

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR 6 December (Vol. XXXV, No. 8)

The 2010 – 2011 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available on the Web at:
<http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>

Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

I. Call to order by Chair Andrew Methven at 2:00pm. (Booth Library Conference Room)

Present: A. Adom, J. Coit, S. Knight-Davis, T. Leonce, A. Methven, M. Mulvaney, K. Padmaraju, A. Rosenstein, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, L. Taylor, A. White, J. Waller. Excused: M.-L. Li, D. Viertel
Guests: Blair Lord (Provost/VPAA); William Weber (VP Business Affairs); Assege HaileMariam (Psychology)

II. Approval of the Minutes of 29 November

Senator Stowell (Mulvaney) moved to approve the minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

IV. Communications

- a. Memo of 30 November from Andrew Methven re: Revised Faculty Senate Taskforce on Electronic and Online Learning Materials
- b. Email of 6 December from William Weber re: Preliminary Draft of Strategic Plan, report of Academic Excellence Subcommittee

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee: no report. Senator White asked if progress has been made in purchasing the electronic bulletin boards, proposed by Dan Nadler. Lord stated there has been lots of discussion, including with the board of trustees, but it hasn't moved ahead.

2. Nominations Committee: no report

3. Elections Committee: no report

4. Faculty— Student Relations Committee: no report

5. Faculty— Staff Relations Committee: Vice-Chair Mulvaney stated he will attend the next meeting of Staff Senate, December 14, 1pm, in the Martinsville Room of the Union.

6. Awards Committee: no report

7. Faculty Forum Committee: no report

8. Other Reports

a. Provost's Report: Lord stated that some Senators may have attended first of several visits by consultants from Noel Levitz last week. They are focusing primarily on retention efforts, and we expect to get a written report of the meeting. They said a lot of very positive things about what we're doing with retention here, although every institution in the world can do more.

Regarding the EIU budget, we got another payment from the state for fiscal 2011, roughly \$5.5 million. The state has fallen behind on fiscal 2012 trying to catch up on fiscal 2011, and a lot of our capital expenditures need fiscal 2012 money.

As a result of the vandalism in Chemistry, Chemistry faculty and other faculty in the Physical Science building are more aware of issues of security. It turns out there are over 700 videocameras on campus, but the only academic buildings that have cameras are in the Library and a handful in Lumpkin. There has been a plan for some to go in Doudna. The Union's had them for years, and the Recreation Center and residence halls have many and have had them for some time. Talking further about securing the perimeters of buildings, we are considering installing more cardswipe locks, which can create a record of whose card was used to get in. There will be conversations about developing entry points with cameras and card swipes. We also have to be sensitive to students' needs to get in buildings, right now, they can only get the Physical Science buildings if someone meets them there. We need to start to talk about having more e-locks on campus, and marrying external entrance points and video. If you have thoughts share them now. I know in Physical Science there will be some changes. Right now we're scrambling to get equipment to have teaching labs function for Spring Semester.

Chair Methven stated that in the life sciences building faculty have had similar concerns, there are a lot of students who need to do research, and get keys to building doors, labs, and classrooms, and when students leave their keys may or may not be returned. I hesitate to think about how many keys are floating around. The building has a computer lab with a card reader, and a stockroom employee makes a list of cards that can be used to open the lab, and end of semester the list is erased.

Lord as we are looking institutionally at electronic locks, access could be based on class rosters for example. We are having discussions for a Request for Proposals, for pilot programs that focus on external entry to a few key buildings. An RFP basically says, this the service we need, you tell us how you'd meet that. This is a conversation the Provost's office has tried to have for 10 years.

White asked about the progress of investigation into the vandalism. Lord stated he didn't know, he received a generic update which shared with the occupants of the building, and presumably the public. The investigation continues, and investigators have interviewed a goodly number of people including all the faculty. I have no idea what's developed so far. We'll hear when they have something to share.

Senator Adom asked if taking steps like having more police patrols on campus might deter any kind of attempt before it occurs, and stated that this would be more efficient than having cameras, which are only useful after crime occurs. Lord stated that for right now additional overtime has been authorized for the University Police Department. We have a finite police force, and they can only run overtime for so long. We are not talking for the moment about significantly increasing the size of UPD, but instead about hardening access to academic buildings. A camera doesn't stop vandalism, but some of the things you can do with electronic locks will allow access to people who are supposed to be there, and deny it to people who are not supposed to be there. Departments should review the last time the lock cores were changed out, and might want to consider changing them. Everything is on the table in considering how to improve security.

