

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR March 18, 2003 (Vol. XXXI, No. 24)**

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 2:03 p.m.** (Conference Room, Booth Library)

Present: R. Benedict, D. Brandt, G. Canivez, D. Carpenter, D. Carwell, L. Clay Mendez, J. Dilworth, F. Fraker, B. Lawrence, M. Monippallil, W. Ogbomo, S. Scher, J. Wolski, A. Zahlan. Excused: M. Toosi. Guests: P. Age, K. Bryant, J. Chambers, C. Chatterji, B. Donnelly, S. Guccione, M. Hoadley, B. Lord, K. Martin, A. Sartore, J. Tidwell.

### **II. Approval of the Minutes of March 4, 2003.**

Motion (Wolski/Dilworth) to approve Minutes of March 4, 2003, with the following addition: On page [4], between the Scher/Monippallil motion and the Scher/Toosi motion, Brandt withdrew the Brandt/Canivez motion. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Scher, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Carwell, Ogbomo. **Passed.**

### **III. Announcements:** None

### **IV. Communications:**

- A. E-mail message from Interim President Hencken re: his approval of Constitutional Amendment 1, and his non-willingness to approve Amendment 2.
- B. E-mail message (14 March) from Keith Andrew, including Minutes of 26 February Meeting of the Council of Chairs
- C. Memo (3 March) from Student Affairs re: Search Committee for EIU Police Chief

### **V. Old Business:**

#### A. Committee Reports:

1. Executive Committee: Chair Zahlan reported that the Senate Executive Committee met on 17 March 2003 with Provost Lord, the interim president absent because he was in Chicago at an IBHE meeting to discuss budget reserves in FY 03 and FY 04. Discussed with Provost Lord were areas of the university where cuts might need to be made, the desirability of having more consultation between faculty and administration about establishing budgetary priorities on campus, as well as the functioning of CUPB. Brandt reported that, on 6 March 2003, the executive committees of the Faculty, Staff and Student Senates met with the interim president about the university's budget and possible state-imposed reductions, most of the information presented now having been published in newspapers (e.g., a possible 8% call-back of allocated funds, instead of the earlier threat of a 4% call-back).

Lord: Initially, we were asked to do an impact statement [re: a possible] reduction of 8% in FY 04, and [an impact statement re:] a quarter of that level in FY 03.... By the time of the [6 March 2003] meeting, the State Budget Office made it clear it expected that the twelve universities would demonstrate an ability to make [budgetary] reserves, with associated impacts, to the level of 8% for the balance of FY 03. The universities' presidents decided we'd simply say, "We planned for 2%; we know how we can deal with that. We can't do more than that...for FY 03...." By Monday morning of Break Week, an e-mail from the IBHE said, "Sorry; it's going to be 8% [in FY 03], and you have until 2 o'clock to get us some sort of an impact statement." We received the e-mail at 12:30, and had an hour and a half to write an impact statement. ...The point I'd like to make right now is that [the state government] is talking about a reserve; they aren't actually asking for a check in that [8%] amount. The reality is I don't think they can collect a check for that amount right now. The commitments to finish the semester, which goes until May, are legal commitments to people on contract and to students, who in fact have a contract with us for the delivery of

educational services. ...It' s a very difficult situation, with too many unknowns, but we' re trying to manage it as best we can.... Benedict: What are they asking of the two-year institutions? Lord: The same.... It would have the same kinds of impact on community colleges it would have on us if we were asked to give all of that [8%] up....

2. Student-Faculty Relations Committee: No report.
3. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report.
4. Elections Committee: Senator Brandt reported that elections are Tuesday, 25 March, and Wednesday, 26 March, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on both days, in the Martin Luther King Bookstore lobby. **[Please see attached election material--e.g., candidates' statements--at the end of these Minutes.] Faculty desiring absentee ballots should contact Senator Brandt.**
5. Nominations Committee: No report.
6. Other Reports: Senator Scher reported that the Distinguished Faculty Award Committee had selected two recipients for the award this year.

Motion (Brandt/Scher) that the Faculty Senate this year award two Distinguished Faculty Awards if two individuals are recommended. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carwell, Carpenter, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Wolski, Zahlan. **Passed.**

Scher informed the Senate that the Distinguished Faculty Award Committee recommends Dr. Luis Clay Mendez and Dr. William Kirk each receive a Distinguished Faculty Award.

