

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR September 3, 2002 (Vol. XXXI, No. 2)**

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 2540 Buzzard, and at 2107 Buzzard Hall.

### **I. Call to order by Anne Zahlanl at 2:10 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: R. Deedrick, D. Fernandez, B. Lord, B. May, S. Miller, D. Raybin, A. Sartore.

### **II. Approval of the minutes of August 27, 2002**

**Motion (Canivez/Toosi) to approve the Minutes of August 27, 2002.** Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Canivez, Carpenter, Carwell, Dilworth, Fraker, Monippallil, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Zahlan. Abstain: Lawrence. **Passed.**

Hearing no objection, Chair Zahlan suspended published order of business to permit the Senate's discussion with Bud May about funding of faculty research/creative activity.

### **III. New Business**

- A. May: Probably the main thing that the Office of Grants and Research does is work with external grants. This past year we had a little bit over 7.8 million dollars in external-grant funding. It was about a hundred grants funded from various agencies. We've probably had between thirteen and fifteen million dollars in applications, which is pretty much par for the course at this stage of the game. Around one hundred and fifty applications went in. So, in terms of the overall external package (and I'm not talking about student aid right now; I'm just talking about predominantly dollars that faculty go after to support research and creative activity), we have a revolving volume of close to twenty-five million dollars each year that's either in process or has been funded. Probably at a given time, in terms of grants being funded, we have maybe ten, eleven million dollars of funded grants, and maybe a hundred twenty-five to a hundred-fifty grants, depending upon the time period. How does this break down? In the last year, 2002, we saw the College of Education and Professional Studies with just about a quarter of that; similarly, the College of Business and Applied Sciences had about a quarter; the College of Science numerically had a quarter, too; and then the rest was split between the College of Arts and Humanities and others. In terms of actual dollars, the College of Education and Professional Studies was a little over 2.5 million; the College of Business and Applied Sciences was about 2.33; the College of Science was about 1.1; and the other sources combined came to about 1.8. In any event, as many of you know, there's been quite a bit of activity on campus; certainly we've seen increases in recent years in this area. We're encouraged by those increases. We benchmarked a few years ago..., and I think we're in a decent position in terms of the peer schools that we benchmarked with. That's not saying we're where we'd like to be; there's a distinct difference between those two things. While I think we're being competitive with other schools, we'd like to be a lot higher. In order to get a lot higher, there are things we can do, which we've gone into in our strategic plan. Obviously, financial resources is one of the most important things. The way those financial resources break down into the individual departments, in terms of release time and other factors important to you as a particular researcher, a particular grant-getter, I think very critical. We have a problem here at Eastern: it is very difficult to get release time to do research. To get the kind of grant money that we're talking about here, without having release time, or building release time into the document, is very hard to do. While the union contract allows for overloads, unfortunately it only allows for overloads with those agencies that will accept the overloads; so what I'm saying is federal agencies may be more difficult to get one-hundred-twenty-five percent, or something like that. So it's a good thing for faculty that we can draw those overloads; but in terms of grants, there are some grants that that is a lot harder to work with than other grants. Canivez: In institutions that are much better endowed than Eastern, in terms of financial resources, one of the things that has paid large dividends, in terms of grant-getting, is sending individuals, who have [grant] proposals, to Washington, D.C., to actually meet with program officers, and to present to them directly what their research is going to be about. That definitely helps; but, again, it takes money to make money, and as we get better at bringing in grants, then that will mean more money in Grants and Research that can help to do those kinds of things. Benedict: Very seldom

