

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR 17 January 2012 (Vol. XXXV, No. 9)

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, M.-L. Li, A. Methven, M. Mulvaney, K. Padmaraju, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, D. Viertel, A. White, J. Waller. Student Representative: A. Gonzalez. Excused: A. Rosenstein, L. Taylor

Guests: Blair Lord (Provost/VPAA), David Raybin (CGS, English), William Weber (VPBA), Rebecca Throneburg (CAA, Communications Disorders and Sciences), Diane Jackman (Dean of CEPS), Jeanne Snyder (Associate Dean of LCBAS), Marshall Lassak (Mathematics and Computer Sciences, Chair of COTE)

II. Approval of the Minutes of 6 December

Senator Stowell (Adom) moved to approve the minutes. Motion approved unanimously. Abstain: Viertel.

III. Announcements

Memo of 21 November 2011 from President Perry re: Shared Governance Report

Memo of 19 December 2011 from Jim Davis re: Minutes of the 1 September 2011, 6 October 2011, and 8 December 2011 meetings of the Intercollegiate Athletic Board

Memo of 4 January 2012 from Christine Derrickson re: Minutes of the 9 November 2011 meeting of the Library Advisory Board

Memo of 12 January 2012 from Vice President Weber re: Revised Strategic Plan

Memo of 13 January 2013 from Judy Gorrell re: Minutes of the 9 December 2011 meeting of CUPB

IV. Communications

V. Old Business

A. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee: Chair Methven stated he would distribute list of nominations for the Committee on Electronic Learning Materials at the next meeting.

2. Nominations Committee: Senator Viertel stated he is still working on completing a list of the committees senate appoints.

3. Elections Committee: Vice-Chair Mulvaney stated that he would propose dates/deadlines for Spring elections at the next meeting. He stated that moving the election earlier might have merit might help the nominations committee. Senator Sterling stated that we should make sure the dates allows for room to extend the deadline..

4. Faculty – Student Relations Committee: Senator Leonce stated that the next meeting of Student Senate is tomorrow at 7pm.

5. Faculty – Staff Relations Committee: no report.

6. Awards Committee: no report.

7. Faculty Forum Committee: Senator Padmaraju stated she would contact the Faculty Development Advisory Committee to set up a date for a Spring Forum on disability issues.

8. Other Reports

a. Provost's Report: Lord stated there will be a Board of Trustees meeting this Friday, at which David Raybin (English) will be recognized for being named Illinois Professor of the Year by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Council of Advancement and Support of Education. Jeff Stowell (Psychology) and Linda Ghent (Economics) were also considered for the award. The Council of Graduate Schools/Educational Testing Service recently recognized the graduate school for promoting minority education, and the award came with matching funds for new programs.

The Board has approved for more campus centers, and Center for Clean Energy Research and Education recently received a \$200,000 NSF grant for outreach and education. Board has also approved

the creation of a Center for Geographic and Information Sciences, which will formalize some of the initiatives we've been doing for a while. This gives it the center a house and opportunity to seek outside funding.

At the Executive Committee planning meeting we will also be sharing briefly that we've received reports from Noel Levitz consultancy, who will make three visits, focusing on retention, marketing and recruitment, and financial aid. We have preliminary reports from the first two visits, and the second one arrived late Friday. We will get those materials out to various governance groups. These reports aren't the end of the consultancy, we have a several year contract.

At the end of the week candidates for Deans of College and Sciences will begin visiting campus.

