

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR November 12, 2002 (Vol. XXXI, No. 13)

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, G. Canivez, D. Carpenter, D. Carwell, J. Dilworth, F. Fraker, B. Lawrence, M. Monippallil, J. Pommier, W. Ogbomo, S. Scher, M. Toosi, J. Wolski, A. Zahlan. Excused: D. Brandt. Guests: B. Lord, L. McElwee, M. Myers, C. Prendergast.

II. Approval of the Minutes of November 5, 2002.

Motion (Benedict/Scher) to approve Minutes of November 5, 2002. Yes: Benedict, Carpenter, Carwell, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Zahlan. Abstain: Toosi. **Passed.**

III. Announcements: Zahlan: Student Senator A. Sartore has had to take a leave for the remainder of the semester. Scher: Urges faculty to give donations to State and Universities Employees' Combined Appeal. Benedict: All of the Student Senate's business has been suspended for this week in remembrance of Student Senator Brian Ford.

IV. Communications:

A. Email Message (5 November) from Gail Richard re: Athletics
B. Email Message (5 November) from Anita Shelton re: Student Participation in Faculty Searches
C. Email Message (5 November) from Bailey Young re: Student Participation in Faculty Searches
D. Email Message (6 November) from Les Hyder re: IBHE Web Opinion Survey on Affordability
E. Email Message (8 November) from Alan Grant re: Senate Minutes
F. Email Message (11 November) from Doug Brandt re: Enrollment Management Resolution
G. Other communications: Zahlan [to Lord re: notice about TEDE being changed to TEAM]: Does the change of names suggest any changes in organization or structure, or is it merely a name-change? Lord: The TEDE referred specifically, this last year, to the grant program, not to the CATS organization. ...[Hoadley is] looking at a chance to use those same funds in effective ways.... Zahlan: My concern is...that we were informed that this was something that was being negotiated.... We were asked not to talk about it, so I'm especially sensitive to seeing a change in structure that was simply de facto.... If there is any change in the organizational structure [of TEDE/TEAM], I hope the Senate will be involved in the discussion.

V. Old Business:

A. Committee Reports:
1. Executive Committee: Zahlan: There will be a CUPB meeting this Friday, 15 November 2002, and the Senate's Executive Committee is scheduled to meet with Interim President Hencken and Provost Lord Monday, 18 November 2002.
2. Nominations Committee: No report.
3. Elections Committee: No report.
4. Student-Faculty Relations Committee: No report.
5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report.
6. Other Reports: Dilworth noted the Distinguished Faculty Awards Selection Committee will meet for the first time today, 12 November 2002.

B. Recruitment, Enrollment and Enrollment-Management Policies and Practice
Senate returned to previous motion (Scher/Canivez) of 29 October 2002.
Monippallil: Before we discuss the admissions and enrollment, there are a number of special questions on which we have reached consensus. The first step we have to take is to determine what is the optimum number of students this university can serve, and serve well, within the financial constraints under which we are operating. It's probably going to be between 8,000 and 12,000, and that's fairly widespread. Let's assume we take the middle

number, 10,000... The next question is what will be the composition of those 10,000 students? How many graduate students are we proposing that we can reasonably serve and educate well? How many students from the BOT Program? How many undergraduate students, and in which colleges? Once we reach the decision about how the student body is going to be composed, there are going to be winners and losers, because some colleges will not be able to maintain the present level of enrollment; other colleges may be able to increase their level of enrollment. We have to reach consensus regarding these matters; then—once we have said this is the limit under which we operate; this is the optimum number ..of students, given the resources—the next question is : What's the quality and caliber of the students we're admitting? ..How selective do we want to be? If we say we're going to be highly selective, that is going to have certain consequences. ..If we raise the bar of admissions, the likelihood is that there will be fewer students who qualify. That is going to have consequences in terms of how we are going to be recruiting students, and how we are going to be admitting students.

Lord: Both President Hencken and I have been invited to a meeting with the Enrollment Management Committee next week, and my intent is to share [with the committee] what I thought was the sense of the Faculty Senate two weeks ago, as well as my own sense that we have an opportunity right now to revisit how we consider admissions. Regional, comprehensive institutions, in large measure because of the nature of their missions, often react to what is coming at them. That's certainly been our history. So when enrollment is going up, and we have a finite capacity, we have an opportunity to use that to our advantage... Scher: As Matthew [Monippallil] pointed out, I do think we need to decide on what our ideal enrollment is; but I don't think we need to wait for that answer to start addressing what we want the shape of that enrollment to be. That's going to be a long process. ..I think that discussion needs to start. Canivez: Coming up with the total number that is sustainable by the institution is the easier question to answer; but you start dropping down to the college and department level, that's a much more difficult thing... What we want to offer and what we want to be [are] more difficult questions and will take a lot longer to figure out—and [it will be] much more contentious, as any decisions like that relate to resources and so on. So, I agree with Steve [Scher] that the process needs to begin...

Monippallil: ..It may be, at this particular point, worthwhile to ask [the Enrollment-Management Committee] to look into the composition and the size, and certainly look into the quality of the student body that we would like to have. So, I agree we don't need to wait to decide upon an ideal number before we approach [the issue of the quality/profile of the student body]... Toosi: ..As far as profiling students and shaping new profiles for students, I can't understand. Have we already identified the problem? Does the problem exist in the profile of our present students? Scher: Right now, the way we admit students [is] those who meet the minimal requirements and get their applications in early [are admitted]; and at some point, once we think we've gotten enough applications in, and that point varies from year to year, we close off applications. So those who happen to get them [their applications] in ahead of that point in time are eligible for admissions—in fact, are all admitted if they have met the minimum criteria. Those who, for whatever reason, got delayed in sending in their applications, before whatever unannounced time that cut-off dates is, don't. ..What I would like to see happen is that we think more seriously and more purposively about what kinds of things we want to take into consideration [for admission], how we would do that. Do we want to count socio-economics as a factor? Do we want to count family-education history? Do we want to count types of courses taken? Do we want to count whatever? We need to decide on [such possible areas of consideration]...