Senator Stowell asked if the key access could be tied to the Panther card. Lord stated that swipes are tied to Panther card. There are a number of cardswipe access points on campus, but the first academic building that had electronic locks are interior classrooms in Blair hall, and the locks are activated after hours. Faculty are given swipe access depending on who is supposed to be here. There is no swipe on the external doors.

Methven stated that he remembers when UPD used to walk through the buildings and asked if that practice continues. Lord stated it does, but is more likely now to be happening late at night.

Adom asked is there a way we can prioritize creating a larger police presence, because this is the most effective dissuasive action. Lord stated that we may well end up with more police, but police are an ongoing expense. Many campuses traditionally have been reticent to have too much of a police presence. For many years people have seen campus as a refuge, and so did not want an obvious police presence, but that's a conversation we'd like to have everyone put their voice into. There is no surveillance in academic buildings generally because that is something faculty did not want.

Mulvaney stated that a camera can be a deterrent, as well, and that in the recreation facilities, since cameras have been installed there has been a decrease in vandalism. Patrols can be helpful, and cameras may also deter activity. If there was one in the Chemistry it could have deterred the vandalism, some studies found they can be deterrent. I have talked to a few Chemistry faculty individually, is there anything myself or other faculty could do to assist Chemistry to help them or the University? Lord stated that Chemistry faculty need to know they have the support of their colleagues.

b. Budget Transparency Committee: no report

c. Other

B. Other Old Business

VI. New Business

A. VPBA William Weber – Strategic Planning

The planning process is on schedule, has been a really excellent year in terms of planning and discussions. We are in the final phase, trying to take all these discussions we've had focusing on strategic themes, we have done some visioning, and some brainstorming on some goals and actions, with the ultimate target of presenting a plan to the Board in its Jan. 20 meeting. We have slightly slowed down the schedule because we have had quite a bit of turnover on our Board, there are 4 new members who started at the last meeting. Virtually half the board is not familiar with the process. January 20 we are doing a first reading of the plan, and we will hopefully have a final endorsement at the board's meeting in March.

Spring 2010 discussions identified 6 themes, academic excellence, marketing and communication, campus and community life, financial sustainability, emerging technologies, and global competition and changing demographics.

We are trying to come up with an executive summary, a document to present to Board. President Perry has been specific on the format, insisting that it should be clear, concise, direct, and no more than 10 pages. What you'll see here is very summary style. There is work behind all these summary statements, more detail that will be available during the implementation phase. Perry believes our mission statement continues to serve us well, have not elected to do anything with that.

The process has shown a desire on campus to break outside the regional compass point, to be global in our reach and impact. A consistent theme of the process is that personal connections are what make an education at Eastern unique.

I envision a section on core values or who we are, this has generated some very vigorous discussion on the steering committee. I hope to capture some of those ideas.

The summary has a section on each of the 6 strategic themes, two sentence summary for each, followed by a list of goals and actions to be achieved over the next five years.

At the end, a section for metrics for measuring progress. I've also tried to put estimated costs wherever I've been able to. I've restricted those costs to tangible purchases, as opposed to cost of time and work. Some that will require hard work and discussion.

I am meeting with governance groups the rest of this month, and sharing the draft I have at this time. I hope to fill in those holes later this week. Later this week I will attend CUPB, ATAC, and the Civil Service Council, and I am happy to come back in January as we wrap this up.

Waller stated that there seems to be an ambiguity regarding the stated goal of being a global institution. It seems to me that public universities fall in two broad types, regional institutions that draw students from their locality, and national institutions that draw students from all over and who go back to all over. I see us as clearly a regional, we don't want or need a national reputation, and we don't want to be competing that that level. Do we want to be the best regional we can be, focusing on students from our region, or do we want to change to a completely different model. These are two different things. I think you are saying we want to be a good regional, but you sometimes slip into suggesting the other model. Weber stated that certainly Eastern has a strong regional identity and continues to do so. For example, on the theme of campus and community life, one vision was to be a regional cultural center. The reality of the market these days is that we are competing at a national level. We see universities from all over coming into our markets where we traditionally recruit students and attracting them away from Illinois. There is a strong desire, based on conversations in the process, to break out of the regional university mindset, start attracting more students from beyond Illinois, and internationally as well. That's reflected here, the transition from having a strong regional identity to a recognition that we are competing on a more national or global level. Waller are students asking should I go to EIU or Eastern Tennessee? This seems unlikely. Weber students in Chicago, as they get more heavily recruited, are saying I might as well go to other universities outside the state, and we have seen heavy competition in our more traditional markets.

