

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR October 8, 2002 (Vol. XXXI, No. 7)**

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, 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. Guests: D. Fernandez, L. Hyder, B. Lord, K. Martin, C. Prendergast, A. Sartore.

### **II. Approval of the Minutes of October 1, 2002**

**Motion (Canivez/Dilworth) to approve the Minutes of October 1, 2002.** Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Canivez, Carpenter, Carwell, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Pommier, Ogbomo, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. Abstain: Scher. **Passed.**

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

### **IV. Communications:**

- A. E-mail message (30 September 2002) from Waldo Born re: Faculty Concerns
- B. E-mail message (1 October 2002) from Keith Wilson re: information technology
- C. Minutes (23 September 2002) CEPS Curriculum Committee
- D. E-mail message (3 October 2002) from Amanda Sartore re: Distinguished Faculty Award Committee
- E. E-mail message (4 October 2002) from Barbara Lawrence re: Discussion of Faculty Concerns
- F. E-mail message (4 October 2002) from Mahmood Butt re: proposed Honors College
- G. E-mail message (5 October 2002) from Bailey Young re: proposed Honors College
- H. E-mail message (7 October 2002) from David Radavich re: proposed Honors College
- I. E-mail message (7 October 2002) from Kipp Kruse re: proposed Honors College
- J. E-mail message (7 October 2002) from Scott Crawford re: proposed Honors College
- K. E-mail message (8 October 2002) from Dave Smith re: proposed Honors College
- L. Minutes of 11 September 2002 meeting of President's Council
- M. Minutes of 18 September 2002 meeting of President's Council
- N. Minutes of 25 September 2002 meeting of President's Council
- O. E-mail message (8 October 2002) from Jonelle Depetro re: proposed Honors College
- P. E-mail message (8 October 2002) from John Allison re: proposed Honors College

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

- A. Committee Reports
  1. **Executive Committee:** Zahlan sent a letter to Interim President Hencken re: an appointment to the Distinguished Faculty Award Committee; a letter to Robert Manion, of the BOT, re: a possible meeting with the Faculty Senate; and a letter to Steve Rich re: an alumni representative on the Distinguished Faculty Award Committee.
  2. **Nominations Committee:** A vacancy still exists on the Library Advisory Board for someone representing College of Education and Professional Studies.
  3. **Elections Committee:** No report.
  4. **Student-Faculty Relations Committee:** Committee is considering—and will meet to deliberate upon—Eastern's policy re: sexual harassment.
  5. **Faculty-Staff Relations Committee:** No report.
  6. **Other Reports:** None.
- B. Faculty Concerns: Zahlan requested that Senators identify those faculty concerns, submitted by constituents, which they would like to have placed on the Senate's agenda for future discussion and possible action. The following are those expressed concerns: Computer infrastructure and support (Toosi, Benedict); computer privacy issues (Toosi, Scher); the general erosion of the faculty role in shared

governance (Toosi, Scher, Lawrence); the evaluation of chairs (Toosi, Wolski); securing faculty representation on the BOT (Scher); increased workload and overload (Lawrence, Scher); temperature control in classrooms and offices (Scher); distance learning and where it's housed (Wolski); WEIU-FM programming (Carwell); timing of commencement (Scher); evaluation of writing portfolios (Lawrence); efficient and prudent use of available resources (Pommier).

C. The Senate decided its faculty forum will take place in Spring, 2003.

D. Senate Minutes: There was general agreement expressed about indicating to constituents that the Minutes are not verbatim transcripts of *all* that is said at given Senate meetings.

Hearing no objection, Chair Zahlan suspended the published order of business so the Senate could move to New Business and receive a report from Les Hyder, Eastern's representative on the IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee.

## **VI. New Business:**

A. IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee Report.

Hyder: [The IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee] is an exceptionally important body, one that has the opportunity to influence public policy in the state and that the IBHE does listen to and respond to. [At this point Dr. Hyder handed out a four-page document, "Notes for Presentation to Faculty Senate/ Tuesday, October 8, 2002/ IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee," available on the Web at <http://www.eiu.edu/~FacSen>.] As you look at this, you can see there's a wide variety of topics and issues that the Faculty Advisory Council is concerned with; and, of course, given the scope of higher education in this state, that shouldn't come as any surprise to you. In fact, in pulling this together it's quite probable that there are issues that will be on the table that I've overlooked...; so if that's the case, I apologize. A general observation I will share with you, about how Eastern is perceived: When I first joined the Faculty Advisory Council three years ago, we [at Eastern] were going through a time of some transition and turmoil, and I don't think Eastern was held in the esteem to which it should have been held by the folks in Springfield—and at the IBHE. I believe now that we are perceived very positively; in fact, I think we have one of the best reputations and best perceptions, among both the IBHE board, the IBHE staff—especially the IBHE staff—and among legislators, of any four-year institution in the state. They truly feel that we are as productive and successful, with the resources we have available to us, as any institution in the state is, and that's a pretty good position to be in. It would be better if the state had more resources to reward our efforts, but that's not the case right now. As we look at all of this [on "Notes for Presentation..."], it goes without saying that budgetary and fiscal issues...play a role in everything we look at, so I didn't put that in here [as a category] because that seemed to be self evident.