Motion (Scher/Benedict) that the Faculty Senate approve the recommendation of the Distinguished Faculty Award Committee that Dr. Clay Mendez and Dr. Kirk each be awarded a Distinguished Faculty Award. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carwell, Carpenter, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Clay Mendez. **Passed.**

B. WEIU FM-Station Manager Proposal. Motion (Ogbomo/Lawrence) that the Faculty Senate recommends the search for FM-Station Manager be suspended until such time as the financial situation of the university improves. Yes: Benedict, Canivez, Carwell, Carpenter, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Ogbomo, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Brandt, Monippallil. **Passed.**

C. Computer Privacy Policies at EIU (Committee Report and Recommendation). Senator Lawrence presented a written report, the result of the Senate' s charge to the Computer-Privacy Committee to propose a computer-privacy policy for the university, and she reported that the strongly supportive language in the recently ratified EIU/UPI contract has put into place a necessary computer-privacy policy. On behalf of the Computer-Privacy Committee, however, Lawrence suggested that the Faculty Senate continue to monitor the computer-privacy policy now in place.

Motion (Ogbomo/Carwell) that the Faculty Senate accept the report of the Computer-Privacy Committee. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carwell, Carpenter, Clay Mendez, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Canivez. **Passed.**

Hearing no objection, Chair Zahlan suspended published order of business and moved directly to

## VI. A.

### VI. New Business:

A. Technology and Academic Technology Governance: Discussion with Mike Hoadley, Chat Chatterji, and James Tidwell.

Chatterji: Since I was here last, we were having some real severe network problems, and we' ve since addressed most of those--at least on a temporary basis. So we have a somewhat steady network now. ...The other change that I made over the last 3 months was to reconfigure the Help Desk, [locate] it in the Greg Triad and extend its hours to the evening so that we would get better coverage--for administration, academics and students. That' s going well. I would love to make it a 24-7 sort of help desk, but I really

don't have the resources at the moment.... I've made several internal changes; I've had a phase one of a reorganization in ITS to serve the university community better. I moved several pieces over to the Help Desk so there would be a more seamless transfer of help from the person who picks up the phone, on down to the person who fixes the problem.... By the way, we did add 10 more megabytes per second to the Housing network. [A general discussion followed about perceived delays in the set up of new computers and the replacement of defective hard-drives.]

...Hoadley: Several things have happened since I was here in the fall, and I hope you've seen some positive things occurring, in terms of the CATS operation. You'll get your March newsletter this week, and we have moved to MacAffee, in the basement, 1336. ...CATS has been working very closely with the ISS people, and I've been extremely pleased with that progress, in terms of increasing communications with the ISS people. ...Starting in May, we're doing some technology institutes, intensive one- and two-day institutes..., and we'll have some of those in the summer; plus, we'll have the others that are 2-hours-type setups.... The TEAM process changed; we just had (as you know, TEDE changed to TEAM) the first round of applications for the professional-development grants, and we'll be looking at those. I've been meeting with the Council of Deans and talking about what we're calling, "Planning, Implementation, Evaluation Grants," and that's going to be looking at a new process for funding initiatives that relate to not only the individual, but more to departmental, college and university needs, relative to planning and the use of technology. That's still in the discussion stage, but hopefully we'll be seeing some changes very soon with that.

...The Comprehensive Technology Planning Committee is meeting; we've...had four meetings. ...What we're really trying to do is explore what some of the issues are, what some of the concerns are and how we can make it a better situation; so that group will continue to meet and hopefully bring some information back to the campus for review.... Over in CATS we've been working a lot with the technology-enhanced courses. I said the last time that we probably have about twenty projects going on all the time; different faculty members bring in projects; we're always doing something. ...Distance learning is a big topic for CATS; we're trying to help as much as we can, in terms of people preparing their courses properly.... One of the things we have set up over in the new CATS facility is a small area for video-taping and recording, and then converting it to DVD, or CD-ROM, or VHS, or whatever you want....

...In CATS we've been working with the ADA issues about websites; we've actually converted our whole website, so it's ADA-compliant right now. ...Something that's coming up on April 29...is that we're going to have a technology-celebration-and-recognition day. ...We're going to have a whole day of activities here on campus that will [highlight] the types of things the faculty are doing in their classrooms: ...there will be presentations; there will be workshops; there will be a luncheon....

Tidwell: There are two really important functions that have to be taken care of--the Student Technology Fee Distribution, how that money is spent (which a subcommittee of ATAC decides, and that's really the only thing ATAC does.... ATAC really should be abolished and something new put in its place...). The second function, of course, is the TEAM Grant, and that's sort of been [handled] in an ad-hoc way; the first TEDE grants were created by the TEDE Taskforce..., and last year, the second year, was an ad-hoc committee of each group organized, and they did two different rounds, I guess.... Is it sort of an ad-hoc committee this year? Zahlan [to Hoadley]: Who is deciding [who receives] TEAM grants? Hoadley: Good question. We haven't done that yet. I've just gotten the applications. Those came in during Spring Break. Zahlan: But you're going to have to organize some way to evaluate them. Tidwell: ...We need to quit doing this on an ad-hoc basis; and we really do need to create a system that can work, instead of doing it on an ad-hoc basis year after year. The TEAM Grant is very much like [grants awarded by] CFR..., so we need to come to a conclusion. ...Here it is the end of this school year, and it's really too late to elect people....

