I. Call to Order by Chair Sterling at 2:01 pm (Booth Library, Room 4440)

Present: Jeff Ashley, Todd Bruns, Jim Conwell, Minh Dao, Crystal Duncan-Lane, Stefan Eckert, Jeannie Ludlow, Mike Mulvaney, James Ochwa-Echel, Jon Oliver, Emmie Robertson, Amy Rosenstein, Steve Scher, Grant Sterling

Guests: B. Lord (AA), M. Izadi (LCBAS), S. Ahmad (Student Sen), S. Bennett (Staff Senate), K. Whisler (LIB), M. Slough (LIB), G. Canivez (PSYCH)

II. Approval of Minutes of 18 November 2014

Minutes from 18 November 2014 Senate meeting were approved with two edits identified by Senator Scher.

Motion made by Senator Conwell and seconded by Senator Eckert.

(Abstained = Senators Duncan-Lane & Ochwa-Echel)

III. Communications – reviewed & discussed by Chair Sterling

a. CAA – email from R. Throneburg received. Expectation will be CAA reps visiting in January to update on Learning Goals process.
b. ACF years of service data – requested from Provost Lord – most ACFs are long-term employees
c. Wiley journals situation

Scher – are we going to directly address the data included in the communications/meeting? Sterling – yes, we plan to do that – I am flexible in terms when during today’s meeting

Ashley – based on today’s visitors from Booth Library, maybe the Wiley questions should come first

Lord – first, a preamble to the Wiley journals situation. Booth Library budget is primarily ‘acquisitions’ (serials) and ‘personnel’. Acquisitions is approximately $1.5 million per year. Personnel is 3x the size of acquisitions. In preparation for the June 2014 BOT meeting, the President’s council evaluated the budget and analyzed the spreadsheets. The plan recommendation placed in front of the board was to reduce acquisitions budget by 20% ($300,000). I talked with Dr. Weber and Paul McCann how to strategically reduce by 20% from overall library budget, not just acquisitions side. Then in August, another budget reduction request was requested by AA. In addition, the Library has had almost no personnel reductions. So the majority of the reduction has been focused on ‘acquisitions’ rather than ‘personnel’. Dean Lanham had a difficult decision to make. He worked with his staff (some present today) to solve this budgetary issue. Ashley – is AA being asked to cover budget mismanagement in other areas – like athletics? They have had a shortfall. Lord – two separate budgets being here – you are talking about athletics in 2014 vs the AA budget in 2015. The president or VP of student affairs would be a better candidate to answer your question. However, I do know athletics did run a deficit last year.

Lord – for fiscal year 2015 I have been asked to reduce AA budget by $3.5 million.

Lord – so to look at the 20% reduction for the Library, the staff looked at the costs related to library resources going to each academic unit. To complicate the issue, you don’t buy 1 journal subscription at a time – you have to buy a group of journals together (like the Wiley collection). So the team of librarians came together to manage this situation. Lanham – the $300,000 was reduced during the Fall 2014 semester to $287,000, and then to $177,000 due to unexpected retirements elsewhere on campus (personnel). So 20% reduction actually reduced to a 12% reduction. More than ½ of our budget is in periodicals (serials) through purchase or contract via large bundles. It represents hundreds of thousands of dollars. We had to evaluate our bundles. Wiley is the largest bundle we pay for. It encompassed journals represented by most departments on campus, but it was $131,000 this year. It was going to be raised to $134,000 next year. We put Wiley on the cut list, but we also looked at other print journal titles as well to see where we could save money. We have been trimming and converting to online (cheaper option) as much as possible during the last few years. We ended up cutting print and electronic journals. We still needed to cut a little more to
reach the reduction goal. We had come up with the 20% reduction ($300,000), but with the Provost’s help, we were able to avoid more significant cuts. We were also able to salvage some of the Wiley titles through print options.

Ashley – so not all of the Wiley titles are gone?
Lanham – correct, we went back in and asked for the 40 most utilized Wiley titles (some are bundled with others) to continue providing access to most of the Wiley journals that have been used the most by EIU patrons. We did not retain some Wiley titles that cost the most (up to $16,000 for an individual subscription). In terms of print, we got rid of some of the journals that were simply not being used by library patrons. We actually keep track of print journals usage.

It’s a painful process, but we kept the many frequently used Wiley titles and many of the Wiley titles are still available via consortia agreements/partnerships and alternative embargo agreements within 1, 3, or 5 year windows of access. So through other licenses that we have some of the cut Wiley titles will be available or will become available through different vendors-avenues.