Stowell asked are these scholarships proposed as part of building a culture of academic rigor being offered to high performing students a annual award or a one-time award. HaileMariam stated that depending on the resources, they would be continual as long as they keep to the standard. Stowell stated this is a pretty significant cost to attract high caliber students. What does success look like, these scholarships will help to retain and enroll an additional 100 students. Additional state aid far exceeds cost to the student, where that money would come from. Weber stated that part of the concept here is, if we have excess capacity, if somebody is not filling the seat and having no tuition, then having someone get one of these scholarships to cover part of tuition, it is better to fill the seat than get zero. Kind of like the airline seat situation. One of the things we've argued with Panther Promise, with targeted tuition waivers, is that we can actually increase our tuition dollars by filling seats and getting partial tuition. As for state aid, performance based funding is in the works from the state. Perry really pushed the initiative, pointing out that on some basic metrics, EIU performs very highly and often at the top, for example freshman-sophomore retention, we're at the top. When it comes to graduation rates, we are at or near the top, with a 6 year graduation rate of 60%. When you look at state funding and normalize it by Full-Time-Equivalent students, we're at the bottom, dead bottom. It's almost an inverse relationship between our funding and performance.

Stowell stated that if these scholarships attract students that otherwise wouldn't be here will be of value. How much an increase in ACT scores would there be if you replace 100 typical students with high

caliber student? It would raise the overall average ACT score of EIU students by .06; to raise the average ACT score by a full point, it would require more than 1500 scholarships. Be cautious in using that as a selling point to make a difference in academic rigor, it will have a small effect on the average. Weber stated you're absolutely right. The average ACT score at EIU has been at 22 forever and a day. It is not easy to raise that, we are not going to see raise from 22 to 30.

Waller stated perhaps a better way to characterize this is that we're a regional university, but our region is getting bigger, maybe the whole midwest, but thinking of EIU as nationally competitive seems implausible, we would find it difficult to compete with California. Weber stated we do reach out beyond national borders, we are attracting international students, but I think you're correct that we will probably continue to attract students primarily from the Western region, but we should not limit ourselves there, are places, for example Arizona, where there are not enough courses and programs being offered to satisfy demand, and universities have had success importing students from Arizona. I think its fair to think of EIU as drawing from a broader region than Illinois.

Adom stated I am trying to understand the program for increasing the endowment. Is there a review of the campaign for every single year, for how many years? Weber stated that biannually the area would need a base adjustment. If we are talking about the second action under the goal, increasing the endowment, the consultant, that's a one-time expense. It would assess how effective our campaign was, what did we do that worked, what to improve. For the stewardship phase following that, we are talking with VPUA Bob Martin and his staff. The needs are more in terms of having another fundraiser on the staff, additional travel funds for president. Right now the budget for the President's travel for fundraising is \$25,000, Martin wants \$100,000, and those sort of changes would need a base adjustment in that division's budget, to have them recur year after year.

Recorder Coit asked which goals will be implemented. Weber stated that in the summary you'll see the first two prioritized goals from the goals conference, and then the third one or some modification if the others were similar in nature. There are three preliminary goals for each of the 6 themes, and that may be too broad. As I work with the President's Council, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, and governance groups, we may see some of these goals dropped to bring greater focus to the plan.

Methven stated that those of us who have been at EIU for a while realize that Eastern has been inadequately funded for a long time. How realistic is it that the funding model will change so that we will get more funding. Weber stated that as far back as I can remember, EIU has been underfunded relative to other institutions on almost any measure. The state's budgeting model has not improved that situation any. The funding we receive in nominal terms is less than we received 10 years ago, it peaked in fiscal 2002. Now we're seeing a little decline. Will performance based funding have any significant impact on that, it could have, around the edges. Maybe performance-based funding will only impact 1 or 2% of the margin and not create a huge shift, that will almost certainly be the case. To get us back to FY 02 funding, adjusting for inflation, would require a \$35 million increase to our base budget. Our appropriation from state is \$46.8 million. We would tell the state, if cuts are coming, then please try to protect your centers of excellence. Instead of cutting across the board, start seriously looking at performance, and tying performance to the budget, and have differential cuts. If new moneys are coming, reward your centers of excellence.

Methven stated it is interesting that you put it in terms of spending cuts that are coming, we often hear about performance-based funding as new dollars, not as insulating us from cuts. Weber stated that's the case the administration team makes when we testify to the legislature, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Governor's Office of Management and Budget. Keep in mind how crazy of a situation we are in. Fiscal 2011 ended June 30, ended with the state having failed to give us more than \$20 million of our \$47 million appropriation before the end of the fiscal year. Today we still do not have \$6.4 million of that appropriation, and we are promised by the end of the calendar year. The state financing education by paying it off eventually is not sustainable, government officials have started to recognize that because discussions on budget at the state level have been deeper, and people are floating more and more controversial ideas. Will know more in February and March.