Dilworth [to Hoadley]: ...You have TEAM grants [to award], but you haven't decided who is going to be on the [application-review] committee? That worries me. ...Hoadley: I look at that I was hired to run CATS, and part of CATS was to put together a structure for reviewing those, in terms of the funds being designated for supporting the faculty and their initiatives on campus. ...Now we're ready to review the applications. I've been struggling with who should be reviewing the applications, and I admit that fully. I wish I could have walked in here and said I've got the committee together, but I don't because I wanted to see the first wave of who we got [applications from]. I will put together a committee, and they will be reviewing them, and then we'll be making the announcements about which one will or will not be funded. Unless I'm wrong, I see that as my function--putting together that group. I sure would take advice; I would

love to hear what you think the structure should or could be for that particular committee, so...I would be very receptive to that. Remember it's in support of the academic mission of the university, so it's not just faculty who are going to serve on that committee. I see there would be staff, administration; if we want to, we could have students, try to include them all the way through this. If you have some ideas about that, please let me know. The applications just came in. Like I said, I wanted to see who was going to apply; I didn't want to eliminate anybody right at the beginning, but now I'm ready to put together a group, and I see that those people would be the ones who would be reviewing all three sets of applications for the coming year, probably on a one-year basis.

Carpenter: I don't understand why you would wait to see the first wave of applications before you determined the committee membership. Hoadley: The composition, I meant. Carpenter: The composition. The first wave of? Hoadley: I meant the composition--so many faculty, so many staff. Carpenter: Didn't you just say you were waiting to see the first wave of applications? Hoadley: I was a little slow in getting that around. Carpenter: So you saw the first wave of applications, even though there's no committee to review those applications, and now you're going to determine who is going to be on the committee to review those applications? Hoadley: Maybe I'm not saying it as well as I should. I took the applications in, but the committee had not been formed yet. I'm ready to form the committee, but the composition of that committee has not been determined. Is that saying the same thing? Carpenter: Yes. Hoadley: Okay, let me say it in another way then. Carpenter: The bottom line is you have applications already. Hoadley: That have been received. They haven't been reviewed, but they have been received. Carpenter: But you did review them to see who'd applied. You just said you did. Hoadley: Well, I received them, as in checking them off. We made sure that they were stamped and that they came in by the deadline....

Monippallil: What is the amount available for TEAM grants? Hoadley: That's a good question. For FY 04? Monippallil: Yes. Hoadley: If it would be similar to what was in the past..., about--let me have a little bit of a fudge factor here--\$150,000. I'm combining what were in the past TEDE, Technology-Enhanced grants and Technology-Delivered grants together. So there were some programmatic ones, and then there were individual ones for classes. Monippallil: How many courses are offered on-line? Hoadley: ...It's around 23 or 25 were offered this spring. There are 37, 38, 39 (I don't remember the exact number) of courses that have been created for distance delivery at Eastern.... Monippallil: Who is actually in charge of EIU's website? Hoadley: External Relations. ...Scher: Do we have any indication about how many students, who are taking those [on-line] courses, are here in Charleston, who are local...? Hoadley: That information would be available. We could get that. ...Lord: Your question is how many [of such courses] are being delivered to our own students? Scher: Yes. Lord: It's relatively few....

Tidwell: I still think we need a permanent structure for [a selection/review committee re: the awarding of] TEAM grants. I mean, that protects you [Hoadley], too, from complaints and so forth. It's like the CFR. I hope the Senate would agree with that. ...We keep talking about it, but we've got to do something about it.... I just don't think this ad-hoc thing year after year is a good thing....Canivez: [When the campus selected Model B a few years ago, one component of that model was an oversight committee that would be an elected one.] Hoadley: ...I told you the last time that I had evaluated what had been done the first three rounds. I found it very informative; you did a great job; the incentives were there to get people involved; and that's exactly what it was trying to do, and it did.... I think, though, the university had to be sensitive to the idea that we've got to talk about how do--when things get done--how do they affect more than just the individual; and I know that's a real simple thing to say, but it's very, very important because a lot of those projects--and I said it before--I think we could have made better use of the funds; I think there could have been more lasting effects, relative to the funds. I also think that when we talk about--and that's not a slam on anybody, so don't take it that way; basically what I'm saying is we have to look at the bigger picture.

