his initial motion and moved (Walker) that the drafting committee draft a letter to the Board of Trustees, expressing serious senate concerns about the BOG, and return the letter to the senate for approval. In discussion, Senator Foster stated that

he thought it was insincere of the Chancellor to ask what we could do to work together, short of having him fall on his sword. Senator Foster noted that when Senator Aylesworth asked of the BOG would be doing more with less, citing greater efficiency of the BOR, the Chancellor stated the BOG was already doing more with less. When Senator Miller asked if the BOGAPR might be made a more cooperative enterprise, the Chancellor said the process works. When Senator Foster asked if there might not be way to provide liability insurance, and avoid dramatic increases with little notice, the Chancellor said no. Senator Foster said this showed no willingness to engage in a cooperative kind of effort. Senator Allison noted that the Chancellor seems to favor the adversarial process and Senator Walker stated that the Chancellor was eminently happy with the qualifications of the board staff, despite a lack of real campus experience. Senator Carpenter feared that this last issue is personalizing and not a campus issue. Senator Walker responded that it is not 1 or 2, but 10 with no campus experience, and 2 more with 1 year or less campus experience. Senator Aylesworth felt that the issue was specific, but not personal, and noted that the 2 chief officers of academic and student affairs lack on-campus experience, and that has serious consequences for our interrelationship with the board when reviewing programs. It is a concern, not a personal attack, that they have no idea what it is like to be at ground level in an institution of higher learning, and it is ridiculous to suggest that experience can be absorbed through osmosis. Senator Jorstad noted that the cost of the BGU central board is greater than the BOR central board because the BOG provides more services; whether or not you want those services at the board level is a different question, entirely. Chair Addison said that it is a two-way street to be open and sensitive to concerns, and from the BOG perspective, if the central office provides more services, it should have more personnel. Senator Miller felt that explanation only goes so far. He noted that there is only one legal staff person, and the legal work which is centralized at the board level is actually farmed out, the cost of which is actually absorbed by the universities, so all that is centralized is some oversight, and that does not justify all of the additional cost. Senator Jorstad suggested that the staff's lack of campus experience might be addressed by creating an exchange program that would enable staff administrators to come and teach for some period of time. Senator Miller felt that the issue was not the qualifications, in an academic venue, of administrative oversight. Rather, objections center around the recognition that there is a higher authority, and that the character of that oversight is inappropriate, being adversarial and confrontational, and not consultative or recommendatory. Senator Simpson said he favored an exchange that would bring staff from Springfield and would conduct business routinely from each campus, with contact, not rare, but daily. Senator Marlow noted that the Chancellor is responsible for balancing 5 schools. He has the responsibility to do what is best for the system and not what is necessarily best for any one school in the system. Senator Lasky noted that part of the problem is that there are different schools with different characteristics, and no single system can do well for such diverse schools, and that cannot be resolved without some realignment. Senator Wandling stated that from a political standpoint, the BOG will be around as long as Madigan is Speaker of the House. Hence, we need to find some way to work with the system, and he favors a liaison, as suggested by Senators Simpson and Jorstad. Senator Wandling felt that an official from the central office, located on campus, could interact easily with personnel in Springfield via computer. Senator Miller said that, in the Chancellor's view, that person is the president of the university. Senator Wandling responded that just as the university has been reorganizing and restructuring, perhaps this is the time and the way for the system to reorganize. Such a step would be in the direction of a fresh relationship. Senator Miller said he favors a cooperative effort with an effective liaison that would disseminate some of the centralized services, e.g., a staff attorney for, and at each campus; centralized computing would also best be done locally for fiscal and administrative efficacy. Senator Lasky noted that such an approach might address the different characteristics of the different campuses. Senator Allison felt that this approach could allow our concerns to be cast in a positive light.

Senator Foster added that, none the less, the concerns should be stated forcefully and strongly, and that caution should be exercised so that any liaison does not merely pontificate from campus rather than Springfield. Senator Marlow noted that we can speak only for Eastern and not the other campuses. The Allison motion to have the drafting committee compose a letter to the trustees passed unanimously.

- B. **PROPOSED CHANGES IN INTERNAL GOVERNING POLICIES: DEPARTMENT CHAIRS**
Dr. Phoebe Church provided background and history to the proposed changes. She stated that the President asked the President's Advisory Council to examine the internal governing policy late last spring. It was sent to the Council of Chairs to make recommendations and revisions. The Council formed a committee to make revisions which were sent to the deans. The deans approved the revisions and sent them to VP Hill. The Advisory Council met with VP Hill and felt the revisions were good, and they were submitted to the President. Dr. Bahariou stated that two and a half years ago, the campus voted 2 to 1 to count chairs as faculty. Chairs serve the faculty at the departmental level and carry 95% of the academic function of the university. He then briefly summarized the two major changes: chair appointments go from 3 years, to 5 years; there will be a structured, standard mechanism to evaluate chairs. Dr. Bahariou noted that chairs quite vulnerable, being evaluated every 3 years, because they often have to initiate changes that go beyond the term of appointment. Previously, there has been no constructive, organized way for chairs to be evaluated. Rather, deans would send letters to faculty, asking for evaluations of chairs by criteria identified by the deans. Dr. Bahariou felt these changes gave chairs greater independence from deans and asked for Senate support of these changes. Senator Carpenter asked if all chairs supported the changes, and Dr. Church said it was unanimous. Senator Wandling asked why the advisory ballot was dropped for appointments within the department. Dr. Church said it was a recommendation by Affirmative Action because advisory ballots tend to disadvantage women and minorities. Dr. Church also noted that even without the advisory vote, faculty will continue to have input through consultation and comment, and through the evaluation instruments. Senator Walker felt that the consultation process is there in name only. "The Senate lost a quorum at this point, 3:05 p.m." Dr. Shank noted that a person selected as chair, not getting the advisory vote, is placed in a very awkward position. Senator Miller asked if the Chairs' Evaluation Form, the Evaluation Form for External Candidates, and the Faculty Consultation Form will be standardized across campus or tailored to each department. The Senate was told that the forms will have elements of both. Senator Foster noted that chairs hired from the outside can be given tenure, but chairs from within cannot be granted tenure upon appointment as chair. While this is board policy, it discriminates against those hired from within.

III. NEW BUSINESS None Introduced

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m. The next meeting will be January 11, 1994, 1:00 p.m., BOG Room, Booth Library.

TENTATIVE AGENDA ITEMS: Letter to Board Staff, Revised Articulated Plan, Faculty Concerns, BGU Enrollment Management Report, Revisions to Election Procedures.

Respectfully submitted, Gary Foster