

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR April 22, 2003 (Vol. XXXI, No. 28)**

The 2000-2001 Faculty Senate minutes and other information are available on the Web at <http://www.eiu.edu/~FacSen> The Faculty Senate agenda is posted weekly on the Web, at Coleman Hall 3556 and on the third-level bulletin board in Booth Library. Note: These Minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of all utterances made at the Senate meeting.

### **I. Call to order by Anne Zahlan at 2:04 p.m.** (Conference Room, Booth Library)

Present: R. Benedict, D. Brandt, D. Carpenter, D. Carwell, L. Clay Mendez, J. Dilworth, F. Fraker, B. Lawrence, W. Ogbomo, S. Scher, M. Toosi, J. Wolski, A. Zahlan. Guests: J. Abell, A. Baharlou, S. Bingham-Porter, J. Chambers, R. Deedrick, M. Hanner, M. Hoadley, B. Irwin, J. Johnson, B. Lord, K. Martin, T. Martin, D. Radavich, D. Righter, J. Tidwell, B. Weber, B. Young, N. Zegler.

### **II. Approval of the Minutes of April 15, 2003.**

Motion (Clay Mendez/Dilworth) to approve Minutes of April 15, 2003. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Clay Mendez, Lawrence, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Carwell, Dilworth, Fraker, Scher. **Passed.**

**III. Announcements:** Chair Zahlan reminded Senators the Faculty-Retirement Reception will be 29 April at 4:00 p.m. in the north foyer of Booth Library. Senator Scher announced that Dr. Alice Eagly will be on campus 24 and 25 April to discuss gender and leadership, as well as gender and heroism.

### **IV. Communications:**

- A. E-mail message (11 April) from Dan Carpenter re: CUPB Resolution
- B. E-mail message (15 April) from Daiva Markelis re: Electronic Writing Portfolio
- C. Telephone message (17 April) from Ronnie Deedrick re: Student Fee Committee [Student Senator Deedrick, in attendance, spoke in favor of retaining the present structure/composition of the Student Technology-Fee Committee.]

Hearing no objection, Chair Zahlan suspended published order of business and moved Senate's focus to VI.A.

### **VI. New Business:**

#### A. Legislative Update from and Discussion with State Senator Righter:

Righter: Thank you for the invitation to be here today.... I thought what I would do is lay out the general perimeters of what the governor's proposed budget is, in general terms, then talk a little bit about the numbers for higher education and specifically Eastern.... The fiscal year 2004 budget, that the governor laid out on April 3, has an overall spending plan of about \$52.4 billion.... The part of the budget that I'm concerned about...really has to do with the general-revenue fund. That's, of course, where all the appropriations for the state universities come from. The governor has proposed spending \$23 billion out of the general-revenue fund this year; that is a \$715 million increase, from fiscal year 2003. ...In order to fund more spending, the governor has come up with new revenue sources, which he has to because tax revenues, at best, are flat and in some projections are continuing to slip.... The new revenue sources I want to lay out for you very quickly--and the reason I want to go through all of these is [that], over the next few weeks when the General Assembly has its opportunity to work over these numbers, some of these numbers are predicated on very thin ice....

I want to put the revenue sources, that the governor has put in for fiscal year 2004, into two categories: recurring, which is something he's going to get year after year, and non-recurring which, for the most part, are one-time splashes. The recurring: He has several proposals...revoking different tax exemptions, largely for business, regardless of the size of the business.... Right now, the federal estate tax is being phased out; the governor's proposal includes separating ourselves out from the federal tax code and basically instituting our own state tax.... The casino boats: He has proposed changing the tax structure on the casinos.... Fee increases of \$349 million: The governor has not told us specifically what those are yet.... You'll see some...fees, that are very low, go up 3 or 4 times what they are currently. Another

category he has in fund surcharges: ...I don't know how many funds there are in the Illinois State Treasury, but there are dozens and dozens, and some of these funds have accumulated over a period of time surpluses in them, and the governor wants to go in and tax those funds at a level of 4%. The governor's rationale is that taxpayers' money is being spent on administering those funds, so why don't we go and tax those funds and...bring that money into the general-revenue funds.