Ashley – so is the list that we received with all of the Wiley titles been modified with what you just described?
Lanham – yes, and with any package, there will be titles that will never be used by patrons. Hundreds of titles in the past year were not accessed by Eastern patrons. But we are still very close to the publication date on some titles that we cut, as well as past journals that we already own. What will change is access to 2015 titles and forward – but we have tried to maintain access to the most regularly used titles from the Wiley collection.

Scher – but there are still over 500+ titles that were used at least twice. Which are still available?
Whisler – all of them. You are not losing access. They will be accessible in a different way.

Scher – I see this as a communication issue - the troubling aspect is that this is the first time we have heard of this, and we all have to cut our spending, but most troubling is that this is the first time that this is being heard about by many faculty.

Whisler – we have been talking to representatives in the departments
Lanham – I have discussed this with other Deans. This is probably not ‘headline’ news for the DEN, and I definitely would not ‘hide’ the journal cuts from the campus community. Most universities are going similar exercises. The field is changing and there is cutting for different reasons. The library is still here to help provide faculty access to the materials that they need in any way we can.

Scher – I beg to differ about if this is ‘news’– I think it is front page news – for a variety of media outlets in Illinois – so that students and parents receive the information and be outraged, and bring it up to the Illinois legislature.

Conwell – what about cuts to books?
Lannman – I don’t have a total in front of me, but our staff (Slough & Whisler) went back and evaluated each department accounts (fund) to determine the impact of the cut on each unit. Some departments were affected more heavily with the Wiley cut, while others were impacted more through print journal cuts. It’s a bit different with books versus journals.

Conwell – I am interested in ratio of dollars to books vs. journals
Karen – that is probably not a relevant statistic to consider because the obligation for serials is much more significant
Conwell – and where did the $1000000 come from to help with the Library budget reduction?

Lord – from unexpected retirements (personnel), where the savings were transferred to the Library reduction
Rosenstein – so we paid for 2013-2014 online serials. Do we still have access to those, even if we don’t pay for ‘14-’15?
Lanham – yes, you still have access to those journals. As long as the company continues to exist. The Illinois academic libraries also work together to maintain access to back issues from different library warehouses and online sources.

Whisler – what we have already bought in the past, we own.

Rosenstein – what about subscriptions – if I own a professional association membership that comes with a journal subscription, can I share those journal subscriptions with the institution?

Slough – somewhere in the small print within the publication that type of donation would be ‘prohibited’
Lanham – it turns out to be a license. In the new electronic age, faculty cannot provide journal access to libraries. It probably happened back in the ‘print’ era, but not in the new electronic age.

Rosenstein – are their cost tiers for licenses based on university enrollment? Like at the U of I would it cost more for a journal license or subscription?
Lanham – not necessarily. But there are some that cost more if your enrollment is 10000+ students.

Lanham – in summary, the journal industry is extremely complex. The industry is changing quickly – look at ‘open access’. We are not trying to cut content here at EIU, but we must cut subscriptions due to budget constraints. We are in some ways pleased to be out from under the Wiley ‘price gouging’ umbrella. Wiley continues to take over more journals each year and dramatically increase access costs to those journals. Sometimes 10x as much as the year before.

Lanham – in regards to books, we have $1.387 million remaining in our budget – we are spending under $300000 on books. But journals and other periodicals (film, music score, etc), along with inflation, are ‘eating’ our budget
Karen – and our book budget has not increased since 2006, so as journal prices have increased we have had to spend less on books.
Bruns – we all serve as peer reviewers and editors for these journals – we should pressure our associations about these journal practices. Other libraries are going to have to cancel subscriptions. Rosenstein – and increasing costs is leading to open access laws, and might lead to decreases in journals, leading to decreased opportunities to publish. Bruns – Math is a great example – the entire discipline has gone to open-access, high impact journals because of inflationary-excessive costs. Lord – some of these publishers are actually killing their ‘golden’ goose. Rosenstein – and increasing costs is leading to open access laws, and might lead to decreases in journals, leading to decreased opportunities to publish. Bruns – we all serve as peer reviewers and editors for these journals – we should pressure our associations about these journal practices. Other libraries are going to have to cancel subscriptions.