I noticed in the Minutes of your first meeting that one of the things you expressed an interest in having made known to the Board [IBHE] is your concern about funding of private institutions versus public institutions. I will tell you there are some sacred cows in higher education in that state that we're not going to change any time soon—at least not the Faculty Advisory Council or the Board of Higher Education. That's something that the legislators themselves feel pretty strong about. We can try to make the case to them that they should revisit that issue; but the fact is a lot of students in this state are being educated in non-public institutions, and in community colleges. Just about every legislator has a community college in [his/her] district, and a threat to one community college is perceived as a threat to all of them, and they'll unite to support that group of colleges, whereas there aren't as many four-year institutions and we don't have that degree of clout. That's a political reality; we don't have to like it, but I don't think we've got much choice but to accept it. Benedict: [re: IMAP grants and public funds allocated to private versus public institutions] Could you recapture for me the conversation and rationale [for giving public funds to students enrolled in private institutions]. Hyder: The rationale, as I understand it, is the state has an obligation to educate our students; and if they choose to go to a private university, we [the state] have an obligation to make some contribution toward providing that education. Other arguments are that private institutions do assure some diversity of educational experiences. The money pretty much goes to the students, as opposed to the institutions. The alumni of those private institutions can be quite active and quite vocal and therefore quite influential. If you look at a map of higher-education institutions, you notice there are a lot of red dots around the Chicago area, not so many south. Carpenter: Private institutions receive public funds, but they aren't held to the same requirements by the state as public institutions. In the

past, for instance, they weren't required to submit annual reports on underrepresented groups—how many they hire, how many they recruit. Are they still not required to submit such reports? Hyder: That was an issue of continuing concern of the Faculty Advisory Council. You should understand that the Faculty Advisory Council has thirty-six members: one third of them are from public, four-year institutions; one third are from community colleges; one third are from private institutions. So there is not enough of us ever to command a majority vote, without being willing to make some compromise. We're continuing to try to address those issues; but we have to have a level playing field, and we don't have a level playing field. Those of us in the public sector are certainly held to accountability standards that private institutions aren't.

Monippallil: Another reason why the legislature supports private institutions is that, in the view of the legislature, the private institutions are cost-savings to the state. Let's assume that all the students in private institutions suddenly migrate to the public institutions. That cost would truly overwhelm the system. So they [legislators] view that as a true savings to the state, and they will continue to support private institutions. In their minds, money is not given directly to the private institutions; it is given to the students, and especially needy students. Scher: I would like the record to reflect that, in the [IBHE] Faculty Advisory Committee "Notes . . .," item number ten includes a motion passed by the FAC, urging "all institutions of higher education . . . to adopt an explicit policy concerning monitoring the content of electronic communication," which we discussed earlier; and item number twelve [in "Notes . . ."] concerns shared governance. So, I'd like to point those two things out to the senators and the community. Zahlan: Going back to the IMAP grants, is there any hope that public universities will ever realize equity with private universities? Hyder: The reality is that private institutions just have degrees of flexibility that we will never have; so we may get closer to equity, but I doubt that we'll ever see true equity.

Zahlan: Did you [FAC] discuss the cut in funding to CMS for the health benefits for public-university employees? Hyder: Yes. When U said we have ongoing and under-riding concerns about fiscal matters, that is certainly one of them. There has been some discussion about whether we should raise the issue of continued participation in CMS. The CMS benefits are pretty much negotiated by representatives of other bargaining units, and we piggy-back on that without having any input into the positions. So the things that are of concern to them are not necessarily the concerns that we have. However, if we could get IBHE to opt out of that, would we be in a position to get anything better? So, it's been discussed; but, as you well know, a lot of these issues are very complex, and there are so many factors and issues, that sometimes you end up with some unintended consequences, and we wouldn't want to find the benefits diminished more than they have been. Monippallil: The difficulty is that the faculty has virtually no representation on CMS; and maybe the time has come for us to say that, if CMS is determining what our benefits are going to be, we need representation in that decision-making. Hyder: I'll certainly represent that position. One thing that you may have not noticed, we [FAC] are now debating whether we want to put forth a proposal to ask for a faculty member to be appointed as a voting member of the Board of Higher Education. We think it's appropriate students have that voice, but we think that faculty need to have a voice also. So I expect, before the year is out, that will be a position the Council [FAC] will take. Scher: On page three [of "Notes . . ."], there's an addition [proposed] of a seventh goal to the Illinois Commitment . . . I'm happy to see this is on your agenda for the upcoming year. Zahlan [to Hyder]: Do you think that the IBHE is a positive influence on higher education? Hyder: I think that the Board is a pretty good barrier between us and the legislature. The legislature has the potential for not understanding what it is we are here to do, and that lack of understanding could cause them to make some decisions that wouldn't be in the interest of the state of Illinois.

**VII. Adjourn:** Meeting adjourned at 3: 48 p.m.

**Future Agenda Items:**

Enrollment and Enrollment Management; Honors College Proposal; Lessons of Presidential Search; Administrative Search Procedures; Faculty Concerns.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Carpenter

**REMINDER: Volunteer needed, from College of Education and Professional Studies, to serve on Library Advisory Board. Contact Gary Canivez or any other Faculty Senator.**

**The Faculty Senate invites comments about the Honors College proposal.**