The non-recurring (these are more one-time splashes): The first two here are probably the most troubling, in my mind anyway. One is the sale of the 10th riverboat license.... \$1.6 billion to be spent on the borrowing plan that the governor moved earlier: That plan is basically...to issue \$10 billion, in general-obligation bonds, put those in a special-investment account, and then use that investment account to pay the pension-fund contributions that the General Assembly has been making since 1995. My serious concern with that is...with the fact that we are counting on now that, over the course of 30 years, we're going to make \$2 billion off the difference between what we can borrow at and what we can invest at.... The governor deserves credit, no question, for thinking outside the box, which I think is required here. ...The last three I'll name very quickly--the non-recurring revenue sources the sale of assets [e.g., the sale of the Thompson Center]...; pre-paid taxes (the governor wants to change the way in which the state collects taxes, to some extent on cigarettes and alcohol; he wants the payments up front...); and finally a tax-amnesty bill that passed the Senate (basically for people who owe back taxes; this will give [them] an opportunity to write a check and send it in now...).

...Higher education specifically I want to go through in two steps: The Board of Higher Education recommendation to the Governor's Office, and then what the Governor's Office put in front of the General Assembly. The Board of Higher Education's recommendation was for an increase (an I'm talking about state-appropriated funds here...), an increase of \$74.3 million, or an increase overall of about 3 1/2 %.

...My understanding is...there [were] \$31 million in there set aside specifically for salary increases. \$17.3 million would have come from the state; there's an assumption that \$13 million would have been matched by the income funds of the universities. Also, recruitment and retaining critical faculty and staff: There was...a little over \$15 million in there (that was a 1% increase, and again that was expected to be matched by the income funds with another 1%). The governor's proposal is a little bit different [from] that. The governor's proposal is for overall--for Eastern is \$47.6 million; that's appropriated funds.... That is down \$5.4 million, or about 10% from what the IBHE recommended for Eastern, and it is down about 8% from what Eastern was appropriated last year.... Now I want to make a point here, with regards to the reserve that the governor is requiring the universities to set aside: That is \$1.5 million right now; the numbers I just gave you do not take into account that reserve.... If you include all those numbers, and then put in the group-health insurance, which the administration has said the universities are going to pick up for 2004, then for Eastern, between FY 03 and FY 04, overall the funding reduction is a little over 16%--about 16.3%, according to the numbers that I have. Very quickly, I want to touch on a couple of other issues that are...related to higher education.... One is the tuition-increase limits that are out there. ...There are not as many out there as there were a few weeks ago. The one I think most people have...signed on to is one that would guarantee [the same] tuition for 4 years.... Everyone in the universities...[has] indicated to us that that's something they think they can live with. There's another proposal cooking out there now that I think...people weren't looking for. The governor did announce it in his budget address: ...To also limit tuition increases, from one year to the next, [to] no more than 5%. Now there's been a negative reaction to that because I think the attitude has been, well, cap us on one end, but please don't cap us on both ends. If we can't have the money here, we need to be able to draw it from somewhere, which I think is a reasonable argument to make. ...The last point: ...The governor's budget proposal for fiscal year 2004...also advises the universities that they're going to be required to set aside, reserve or whatever, a certain amount of money, not only from appropriated funds, but from income funds. I think, for the long term, that's probably the most dangerous thing that's out there right now. ...Since I've been in the General Assembly (I started in the fall of '97), I have always been...blessed with the amount of cooperation that I've gotten from the folks here at Eastern--the students, the faculty, the administration.... Anytime that any of you have a suggestion,

have a concern, have a question, want to complain to me, I'm in a phone-call or a letter...away.

[A general discussion followed Senator Richter's remarks, during which concerns were expressed about the governor's perceived attitude toward higher education; the theoretically--and potentially practical--benefits of lobbying legislators on Eastern's behalf; the perception that legislators undervalue what faculty members do and expect universities to do more with less; the potentially negative effects of universities being required to return local/income funds to Springfield and the general-revenue funds; and, among other related topics, the fact that universities are being threatened with higher budgetary cuts than other state agencies.]