is a professor successful in a first attempt at a large grant. What does your [May's] office do to assist in that learning curve for faculty? May: If you're not experienced, probably the best way to get started is to give us a call; let's get together and let's talk, kind of map out a plan how your first proposal's going to go. Ogbomo: It's important to start early, sometimes even a year before you apply [for a grant]. May: There's no question about that. Zahlan: We're hoping in the next year or two there's more organized faculty development going on on campus, and I have a two-pronged question: First, could you articulate what you [May] would like to see happen, your goals for improving funding of faculty research, and how you would envision cooperating with an initiative for faculty development? May: There are a variety of things in faculty development that literally do go hand-in-hand with what we're talking about here, and one of the things in our strategic plan falls in the area we've just been talking about: release time. What can be worked out with the deans, with the chairs, to get faculty release time. This may not be the most expeditious time to bring this up, where we are with our overall budget, but that doesn't mean it's still not a good strategy, and certainly that's one thing I've been talking with deans and chairs about. Zahlan: If you [May] are ready to talk about internal funding, the Council on Faculty Research and summer-research grants, I think we have a few questions to ask. May: Sure. We have about forty-thousand dollars for the academic year that the Council on Faculty Research pledges. Those dollars are non-personal services, non-salary dollars; they're not faculty-salary dollars. Last year we had about thirty-two applications and fifteen funded. In the summer it changes a little bit. In the summer, the dollars are personal-services dollars; they actually go into your paychecks. These funds have been up and down over the years. A few years ago we got them up to four-thousand dollars. Four-thousand dollars for summer research. Zahlan: This past summer one third of the summer-research grants went to one department, and seventy percent went to one college; two colleges had none. There was some discontent. May: Discontent is the nicest word anyone's used all summer about that. We're aware of the problem; actually, we're talking about one summer, but we're also talking about a pattern. Is there a pattern in the way the Council is constructed, structured, that might give rise to this type of funding pattern? That may be the crux of the issue. The Council is looking at this issue right now. We've had written testimony and heard from several people over the summer. I think the disposition will be to look at it again during this first semester, and hopefully by the second semester we'll have some recommendations on where to go on it. If there's nothing more than the perception that there's a problem, it's something that we're very concerned about right now because there's a huge perception out there that this is a problem. The Council is looking at it very seriously, and I would be very surprised if there weren't some recommendations for some changes. Scher: The important question is not what percentage of the awards went to what college or department, but how does that compare to what percentage of applications came from what department. May: Tenure-track faculty are the ones that are eligible for summer and academic-year CFR funding. You find some interesting data there. For example, the College of Arts and Humanities has a hundred and forty-two tenure-track faculty; the College of Science has a hundred and thirty-six; the College of Business and Applied Sciences has a hundred; and CEPS [College of Education and Professional Studies] only has sixty-four. So here's one college, the College of Education, that's had a disadvantage numerically, in terms of applying for grants, because they don't have as many people to do it, so that's the kind of problem that continues to complicate the issue. Basically, you're correct [Scher] in what you were saying: If we were talking about one department, Biology, the department we're talking about, there are a lot of biology applications, yes, a lot of biology applications. Raybin: I think this year the Council of Biological Research [Council on Faculty Research] had a problem itself, and the problem had to do with orientation. If we're going to have the situation where people are writing for an audience of people who aren't specialists, it helps to have some representation to explain proposals to non-specialists. When the majority of the members of the Council are from one college, there is a much easier understanding of proposals from that college, regardless of jargon, regardless of the difficulty in understanding. From what I hear about last year's Council, there was very limited representation from outside that one college, and perhaps that's one reason for the problem and why we should consider what the representation on the Council should be. May: That's why we're looking at it. We're not only concerned from last year but for this year, as well. As you know, the categories are self-defined categories, and six appointments [of CFR members] are Senate appointments, and three appointments are administrative appointments; but that doesn't mean this is the Senate's fault, doesn't mean it's the administration's fault. If you only get a couple of applications [to serve on CFR], then

you've got a problem in terms of who are you going to put on the Council; this has been the case in previous years. Zahlan: Are the terms three-year terms? May: Three-year terms. Zahlan: One reason it's hard to get people to serve [of CFR] is that they can't apply [for grants while serving on CFR]. Would it help to have two-year terms? May: It might. That might be something we need to discuss. Raybin: The Council this year, for whatever reason, seemed to favor very strongly proposals from the sciences, and particularly from certain parts of the sciences. A question for the Senate and the Council is how do you want to distribute it [limited funding for research]. May: There's no question that the science percentage is higher. Arts and science historically have been higher in the summers, but not last summer.

At this point the Senate returned to its published order of business.

**III. Announcements:** None

**IV. Communications:**

- a. Chair Zahlan received a phone call from Jeff Boshart regarding the condition of "Art West": e.g., no restrooms, no ventilation, no water, no electricity, and numerous other potential health hazards for students and faculty.
- b. Letter of 2 September 2002 from Les Hyder regarding IBHE Faculty-Advisory-Committee meeting of 12 September 2002.

**V. Old Business:**

**A. Committee Reports:**

1. **Executive Committee:** Zahlan: I wrote to Gail Richards and requested an update on the NCAA Report on Eastern Athletics. Also, I sent letter to the trustees [Anderson and Manion], and I suggested they might visit with the Senate on September 22, but any other date would be fine. Carpenter: Last week, I neglected to report that, during the Senate Executive Committee's meeting with Interim President Hencken and Provost Lord on 27 August 2002, I asked Mr. Hencken the cost of retaining Athletic Director Rich McDuffie, who was reportedly a finalist in a search at another university this past summer. Mr. Hencken informed us that he'd increased McDuffie's salary by one-thousand dollars a month, by eleven-thousand dollars a year.

2. **Elections:** Benedict: John Pommier will serve on the Senate this semester in place of Luis Clay Mendez, who is on sabbatical.

3. **Nominations:** Carwell: Bud Fischer has resigned from the Campus Recreation Board, and John Pommier has agreed to serve in Fischer's place. George Bizer has agreed to serve on the Financial Aids and Grants Committee, and Tom Moncada has agreed to serve on the Library Advisory Board.

Motion (Carwell/Wolski) to approve nominations of Pommier to the Recreation Board, Bizer to Financial Aids and Grants Committee, and Moncada to the Library Advisory Board. Yes: Benedict, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Dilworth, Fraker, Lawrence, Monippallil, Pommier, Ogbomo, Scher, Toosi, Wolski, Zahlan. Passed.

4. **Student-Faculty Relations:** No Report

5. **Faculty-Staff Relations:** No Report

6. **Other Reports:** None

B. September 11 Commemoration Programs: Zahlan: Bonnie Irwin and I met last week and talked about the part she has in mind for us [Senators] specifically. She envisions that the Senate would be a core group, and that we would be at the name-reading ceremony between 8:45 a.m. and 9:45 a.m., at the flagpole in the South Quad.

**VI. New Business:**

B. Zahlan: Interim President Hencken and the vice presidents will attend the Senate meeting next week

[10 September 2002].

**VII. Adjourn:** Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

**Future Agenda Items:**

Enrollment and Enrollment Management; Honors Program; Fund-Raising Structure, Plans, Campaigns; Academic Computing and Electronic Infrastructure.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Carpenter