Dilworth: We keep talking about how many we're admitting, and how we're profiling and who comes in and where they go. You keep hearing this. What happens [to students] we deem are not doing very well, we put them on probation, and then we go ahead and kick them out, and another semester we welcome them back? Is that part of it, or are we just talking about new students coming in? Scher: A Retention Taskforce [on campus] is addressing student retention—in all of its manifestations. ..One part of this process is to think about outcomes we want for and from our students, which includes academic success, includes contributions to the community and state, might include contributions to the university at some future date (while they're here and subsequently)... Fraker: We have to be careful not to lock ourselves into any admission process because the pool of students out there is going to rise and fall... So whatever system we create we have to recognize it's got to be flexible... A goal also has to be not just setting the [enrollment] number; but the ultimate goal is to stabilize. So the process has got to, given the times, [allow us to determine] how we stabilize the numbers coming in... Canivez: One of the things that might help with stability of enrollment might have to do with when a university determines where it wants to be, what the focus is, and that sort of thing—maybe selecting students in the state who recognize an institution for what it's offering and what the outcomes are. Maybe that would help to stabilize enrollment, too. So [students] who are choosing Eastern, or applying to Eastern, are applying because of what specifically we're offering, not just because it's in a particular geographical location... Scher: ..Given that the provost has said that he and the president are in

favor of beginning this process, and are going to the Enrollment Management meeting next week to say so, and given that the provost clearly knows the sentiment of the Senate on that, I'd like to suggest we withdraw this motion and move on...

Ogbomo: Is there going to be a balance between having higher quality in the students and making sure there's access for not only racial, ethnic minorities, but also in terms of gender equity? ..To what extent can we provide a guarantee that this is not going to be used as a code to exclude those who ordinarily would not have access to a college education? ..As a minority faculty, I would emphasize that, whatever direction we want to take .., we [remain] cognizant of the underlying problem, so we don't turn around, after a few years, and realize that—because we raised the standards—certain groups of students have been left behind. Fraker [re: the Scher/Canivez resolution of 29 October 2002]: I'm not sure that this is such a contentious issue that we need a resolution. At some point, you trust in the process that we've got. Ogbomo: I think making the resolution is not going to hurt the Faculty Senate. It will state clearly how we feel about the issues and what we expect from the administration. ..The Faculty Senate should be able to make a statement [about] how it stands on enrollment-management issues. Dilworth: I'll vote against the resolution. I don't like the word "empower" [in proposed, alternative language], and I'm really uptight about [the notion that] a student body should be shaped. We don't have a carving knife, and it sounds like that is not where we are; we're not to that point. ..I'd appreciate Steve withdrawing it [the proposed resolution].

Toosi: ..It's time to withdraw that [the motion] and move on. ..It's reflected in our Minutes that we've had this discussion. Zahlan: I don't believe that resolutions suggest contentiousness... The Minutes reflect discussions; they don't reflect the collective view of the body. ..We're stronger by going ahead. Scher: I will withdraw my motion.

Motion (Carpenter/Pommier) that the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate call upon the provost and interim president to empower the Enrollment Management Committee, or some other body constituted for the purpose, to study how the nature of the EIU student body should be shaped, and to make recommendations for enrollment policies and practices that would lead to a student body shaped according to the criteria deemed advisable for the university's future development.

Yes: Canivez, Carpenter, Lawrence, Pommier, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Wolski, Zahlan. No: Benedict, Dilworth, Toosi. Abstain: Carwell, Fraker. **Passed.**

C. Computer Privacy Policy: Zahlan distributed "Proposed Policy on Computer Privacy," authored by Dr. John Kilgore. The Senate postponed discussion of this item until its meeting of 19 November 2002.

D. Lessons of Presidential Search

Motion (Lawrence/Carpenter) that the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution:

Whereas faculty are responsible for the setting and enforcing of academic standards and curriculum, and

Whereas faculty know best who among them will represent most accurately their interests and professional values, and

Whereas administrative staff at all levels are responsible to faculty and students to ensure the maintenance of academic standards and curriculum, and

Whereas Eastern's three previous presidential-search committees have been chaired by a faculty member (Faculty Senate Chair), and

Whereas departmental chairs are considered members of the administrative staff, not members of the faculty,

Be it resolved, that the Board of Trustees assures that faculty be represented by three faculty members on the search committee for the upcoming presidential search,

Be it further resolved that the Board of Trustees assures that Faculty Senate have full responsibility for appointing those faculty members to the presidential-search committee, and

Be it further resolved that the Board of Trustees of Eastern Illinois University names a faculty member

as Chair or Co-Chair of the presidential-search committee.

Yes: Benedict, Canivez, Carpenter, Carwell, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Pommier, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. **Passed.**

VI. New Business: None.

VII. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Future Agenda Items:

Administrative Search Procedures; Computer-Privacy Policy; Shared Governance Concerns; Evaluation of Chairs; Temperature Control in Classrooms and Offices; Evaluation of Writing Portfolios; Facilities-Naming Procedures; Textbook-Rental Service; Faculty Representation on Board of Trustees; Increased Workload and Overload; Distance Education; Timing of Commencement; Efficient Use of Available Resources; 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.

Respectfully submitted,
David Carpenter