Senator Stowell asked if the renewable center performing up expectations. Lord stated that when you get a \$200,000 grant, the answer is yes, the center is getting money to build buildings, and the research initiatives are doing fine. Methven asked if we are saving money on wood chips because of warm weather? Lord I hope so. Weber stated that he I asked this very question this morning of BA council, I got the too early to say. Remember that wood chips in and of themselves aren't saving money. Natural gas prices tend to be such a rollercoaster, woodchips are not as cheap as natural gas at lowest price, and not as cheap as coal. Where real savings come in is the conservation projects we did last year. Lord asked if there is a target date for tearing the decommissioned plant down. Weber stated that the target date has come and gone, the holdup is securing a contractor to clean out ash in the silos. It will certainly be down by June, when there will be a statewide response exercise, and then I'm going to give it to the EMR people to blow up. The DEN had a nice article about facilities projects, and did mention the scrubber space. My facilities people thought it should be made into parking, but we hope to have an outdoor lounge type area, which will be a nice change for campus. Recorder Coit asked about the plans for a new Student Services building. Weber stated that the campus master plan calls for us to make that space occupied by the old steam plant into a new Student Services Building, by tearing down the old building, and building a parallel structure. The west end of the new building would line up with the west side of Blair Hall, which would extend the North Quad southwards. It would house various student service along with technology units.

Methven asked for updates on the budget and MAP funding. Weber stated that the state did finally pay off what it owed us for last fiscal year. When the last fiscal year ended we were short \$20 million, this was promised to us by December, and did come in by the first week of December. For this fiscal year's appropriation of \$48.9 million, to date state has paid \$14-15 million. Very early in fall semester the states was doing a job turning around vouchers, and we've received roughly a quarter of the promised appropriation, a little over a half what we've vouchered. There are also concerns about MAP funding, to date we have not received any MAP dollars, the total amount falls in the neighborhood of \$5 million. For the spring, when you add up MAP and vouchers not received, the state is still behind what they owe us by \$20 million. There have been modest improvements in cash flow, but we still have to be cautious.

b. Budget Transparency Committee: Sterling stated he is going to get the committee together in near future.

c. Other

B. Other Old Business

Senator White asked for an update on the electronic signs planned campus. Methven stated that the topic was brought up at CUPB, and VPSA Dan Nadler said it is in a holding pattern. White asked about the concrete slabs outside some buildings Lord stated that 6-7 years we started a major signage program on campus. We started with signs on the outside of campus, but there was always a plan to put signs on the interior of campus. When the project is done it will have taken ten years.

Leonce delivered a report on the Human Resources Director search, the committee has met twice so far, we had a subcommittee developing evaluation criteria, and have 25 complete and 19 incomplete applications, and has begun reviewing applications. The committee has 10 members from the Academic Affairs area, and is chaired by Kathy Reed. The cutoff point for applications is January 16, and we will be meeting January 20, to review the applications. There is a steady flow of applicants coming in.

Padmaraju stated that the four vendors for the new learning management system to replace WebCT will have open demo sessions scheduled in the next two weeks.

VI. New Business

A. Michelle Payne – 2012 Faculty Staff Campaign

Payne stated that last year was the first year we did a concentrated effort on a Faculty/Staff campaign. Any gift by a staff or faculty member counts toward the campaign's goal, and we are not concentrated on

total dollars raised, instead we are concentrating on participation. We have decided to put a lot of emphasis on it this year. It really affects our rankings in US news. When our major gift officers go to look for a gigantic ask, it's nice to be able to say 35% of faculty and staff are giving, it shows internal buy-in. In FY2010 we were at 20% participation campus wide. Last year we raised the rate to 35%, and now that the seed has been planted we are hoping to do better this year. We have 581 donors, with 122 first time donors. Thirty-five departments had 70% participation, and 18 were 100%. Staff Senate had a 54% participation rate, Faculty Senate 60%, and Civil Service Council 84%. Civil Service Council has thrown the gauntlet a bit, to see who could get highest rate, the prize being a snack for meeting after campaign is over in March. No amount is too small. We have people giving \$2 per pay period. Anything helps to contribute to a final amount. The other thing is you can give to anywhere on campus, there is a misconception about donations a big pooled fund that stays in the President's department. You can donate to anything that is important to you. This year's campaign will last from February 1 to Mid-march, we are moving the end back because at the beginning of May everyone is in finals mode. Sandy Bingham-Porter, Mona Davenport, and Gary Aylesworth are the campaign chairs. We think there will be big numbers coming from that team.

Knight-Davis asked if the campaign is just for payroll deductions or are any kinds of contributions welcome? Payne said that one time donations are acceptable, of any kind. Knight-Davis asked about in-kind donation of materials and services. Payne stated that those would not be counted toward the goal until the end of the year.