## V. Old Business:

### A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive Committee: Chair Zahlan reported that she attended the CUPB meeting of 18 April, during which CUPB members further discussed Eastern's perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, as well as the extent to which WEIU would or could be self-supporting.
2. Student-Faculty Relations Committee: Senator Benedict informed the Senate that Student Senator Nancy Zegler will be replacing Student Senator Bryce Donnelly on the Faculty Senate for the remainder of this academic year.
3. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report.
4. Elections Committee: Senator Brandt reported he has yet to conduct a coin-toss between three write-in candidates, and he will give his final report to the Senate on 29 April.
5. Nominations Committee: Senator Wolski reported that enough faculty members have volunteered to fill announced vacancies on various committees, and the Nominations Committee will bring those names forward soon for Senate approval.
6. Other Reports: Senator Brandt reminded Senators that the Comprehensive Technology Planning Committee is holding open meetings this week and next week; the 21 April meeting had eight attendees. Attendance at these meetings is very important.

B. Shared Governance Structure for Academic Technology (Including Procedure for Evaluating Proposals for Grants in Professional Development). Senators Ogbomo and Clay Mendez withdrew their motion of 15 April.

Motion (Ogbomo/Clay Mendez) that the Faculty Senate adopt and recommend to the Provost the "Proposal for Shared-Governance Structure for the Oversight of the TEAM Academic Technology Program."

Motion (Brandt/Scher) to amend proposal so that the penultimate paragraph reads, in part, that "this committee will have responsibility for recommending to the Provost policies and procedures....," instead of "this committee will have responsibility for establishing policies and procedures...." Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Fraker, Lawrence, Clay Mendez, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. **Passed.**

[Discussion followed, during which Senators Brandt and Benedict expressed their belief that instruction-support staff should have membership on the proposed committee, Senator Carwell suggested that such staff be named ex-officio, non-voting members, other senators agreed with the latter suggestion, and there was a general discussion about proportional representation.]

Motion (Brandt/Benedict) to amend proposal so that two ISS members would serve on the committee, as voting members, bringing the total number of the committee members to 11 instead of 9. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Fraker. No: Carpenter, Carwell, Lawrence, Clay Mendez, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. **Failed.**

Motion (Lawrence/Carwell) to amend proposal so that the "staff member appointed by Academic Affairs" would be specified as "instructional-support-staff member appointed by Academic Affairs." Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Fraker, Lawrence, Clay Mendez, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski,

Zahlan. **Passed.**

There being no further discussion of the Ogbomo/Clay Mendez motion, a vote was called for. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Fraker, Lawrence, Clay Mendez, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. **Passed.**

Carpenter: Last week it seemed, when Dr. Hoadley was speaking with us, that we were suddenly talking about two pots of [TEAM] money, and I know I wasn't alone in being surprised by that. This committee that we've just voted to recommend to the Provost would deal with both funds, right? Zahlan: That was the intention of the makers of the motion, including both the programmatic and individual TEAM-grant funds. Carpenter: I'd like to ask either the Provost, Dr. Hoadley or both if there is an intention to separate the [TEAM] money into two pots, and to distribute one pot among the deans.