IV. Presentation to the Senate: Senator Scher: Constitution and By-Laws Revisions (*postponed until the next meeting)

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive = no business requiring action/vote
2. Nominations = no business requiring action/vote
3. Elections = Ludlow – elections are tomorrow and Thursday. I will send an email to EIU faculty.
4. Faculty-Student relations = no business requiring action/vote
5. Faculty-Staff relations = Ochwa-Echel - committee will meet next week.
6. Awards = no business requiring action/vote
7. Faculty Forum = Bruns – would like to run 3 faculty forums in Spring 2015 – Higher Ed topics of interest
8. Budget Transparency = Ashley – just go the data. Committee members should analyze the data to determine any potential future action.
9. Constitution/Bylaws = Discussion of proposals – Steve Scher
10. Committee on Committees = no business requiring action/vote
11. Other Reports = no business requiring action/vote

a. Provost’s Report = I will take up the TRM in this report. First - Presidential Search proceeds. Interviews in Champaign to determine who to invite to campus in the near future. Intent is to identify 4 or 5 for campus visits. Budget ambiguity in Springfield continues – may have an effect on this year’s budget. Rumor is that EIU should expect a 20% reduction in state appropriations for FY 2015-2016. Rauner staff is doing a little backtracking on this. We will see what the Governor does with income tax, education funding, etc in the coming months. Just rhetoric as of right now. Today was the IBHE meeting and President Perry attended, met
with other presidents and chancellors in the morning – hoping to receive some useful information. I am not sure if any of us expect to get more money in next fiscal year.

Ashley – we have had FTE reductions for the last 6-7 years. So with ongoing FTE reductions in academic departments, what reductions have been made in Deans’ offices, VPAA’s office, the President’s office?

Lord – positions are not being replaced. Sometime tricky – because of civil service rules, some eliminated civil service positions require 12-24 month notice

Ashley – but are there not ‘bumping rights’ in place? There can be movement or reassignments. When we see massive department level reductions, we aren’t seeing reductions in administrative offices.

Ashley – the bigger question is what is our vision? We are treading water as an institution. Where do we see ourselves going as an institution? Should we be more intentional about where we are going, even in times of cuts?

Lord – first, the premise – I believe the size of EIU will stabilize. Approximately where we are now; 9500-10000 students. I think our program menu is reasonable. We are not going to eliminate education programs. I think we need to be judicious and astute with how we market programs, but I don’t think we are an ‘out of whack’ institution. This can be a painful process. More pain next year with another large budget reduction.

Ashley – so departments should anticipate not having the same amount of resources and be more creative in curriculum delivery with fewer people

Lord – our student-faculty ratio is still at the bottom compared to peer institutions. The steps are painful that we are taking, but they are directed and measured.

Lord – now TRM – you received the TRM memo. The memo is actually 4 years old. Signed and executed by Dr Weber in 2010. TRM distributions are summer of one year (13), fall of same year (13), spring of next year (14). Fall of 2014 would be when revenue is distributed. It is done after the year is over. So what was distributed 1 month ago was actually put into place with class schedules two years ago.

Ashley – pointed out a few changes on the last page of the document.

Lord – so the memo you received was put into place 4 years ago – Fall 2010. TRM has been in place for 2 decades. It became more aggressively utilized a 10-12 years ago. The idea of TRM is based on recovering tuition from courses that meet a certain enrollment to cover the salary of the faculty. Excess revenue will be distributed back to the colleges and departments. About 12-13 years ago this became a very common model to augment summer offerings. Bill Weber encouraged a more aggressive usage of TRM. So TRM started to be offered during the regular academic year, not just summer. Many departments started to offer online courses in this manner. It largely was administered at the department level. We realized as TRM got bigger, it became an expense item that was not covered in full within the regular budget by provost office. It got out of control in some cases. Bill Weber encouraged it to grow, and then realized it was getting out of control – thus the memo in front of you.

Dao – you may have created a ‘monster’?

Lord – first page of the memo outlines some of the control mechanisms (boundaries) that were instituted by Bill Weber. Limited to certain cohorts and outreach programs.

Ashley – how do we define cohort or outreach?

Lord – cohort – the definition has gotten a bit ‘slippery’. Not traditional definition of cohort used elsewhere in higher education. Definition ‘slipped’ on the part of people that were encouraging TRM.

Ashley – there is some confusion. Is online minor a ‘cohort’ program? We were getting TRM money for it, and now we are not, even though we are doing the same instructing.

Lord – so TRM boundary conditions were set by this document – overload – not out of the general fund that salary is paid out of. As stated in the memo, TRM initiatives should be ‘finite’ in duration. Some departments significantly adopted TRM initiatives – New master’s online in CDS is an example.