B. Shared Governance Report

Senator Viertel suggested the Senate review the report point-by-point.

Methven stated that the first recommendation of the Committee had to do with establishing a universal meeting time. Throneburg stated that this concerns many of us that are on multiple committees, if it's all at one time you would be missing something else. Methven stated that I think there would be challenges, for a variety of reasons. In the Sciences Tuesdays and Thursdays are lab days. That's not even considering the fact that you could be on multiple committees. The ask has been sent to CUPB, but was not discussed at last Friday's CUPB meeting.

Methven stated that the second recommendation was to establish a University Council with representation from faculty, students, staff, and the administration. President Perry stated in his reply that he would create a President's roundtable, which differs in that it would initially offer advice on pursuing the recommendations. Sterling stated that if you look at section 2 under the committee report, the intent was to streamline shared governance, and the first task is a comprehensive review of all university committees and councils, to determine which we have to have, which we use, which we should abolish. Once this is done, in the future the University Council would organize task forces, rather than creating standing committees. The Shared Governance Committee is recommending a structure that would substantially cut down bureaucracy. The President said, we will create this council, but won't give it the job of slashing these committees, and seems what the president has done is create more bureaucracy, which defeats entire purpose of the recommendations. Recorder Coit stated that the Committee's recommendations, and the Presidents' response leaves room for Faculty Senate to do that if we want to.

Lassak stated that the University Council as proposed has no members from CAA, COTE, or CGS. Jackman stated that this would interfere with the EIU's accreditation, as the governing body for accreditation is COTE, and that would not be a good thing for us.

Throneburg stated that she didn't want CAA to be a subset of another larger committee, this would create more hoops and layers to jump through. I don't think we quite understood from this report the relationship between the University Council, Faculty Senate, CAA, CGS, and COTE would be. Methven stated that at other institutions this is the model, and all the other groups are subcommittees of the Senate. It is a different sort of format. Raybin stated that, speaking for CGS, it seems that decisions on Graduate Studies will be made outside CGS, the plan recommends having five faculty members on a larger group, and that decisions on faculty governance would be made by a committee that does not have majority faculty representation.

Methven stated that we don't have to reach a decision on the recommendations today. The topic could be resumed two weeks from now, and members of the committee could attend to discuss the recommendations.

Viertel stated that presumably there would be 15 members of Faculty Senate, and 5 would also have positions on the University Council, and asked if that would make them senior. Would they be elected

from Senate? The structure isn't clear. Coit stated that the Senate is larger at these other institutions with similar structures.

Knight-Davis stated that the delegate system concept poses problems for the library. The at-large seats are how library gets on these committees, and we don't want to be written in to the delegate system. If that at-large option is gone, and if there is business that concerns the library we won't be on those committees. Methven stated that Stacy is referring to the third recommendation, which the President is deferring to the Senate to decide what we want to do. Mulvaney stated that the conversations regarding representation, have just kind of evolved and changed in recent years. The topic has surfaced, and identified areas where there's potential concern, and the conversations haven't moved forward. Speaking from the perspective of Faculty elections alone, whether it is a delegate or at large system, trying to get interest is a problem. WE have elections coming up in a month, and after each initial announcement or call we usually have had to extend the deadline because we are short, have to encourage write in candidacies, we are in effect campaigning to get candidates. Raybin stated that question may also be related to the universal meeting time. Some problems are real but don't have to be, having a universal meeting time doesn't have to mean that it is the only time, major committees could go on separate days, this is part of the dilemma we have now. People can't be in more than one place at a time.

Coit asked for clarification on the structure of COTE for the purposes of accreditation. Jackman stated that COTE is listed in the current accreditation documents as having final say over teacher education curriculum. For accreditation, such a committee has to be an entity with final say, and one on which everyone can serve.

Viertel stated that delegate system might cause problems with elections, since we are having problems getting enough candidates when we are drawing from the entire university. I expressed this the last time this came up, I'd rather the Faculty Senate not have representatives from every single college, but have representatives who want to be here and want to participate.