Hoadley: I appreciate the chance to get to talk on this matter. I'll take your [the Senate's] proposal under advisement; it's an interesting proposal. I think the proposal that was shown to the group before was just as interesting, so I appreciate listening to the discussion. The question about the funds, though: It's been clear, since the fall, that, you know, [in] the previous procedures there were four categories. I'm just going to say it again; I know all of you know this, but I'll say it one more time. There was a TEDE process that worked for three rounds, and...one of the charges I was given when I came here was to look at that, and so I have, and I have tried to gather input from across campus. There were four categories--professional-development grants, technology-enhanced courses, technology-delivered courses and then one for programs. ...One of the things that was very clear was that people were still interested in having professional-development grants; and so, yes, there was one pot of money; there was a set number of dollars that was designated for that last year. For this coming year, we looked at those figures and I had proposed actually a little bit more in that category. The other three categories I have lumped together under the auspice of planning, implementation and evaluation grants; and so that's a larger category that was trying to, instead of focusing on individual competition for grants, [look] at more programmatic and campus-wide needs relative to the use of technology. And so that is another pot of money that is in CATS currently. And the rest of your [Carpenter's] question was? ...Carpenter: ...We were talking about \$150,000 originally, and so you will be taking part of that and distributing it among the deans? Hoadley: What I was looking at was a proposal to figure out how we could distribute that across the campus, not just to deans but for things that were in support of the academic mission of the university, relative to the use of technology.

Carpenter: I guess my question is: Was there consultation, between you and groups on campus, about dividing that money up? Hoadley: Oh yeah, it was very clear, from the few people who attended in the fall, that it was time to change the system; and that the TEDE process in the past served its purpose, but it was not considered the best use of funds, just to meet individual needs. So, taking that under advisement, and then discussing it with the Deans' Council, and I came here to the Faculty Senate and talked about that at one time; I don't remember which meeting it was, but I talked about the idea that we were looking at TEAM grants and the broader perspective of the campus needs..., so trying to get the word out there would be potentially a new process in place. ...Carpenter: So my perception wasn't false or incorrect. You didn't send this proposal forward to the Faculty Senate; we haven't seen such a proposal to split the funds into two groups? Hoadley: I didn't realize I was supposed to. Carpenter: You never formally told us that was what you were going to do. You suggested it. Hoadley: I think my purpose, unless I'm misunderstanding my role, is to advise the different groups on campus, such as Faculty Senate, that there is going to be a change, and we make that knowledge available that some changes are occurring; so if I'm wrong, I sure would be willing to talk about it further. ...Zahlan: ...When the name change [from TEDE to TEAM] was suddenly there in front of us, I believe we turned to the Provost, I remember asking whether that was in fact a change or simply a name change, and we were told that was a name change, not a structural change.

...Lawrence: In the motion we just passed, the second paragraph says, "Whereas the TEAM Program is also a source of support for initiatives related to development of technology-enhanced courses, technology-delivered courses, and technology-delivered programs...." So, is that the second pot of money

that you [Hoadley] are talking about? Hoadley: In the past that was a category for TEDE. ...Carwell: Is there some mechanism in place, as to how this money is going to be allocated, that's going to enhance the academic mission of the university? Hoadley: That's currently under discussion. You know, one thing we're having this discussion about too, and maybe I'm speaking out of line, but we are assuming that these funds are going to exist.... Carwell: You can perhaps understand the joke the last time you were here that we were just supposed to trust you, and now you see why some people have difficulty-- Hoadley: Trusting me? Trusting me? Carwell: I'm not talking about you personally, but talking about the process that perhaps you are involved in, that somehow these things just happen to appear, and it's a done deal, and we should have known this was happening all along. I certainly don't mean to disparage you, but it generates a degree of distrust among the faculty, perhaps. Another thing: ...Do we have a clear definition of what exactly the academic mission of the university is, and what programs specifically fit in that and what do not? Or is that also just sort of you decide this is part of the academic mission; therefore, this money can apply to that? Or is there some sort of strict criteria?

Hoadley: There is on the website posted what is the academic mission of the university. At least to me it's clear what the university has set out there as its mission statement. In terms of these types of funds, I've been trying to be rather broad and more inclusive, in terms of supporting as many things as possible that would have impact upon multitudes of people. At least, that's been the intention all along. I mean, I do believe you can make opportunities available to groups of people and programs and things like that, that in the long run will have a much more lasting effect. ...I think we have to make people understand why--I mean, these are big decisions, and they have lasting effects, and you've seen that before here at Eastern. Carwell: I know; we understand that, which is why we would like to feel like we have some impact on these "big decisions," instead of them just being presented to us. Hoadley: Well, I think you have impact; you do have an impact. You know, the Faculty Senate, unless I'm reading your charge incorrectly that's on the web, and I did look at it to make sure I really had a better understanding. I mean, your purpose on this university is to enlighten the campus--that's not the word that's in there, but--but basically to make sure that you voice the concerns and interest of the faculty. Is that a fair statement? I mean to--let me finish it, though. I mean that's what I read, and of course that's what you're supposed to be doing, and so it's providing input....