Lord – this memo was signed Nov 2010 – with these boundary conditions in place – with interpretations pretty wide open - for the next few years the memo was basically ignored – 2nd year in NOV 2011 – Monitors in Continuing Education continued to do what they always did – not following the memo – Fall 2012 – the monitors in Cont Ed continued to start the memo but did not communicate well with Deans or Dept chairs.

This has now been fixed, but it’s been after the fact

Ashley – Obviously, Continuing Education has not been working with Departments in line with the memo.

Lord – I just acknowledged that. The past leader did not communicate. The current leader has been faithful in communicating with Departments. That started two years ago, but the data in front of you is from 2 years ago.

Scher – how is it being decided how much money goes where? We received 70% less this year than last year.

Ashley – so as of today, what does and what does not count with TRM? Why such a large reduction in TRM funding?

Lord – For distributions in FA 2013, the guidelines in the memo were not fully applied – past traditions still being applied. For FA 2014, the memo was much more strictly followed, which now has impacted the data.
Ashley – since the departments were expecting more money, is there any way to find a happy medium between what was received and what should have been received?
Lord – I have no additional revenues to distribute at this time to find that ‘happy medium’
Ashley – because of the errors of Continuing Education, can’t the reduced distributions be more evenly balanced between colleges?
Lord – I can at least have conversations with the Deans about this.
Rosenstein – the departments still have to support and staff the courses offered through TRM. If ‘creative’ budgeting happening in hopes that TRM money will be gained, the potential negative impact is on the faculty and departments.
Scher – you say you don’t have the money, but the same courses offered as TRM by Continuing Ed in the past created revenue in the past with the understanding that the $ would come back to the departments
Lord – at the end of the day the institution ran a deficit, so no additional revenue exists to give back.
Ashley – at times we had more money to spend a few years back when I was department chair. To go from too much to almost none in the course of 1 year, it may be too big of a hit to handle – we don’t have any funding for travel now.
Ashley – to Rosenstein - why would you give your own intellectual property to someone else to teach a class?
Rosenstein – because I wanted to ensure that an EIU course offered in Special Education had the best resources possible.
Scher – I was told by my chair from my dean that TRM summer courses had more flexibility based on number of students and it would save money for the colleges because you would be paid less. That’s probably how TRM started to take off. And TRM seems to have taken advantage of faculty as well.
Lord – you are correct. As we started into online programs and courses, TRM was an incentive.
Conwell – with such a radical change in funding, what is the collateral damage? Will courses disappear? Ashley – probably not with the new contract where the pay has been regularized between academic year and summer courses.
Lord – and some departments still are seeing a decent return on TRM courses.
Sterling – TRM does not affect my department, but the related programs from Continuing Ed really affect my department. We took a 20% hit on our department budget, but we can still function with other money coming in. If that other money disappears, we can no longer function. There needs to be some consideration based on lost supplementary revenues from TRM.
Rosenstein – and TRM was supposed to be reviewed every 3 years because of industry changes. For example – emergency certification disappeared, so emergency certification TRM courses have disappeared in CEPS.

b. Other – none

B. Other Old Business: None

VI. New Business

A. Future Agenda:

a. Sterling - Future agendas for Spring 2015. Spring Meeting dates include January 13 (Minority Recruitment and Enrollment?), January 27 (CAA?), February 10 (IAB?), February 24, March 10, March 24, April 7, April 21 (Election of Officers)
Sterling - I need to confirm this room with Library. Three topics proposed for discussion already are slotted into first 3 meetings. CAA for Jan 27th. Minority recruitment for Jan 13th and IAB for Feb 10th are the other two presentations being requested at the moment. Does the schedule look good? Do you want these discussions?
Scher – I want to have a discussion with IAB and the athletic director.
Ashley - maybe it would be better to have Dan Nadler?
Conwell – who is responsible for the annual athletic budget deficit?
Lord – an audit happens after each fiscal year. Dan Nadler would be the right person to discuss the budget.
Sterling – keep in mind, at times, academic departments have overspent as well.
Conwell – when I hear that this is an ongoing issue, but not caught, it becomes a bigger concern
Sterling – it has been caught (identified), but not fixed. Maybe it needs to be two discussions.
Mulvaney – do we want to wait until after the 10th day of the new semester for the Enrollment presentation, as well as add other aspects to the Minority Recruitment/Enrollment presentation? Maybe switch dates?
Sterling – Yes, we can switch dates. I will contact people and send proposed Spring 2015 meeting schedule with agendas by the end of the Fall semester. Let’s push back the constitutional discussion to the next meeting because of only 10 minutes remaining

B. Other New Business –

VII. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm by Chair Sterling.

Submitted by Senator J. Oliver