One thing I've been talking with the deans about is the notion of block grants. I mean, if I [were] a dean...I'd want to know I could put together a 3-year plan and know I could have support from CATS to help me in fulfilling that 3-year plan. Now part of it's financial also when you talk about \$150,000, if that's the number, that's a lot of money, but it's not a lot of money when you spread it across the campus. That was affecting about...20 faculty each year because they were getting between \$6,000 and \$8,000 a piece for those projects, and there was minimal impact. There was impact, but [it] was minimal. ...If we did have a committee that was evaluating those [grant applications], I'm not sure...if that would be in the best interest of them, in terms of evaluating, because if we set it up again back to that competition I think we've defeated what we were trying to do, which was let's collaborate; let's work together; let's help prioritize; let's do some

long-range planning, so that you know there' s a commitment.... So the TEDE was right, it did the right thing, but I have been struggling with how to really build that idea across campus that we' re all in this together. And even when James [Tidwell] talks about the University Technology Advisory Committee, great idea; I think there' s a lot of merit to that, and in some ways I think Chat and I are doing that right now, in terms of CATS and ITS....

At this point Chair Zahlan requested the Senate turn its attention to unfinished business re: nominating a senator to serve on the Search Committee for the EIU Police Chief.

Motion (Carpenter/Lawrence) to nominate Senator David Carwell to represent the Faculty Senate on the Search Committee for the EIU Police Chief. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Clay Mendez, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Scher, Wolski, Zahlan. **Passed.**

The Senate returned to its discussion with guests Chatterji, Hoadley and Tidwell.

Lawrence [to Hoadley]: I really agree with Jim [Tidwell] that a pool of money that is being given year after year by an ad-hoc committee is inappropriate. We do have shared governance on this campus. I do understand that, as time goes on, the vision of what these grants are may change; but I think faculty needs to be involved in developing that vision. I really think it' s appropriate for there to be a permanent committee, and for the Faculty Senate to be involved in talking about what the make-up of that committee should be. Hoadley: ...The other part in the puzzle is that faculty are going to have a key role in influencing your administration in your colleges about what needs to be a priority, and what' s important to your future, and how are you deciding those kinds of things. Lawrence: But that' s not really what we mean by shared governance. Hoadley: Oh, I understand what shared governance means. What I' m trying to say is there are other avenues for getting your voice heard. I heard what you said. You want to be able to relate your vision and what' s important, and want to have a voice in that.

Clay Mendez: ...I suspect that a good deal of education is being delivered on-line, in addition to [the 23 to 28 courses offered on-line]. Hoadley: Yes. That' s a good point. There' s about 300. ...If we end up doing these TEAM grants as block grants, you [faculty] will have a process in place where you' ll be talking to your administration. That' s the way it works. That is the way it works. Zahlan: Not here.

Hoadley: Yes, it is. I' m going to say it That is the way it works, in terms of faculty are critical, in terms of influencing the curriculum. I mean, we know that, and there are a lot of opportunities out there. Technology is one way to enhance your courses, if that' s the appropriate thing to be doing. You make a lot of those decisions. Sometimes other decisions have to be made too, and you have to be aware of those. So, as faculty members..., you realize some decisions have to be made. Can [you] influence some of those decisions? Sure [you] can. Can [you] help, in terms of directing them a little bit? Sure [you] can. What we' re trying to do is put a system in place that' s going to support you if you want to make some of those changes.

Carpenter: With all due respect, and I don' t know if your background is public institutions or private institutions--Hoadley: Public. Carpenter: But the model you' re describing here is that of a corporate mentality, number one. Number two, we' re not just talking about faculty participation. We' re also talking about taxpayers' dollars, and I want input as a taxpayer.... It sounds to me like what you' re doing is proposing to move funds from faculty development as a priority to your programmatic vision, if I' m not misunderstanding what you said. Hoadley: I think you might be misunderstanding it a little bit. ...There is some of the corporate mentality in the sense that certain things have to happen, but the curriculum is going to be important from the faculty perspective. So your job is to get in there and influence it, as you see it' s appropriate. ...How do we prioritize things? Well, yes, some things also have to be programmatic. If your unit determines--and it' s supported by the university--and says this is the direction we' re going.... Well, part of it is you are going to have to have support, not just the first time you do it but farther down....

Tidwell: I have no problem with anything you said, but I still think all of that can be done with a permanent committee. Hoadley: So tell me what the structure of such a committee should be. Zahlan: We [the Senate] will work on this and report to you.

**VII. Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

**Future Agenda Items:**

Functioning of Council of University Planning and Budget; Shared Governance Structure of Academic Technology; Shared Governance Structure for Honors College; Changes in Student Academic Attainment at

EIU; NCA Re-accreditation Process; Efficient Use of Available Resources; Senate Constitution and By-laws.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Carpenter

PLEASE NOTE: Faculty should send their ideas and suggestions about technological needs to Senator Doug Brandt (cfdeb@eiu.edu).