[Senator Toosi stated that he doesn't view as viable a distinction between individual and program needs, in that they both support the academic mission of the university.] Fraker: On the planning, implementation and evaluation grants, you [Hoadley] say that those guidelines are currently under discussion. Hoadley: Yes, the whole concept of doing that is under discussion. Fraker: Who is that discussion with? Hoadley: Currently I'm having the discussion with the Council of Deans. Fraker: So, if we want input then we should contact our deans? Hoadley: [Yes.] Ogbomo: The problem I have with creating two strings, or two lines, is the...creation of two separate entities within the university where we have common goals. If a faculty [member] applies for a grant, to enhance instruction, I should think it should be part of the program needs of that professor, that department, that college--and, ultimately, the university. So that is where I have a problem, having two separate funds. Again, it [the creation of two separate funds] creates a sense of us against them, [institutional/program needs versus individual projects which would also serve Eastern's academic mission].... [Senator Benedict urged faculty members to attend the scheduled Comprehensive Technology Planning Committee's discussions, during which participants will be able to express their views and concerns.]

...Brandt: ...I think Michael [Hoadley] is saying the same thing Wilson [Ogbomo] is, is saying the same thing everybody else is, but we're just not communicating here. I think the problem that I saw with the TEDE grants, as they were, [was that] some of the sign-off process, in some areas, they were careful. Chairs checked to see that the proposal was appropriate. And the deans checked to see that they were appropriate. In some other areas the administrators weren't that careful, and so you had faculty members doing things that were of little use to the department. So what you're saying, Wilson, is what you do needs to be of value to the department, needs to be of value to the college, needs to be of value to the university. I

think what' s happening is the process is just trying to insure that that works in all the areas.Hoadley: That' s a good point. I think what I' m trying to do with thatgive it an extra level of accountability and responsibility, in terms of that planning.... Carpenter: This may all work just fine, but there are two things on my mind: Both process and variability. I mean, how one dean handles it [the distribution of TEAM funds], in his or her college, may be extremely different from the way another dean does. One dean may decide funds will go to what he or she views as a priority. By Dr. Hoadley' s plan., [the funds are] going to be divvied up among the deans, and the dean' s will decide. It' s one more layer of bureaucracy between the faculty and instructional staff and the [TEAM] money, made by fiat by one man. You [Hoadley] may say you have been consulting, or people have given you their input, but we [Faculty Senate] have not received a formal proposal that this is what you intend to do with the money. ...One other thing in the Faculty Senate Constitution is that any and all matters affecting the welfare of the university are the necessary concerns of the Faculty Senate. The welfare of the university includes public dollars, and we should have input into that. Hoadley: And, you know, I think that' s probably a pretty valid point, in the sense that you have dollars in your department and you make those decisions; other people don' t always come in and scrutinize them....

Lawrence: The problem of not having support from above for courses that were proposed from the TEDE grants is also a big problem going the other way. As far as I' m concerned it' s inappropriate because curricular changes should come from the faculty, not from above. Hoadley: I would never disagree with the fact that the faculty should be involved in curricular issues..., but the process by which those curricular changes--like course delivery or course development--definitely need to be open to things like how can CATS support those faculty members, in terms of getting their courses changed, that type of thing....

[Quorum was lost at this point in the discussion.]

**VII. Adjournment:** Meeting concluded, for lack of a quorum, at 4:06 p.m.

**Future Agenda Items:**

Faculty Appointments to University Boards and Committees; Election of Faculty Senate Officers; Phi Beta Kappa; Senate Constitution and By-laws; Faculty Representation of Board of Trustees

Respectfully submitted,  
David Carpenter