

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR January 14, 2003 (Vol. XXXI, No. 17)

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 2:05 p.m. (Conference Room, Booth Library)

Present: R. Benedict, D. Brandt, D. Carpenter, D. Carwell, L. Clay Mendez, J. Dilworth, F. Fraker, M. Monippallil, W. Ogbomo, S. Scher, M. Toosi, J. Wolski, A. Zahlan. Excused: B. Lawrence and G. Canivez. Guests: J. Chambers, B. Donnelly, J. Fetty, B. Lord, A. Sartore.

II. Approval of the Minutes of December 10, 2002.

Motion (Dilworth/Fraker) to approve Minutes of December 10, 2002 [incorrectly identified as Minutes of December 7, 2002]. Yes: Carpenter, Carwell, Dilworth, Fraker, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Wolski, Zahlan. No: Benedict, Brandt. Abstain: Clay Mendez. **Passed.** Senator Brandt requested the opportunity to explain his vote: He was advised by a paralegal not to vote to approve Senate Minutes in their current format.

III. Announcements: None

IV. Communications:

- A. Information from the President's Council (13 November 2002)
- B. Information from the President's Council (20 November 2002)
- C. E-mail message (10 December) from Keith Andrew re: Council of Chairs
- D. Telephone message from Michael Hoadley re: Request for Senate appointment to CTC
- E. E-mail message (16 December) from Michael Leddy re: Grade-Appeal Procedures
- F. E-mail message (25 December) from Bailey Young re: Grade-Appeal Procedures
- G. E-mail message (9 January) from Les Hyder re: IBHE Hearings on Affordability of Higher Education
- H. Minutes (11 December) of the President's Council
- I. Minutes (3 January) of the President's Council
- J. Copy of e-mail (14 January) from Senator Benedict, containing reply from Joe Barron to Benedict's query re: the *Open Meetings Act*

V. Old Business:

- A. Committee Reports:
 1. Executive Committee: Chair Zahlan reported she intends to contact Dean Lanham about placement of the Distinguished Faculty Award plaque in Booth Library. She also reported she attended the 13 December CUPB meeting, during which a motion was defeated that proposed representatives from all vice-presidential areas be elected to CUPB's presidential subcommittee; a motion was postponed that proposed to reduce 12-month administrative contracts to 11-month contracts; and a motion was made but then withdrawn that proposed to eliminate, over a 3-year period, allocation of appropriated funds to competitive Athletics, in conformity with previous IBHE requests to that effect and steps taken by other universities. Chair Zahlan spoke at both commencement ceremonies on 14 December.
 2. Student-Faculty Relations Committee: No report.
 3. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report.
 4. Elections Committee: Senator Brandt is scheduling faculty elections for the last week of March.
 5. Nominations Committee: No report.
 6. Other Reports: Senator Ogbomo reported that the Budget-Director Screening Committee has selected four candidates for on-campus interviews, those to take place at the end of January and the first week of February. Senator Scher reported that the nomination form for the Distinguished Faculty Award is accessible via the Faculty Senate's homepage.
- B. Student Senate Proposal on Grade-Appeal Procedures: The Senate postponed discussion of/voting on

previous motion (Scher/Fraker) to support Student Senate Resolution 02-03-07, until after Student Senators Sartore and Donnelly consult with Student Senator Deedrick.

- C. Planning for Faculty Forum (Academic Freedom and Other Concerns), to be held Tuesday, 28 January 2003: [See final page of these Minutes.]

VI. New Business:

- A. Senate Appointment to Comprehensive Technology Committee. Motion (Carwell/Clay Mendez) to name Senator Brandt as Faculty Senate representative on the Comprehensive Technology Committee. Yes: Benedict, Carpenter, Carwell, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Fraker, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Brandt. **Passed.**
- B. Credit-Hour Agreement with City of Charleston.

Zahlan: ...One can certainly see the advantage of bartering in these times, and one can see the advantages of closing Seventh Street.... I think the problems some faculty had [concerned consultation]. Someone asked me if the Senate was consulted about [the EIU-Charleston agreement], and as far as I knew we had not been consulted. However, I was then informed by Doug [Brandt] and, I guess, Reed [Benedict] (I don't know that you [Benedict] informed me), who were both on the [Senate] Executive Committee last year, that in fact this [agreement] had been brought up with last year's Executive Committee. I do not recall that we heard about it at the Senate [meetings], but apparently the Executive Committee had talked about it, so...there was no breach of protocol on the part of the administration. Carwell: Was the Executive Committee consulted, or was the Executive Committee informed? Brandt: We were informed that they were working on it [the agreement]. Carwell: So, in other words, we weren't consulted; we were told it was going to happen. Brandt: Well, our responses were invited, but I remember Bud's [Fischer's] comment that it sounded like a great idea. Zahlan: So that was the judgement call of the Executive Committee whether that was discussed or not. ...I guess the issue that people have brought up was...that a sort of deal has been made with faculty work that faculty weren't consulted about....