Throneburg asked if this document recommends that Faculty Senate would be elected first, and then there are delegates that would go out to form the other committees first, or are the other committees elected first and constitute Senate.

Viertel stated that as a larger question, we need to hear from the group, what is the problem that we are fixing here, is the system broken, do we need to do something this radical. Sterling stated that part of the problem is that very often people on Senate do not know what is going on at CAA or CGS, and if we replaced it with a system where part of members of the committee serve on Senate, than we'd have someone at the table. This would take care of issues where one committee is working on something that goes one direction, or another committee that goes another direction. White stated if I want to know what goes on at CAA I will go ask them. I think its my responsibility to go to them and ask them. Leonce stated we have these relationships already, I don't think we need to revamp the whole system, but create better channels for communication instead.

Mulvaney stated I tend to think the purpose is to have these discussions. Another part is to be more efficient, with financial resources, human resources, to have time more efficiently utilized. Are there some committees that should continue to do what they are doing, are there ones we should revise, restructure, eliminate, to ultimately make the system a little more efficient. For elections when I try to talk to the chairs of committees I find some that don't meet very frequently, if they aren't meeting, what are they doing and do we need them. Methven stated that when I was in charge of nominations, I saw a lot of those same things, even some committees where the name is similar to another committee, and again, the question is how often do they meet, are they necessary. It's a good conversation for us to have, to maybe to look at committee structure, see if those purposes can served in some other way.

Padmaraju asked if the recommendations on hiring committees included only faculty hiring committees, or all committees? Sterling stated that the language recommending procedures for non-administrative faculty hires are singled out, so presumably that's not the only thing that this covers.

Sterling stated I was disappointed that the President chose not to recommend #6, I understand the arguments for the advantages for not having an official rank ordered list, but I think there are advantages to having a rank ordered system. It would say this is the #1, and list the reasons for thinking that this is the best candidate. The advantages of clarity are worth the disadvantages of making the rankings public. I think that's the best recommendation on the whole list.

Padmaraju asked who would be the hiring agent. Is the department chair considered the hiring agent for a faculty? Lord stated that the Provost sends the letter of contract, but the Chair often serves as the hiring agent. I delegate the authority to Deans and Chairs.

Throneburg stated that if we continue this discussion at Faculty Senate's next meeting, since there are concerns about the President's response, can we also invite him? Methven stated we can certainly invite him., the President's Council is visiting Senate February 14, maybe we can defer questions to President until then.

Stowell stated that a representative from Staff and Student Senate should also be asked to attend.

Lord stated that tomorrow there is a panel discussion featuring David Raybin, Jeff Stowell, and Linda Ghent, the three faculty members nominated for the CASE Professor of the Year designation, among the finest of our faculty, 3:30pm reception, Doudna Lecture Hall.

C. William Weber, VPBA, Strategic Planning Process. Weber stated there will be a fourth draft of the plan later in the week. I've been trying to connect with the key governance groups. The changes on this draft include the new introduction required by the president, and it also incorporates some feedback I've received from CUPB, the President's Council, and Civil Service Council. The items, various goals and actions, have been tweaked, in particular significant changes were made in Global Competition and Changing Demographics, and Emerging Technology was somewhat committee-heavy, and that's been adjusted as well. The niv. metrics have been flushed out a bit. Those metrics are ones that we currently track on the president's website since 2008, no need to reinvent the wheel on those. We are going to be presenting the fourth draft to the Board on Friday for a first reading.

Methven stated open session, one at 3:30pm in Paris room, 9am and 11 am tomorrow in the Paris room.

D. Future Agenda – January 31, 2012 – Shared Governance Report; Todd Bruns, Booth Library, The Keep; Jim Davis, Intercollegiate Athletic Board report

E. Future Meeting Dates for Spring Semester 2012 – January 31, February 14, February 28, March 20, April 3, April 17

F. Future Meeting Topics – CORE; President's Council; Student Success Center; Campus Security

VII. Adjournment at 3:29pm

Future Agenda items:

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Coit
January 28, 2012