Mulvaney stated that being a part of the steering committee, we've heard a lot of exciting things, a lot of positive ideas. The one that I've always thought of as the most important, in sustainable finances, and the most challenging for implementation, is the proposal to eliminate programs that are not financially sustainable or central to mission. The financial sustainability piece is very critical. You were on that subcommittee. Was there any conversation about that particular piece? The summary states: "Assess relevance to core mission to provide guidance: develop guidelines and benchmarks for program and

function evaluations. Eliminate or reduce financially unsustainable programs and functions that are not central to the core academic mission.” What would that look like?

Weber stated that was kind of the jaw-dropper, a very challenging concept. I have no doubt there are things that we are doing that we can stop doing. In my division I’ve challenged all my direct reports to come up with one thing that you can stop doing. We do, too often, continue doing things by habit or by rote. When it comes to a process for this at a university-wide level our consultants have a book and a model to recommend. I’ve not yet followed up with Larry so we can start looking at it, models for identifying things you can give up without giving up your identity, your academic core. In Emerging Technologies, one of the goals is to consolidate, there are some things we can stop doing so we can reallocate funds. No doubt that is as tough a goal as we have.

Senator Sterling stated I was on that subcommittee, and part of the answer is in the section to be drafted, on Core Values, we’ve agreed we have to have a discussion about what are the core values of Eastern. If you have a program that’s not financially self-sustaining and not related to our core values, it’s got to be eliminated. With the first part about transparent budgeting, the university has not done a very good job recently adapting the budget to things it says are priorities. The current budget is what everyone got last year, and generally the budget is essentially based on what it was 20 year or 5 years ago with sometinkering. A lot of what is involved, is to look first at what it is really important that we do, and make sure we do that. Mulvaney stated that those are the really tough decisions, whether it is “right-sizing” or whatever spin we put on it. Weber stated when I first moved into the Business Affairs VP I was involved in a right-sizing with ITS, we reduced it by more than 20 positions, many of which were vacant. It was not a fun exercise, but it accomplished some course-correction. Sterling stated that the summary says academically central, to make it clear that we regard the academic functions as central, part of our academic function are not what we’re looking at, for example the Physics department.

Weber stated that the first draft of the summary was submitted to ATAC and CUPB on Friday, when I come back to the Senate in January, Assege and myself will have refined this document over the next month and a half.

Coit asked about the symbolic landmark goal from Campus and Community Life. Weber stated that the landscaping master plan had proposed for south of the Union a GPS monument that would establish Eastern’s location for GPS. And we do have some interest in that with a couple of donors. The foundation also has two endowments for campus beautification and landscaping. That is a possibility with some assistance from some private funds.

Adom asked if the goals and actions are listed in the summary in order of importance? Weber stated the goals and actions throughout the document are listed in priority order, the goals having been determined by the groups at the vision conference.

B. Taskforce on Electronic and Online Learning Materials

Methven stated that he sent Senate a reformulated version of this committee, and as I looked back through some of the documentation I thought we needed a representative from COTE so I added someone. The way it looks now, there is one representative from CGS, CAA, COTE, and Faculty Senate (that could be the Booth Library representative); one person from CATS (proposing John Henderson), one from the Graduate Student Advisory Council (proposing Nicole Conrad, who is also on the Textbook Rental Advisory Committee), one from Student Body Council (proposing Eric Krause, who is also on the Textbook Rental Advisory Committee), and representatives from the colleges. Should we send out a call or ask the four deans to identify nominees from their colleges? White stated I think the committee will be more quickly appointed if we ask Deans instead of going through the election process. Methven stated that in that case the Provost could lean on the deans. Stowell stated that this seems a little unlike the Online Education Committee, in which we were looking for experience, for this topic that’s not a qualification. Methven stated this committee will rely more on interest and enthusiasm. In the strategic plan summary under Emerging Technologies one goal is creating infrastructure for ubiquitous learning, and this is exactly what this task force is headed for. The committee will be ongoing next year but will not last forever. Mulvaney stated that if we go the route of having the Deans appoint members, we would need to be prepared to communicate the rationale for the different appointment processes. As long as we are comfortable I don’t see a problem. Methven stated that all the named campus governance bodies will submit names to us and we will approve them. I think it would be helpful to write some statement about what this group would do.

Adom (Mulvaney) moved to accept the format of this committee. Motion passed unanimously.

C. Future Agenda – January 17, 2012 – Shared Governance Report
D. Meeting Dates for Spring Semester 2012 – January 17, January 31, February 14, February 28,
March 20, April 3, April 17

VII. Adjournment at 3:33pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Coit
January 14, 2012