Lord: I think the gist of the questions that I heard at the end of last year [had to do with] the effect the exchange would have on the character of the campus and the character of the student body here on campus. ...First of all, I have to point out that anybody who receives on of these waivers...has to be admissible according to our admission criteria. So, from the standpoint of Academic Affairs..., the effect on us, what we see before us in the classrooms, is essentially going to be transparent; we're not going to know the difference [between students attending with waivers and those without].... The other comment I would make is: I guess the appraised value [of the street]...was determined to be [about] \$488,000, so that was the value of the tuition waivers. If you divide that currently by \$108 in credit, which will be higher ten years out—but if you use \$108 frozen—it's about 4,500 credit hours; if you divide that by three, for classes, you're down to about 1,500 classes. If you wanted to say they [the waivers] only went to full-time students for their four years, we'd end up supporting 37.5 students through their degree programs over the course of ten years here at this institution. So I don't think, in terms of the numbers, we're talking about something that is going to have a swing in the character of classes.

- C. Council of Chairs (Functioning and Need for Minutes).

Toosi: The Council of Chairs has changed its function over the years, from when it started in the late '80s as a coffee gathering.... In the early '90s it started to be more formal, and in recent years—starting from the time we changed from six colleges to four colleges—the official decisions [of the Council of Chairs] was valued more than [when the group gathered informally in the '80s], including decisions about changing six colleges to four colleges—they had an opinion; they voted—and including the Honors College; they voted on it. In my opinion, anybody on campus, at a public university, who is voting on anything, needs to publish it because you're making a decision about public funds..., and everybody else on campus needs to be aware of it. If the Council has changed their function, they need to understand that—if they are going to continue as they are--...campus committees are entitled to receive any information [concerning decisions made by the Council of Chairs]. If they would like to have once a month, once every other month, or once a year an official meeting—if they are making decisions about any activities on campus—we should have their Minutes.

Carwell: The Council of Chairs doesn't have Minutes? Toosi: No. Carwell: Do they have bylaws? Toosi: No. Carwell: Didn't they ask us to put somebody on the presidential-search committee? Clay Mendez: That's right, and we did. Carwell: I thought they operated like everybody else. Toosi: In the past [when the Council of Chairs met] it was honestly a coffee-break; they would get together to solve their own problems.... Over the years, as the administration has changed, the Council of Chairs [has come to be perceived] as the foremost body on this campus. ...One issue that they didn't vote on formally but made a decision about...was the issue of going on

strike [about three years ago]. The issue was taken to the Council of Chairs, and that's a very important issue, and extremely important issue. If it were an informal body, such an issue shouldn't have been taken to it. ...Once you form a committee on campus, it becomes part of a public community, public acts, public meetings. Zahlan: I think they do have Minutes now, but they only circulate them among themselves... Toosi: The Minutes of the Council of Deans [meetings] are published; but the Minutes of the Council of Chairs [meetings] are not published, are not available to anybody. [Zahlan suggested that the Senate postpone further discussion of the issue of the Council of Chairs Minutes until after 29 January, when Dr. Andrew will have discussed the issue with the Council of Chairs.] ...Fraker: If they were to say, "Yes, we'll post our Minutes," would that suffice? Is that all we're asking? Toosi: Yes. Clay Mendez: I think it would also be appropriate to request that they convene sometime in the near future and develop a set of bylaws. I think I'd like to have certain standards or bylaws to proceed by, since it is a quasi-official body. Toosi: I would echo that...

VII. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

Future Agenda Items:

Evaluation of Electronic Writing Portfolios; Administrative Search Procedures; Computer-Privacy Policy; Shared Governance Concerns; Evaluation of Chairs; Temperature Control in Classrooms and Offices; Facilities-Naming Procedures; Faculty Representation on Board of Trustees; Increased Workload and Overload; Distance Education; Timing of Commencement; Planning for University Events.

NOTICE: The Faculty Senate requests expressed opinions from faculty members about the Electronic Writing Portfolio and the evaluative rubric to be employed when evaluating students' writing.

NOTICE: The Faculty Senate requests input from faculty about the following motion: The Faculty Senate recommends to the Provost that a student—appointed by the Student Vice President of Academic Affairs or the Chairperson of the Graduate Student Advisory Committee, in consultation with the department chair—be included as a voting member on departmental grade-appeals committees.

Respectfully submitted,
David Carpenter