

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR April 26, 2005 (Vol. XXXIII, No. 28)

The 2004 – 2005 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 the Senate meeting.

### I. Call to order by Chair David Carpenter at 2:00 p.m. (Seminar Room, , Booth Library)

Present: J. Allison, J. Ashley, R. Benedict, A. Brownson, D. Carpenter, L. Comerford, R. Fischer, A. HaileMariam, J. Kilgore, M. Monipallil, W. Ogbomo, J. Pommier, J. Stimac, B. Wilson, and J. Wolski.  
Guests: B. Lord (Provost / VPAA), D. Hoadley (Dean, LCBAS), R. Huwer (Student Government, PHC), and J. Peryam (reporter, *Daily Eastern News*).

### II. Approval of Minutes of 19 April 2005.

Motion (Kilgore / Fischer) to approve the Minutes of 19 April with modification. Yes: Allison, Benedict, Carpenter, Comerford, Fischer, HaileMariam, Kilgore, Monipallil, Ogbomo, Stimac, and Wolski.

### III. Announcements

- A. Senator Allison announced that Facilities Planning and Management Director candidate interview schedules and full vitae are available at <http://www.eiu.edu/~busaff/fpmdir>
- B. Senator Wilson announced that the interview for the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs will be held Wednesday, 27 April.

### IV. Communications

- A. Memorandum of 4 April from Provost Lord, re: Enrollment Management Committee. Senator Brownson volunteered to continue serving on the committee. Senator Allison asked Provost Lord about the application process and what his thoughts on pooling were. Provost Lord replied that until 2002, Eastern Illinois University had an open enrollment policy in which there was not a set application deadline – enrollment was left open until filled. Starting in 2003, enrollment instituted a priority registration date (15 November that year) in which qualified applicants were accepted. After that date applicants were placed into a pool from which the best applicants were drawn. In 2005, the priority registration date is 1 November. Senator Allison asked if it was the Provost's desire to have just pooling. Provost Lord replied that pooling won't happen just yet, but he hopes to become more selective in the future.
- B. CIUS resolution, re: supporting the discontinuation of IMAP funding for students at private institutions.
- C. Meeting notice for the BOT Meeting of 25 April.
- D. Memorandum from Dean Lanham, re: Booth Library's proposed schedule next academic year.

### V. Old Business

- A. Committee Reports
  1. Executive Committee: Senator Stimac informed the Faculty Senate of the Executive Committee meeting held on 18 April. In that meeting, President Hencken stated that Tom Cross has been very instrumental and supportive against the Governor's proposed changes in the state retirement system. Although the Governor hasn't yet introduced the bill, Jim Hacking has indicated that the proposed \$800M savings is only possible if taken over 40 years or so. The Governor's idea to save the money, and spend it now would just place the state deeper in debt. Also discussed was a proposed naming bill in which very small or extremely large donations would still be controlled by individual institutions. All other donations, the majority of all types received by most institutions, would first be sent to Springfield, then the legislature would send the money back to the institution. President Hencken stated all the university presidents are united against this proposed bill. During discussion with the Faculty Senate, Provost Lord stated that such a bill would be very hurtful to fundraising. Both President Hencken and Provost Lord expressed their thanks to the Student Action Teams (SAT) that were present in Springfield. Provost Lord stated that the SATs were extremely articulate when discussing the school and issues with the legislators. In closing, President Hencken stated he is trying to get some of the legislators to visit Eastern Illinois University in the fall, and maybe even have them teach some classes.

2. Nominations Committee: Senator Pommier handed out (**attached below**) the Faculty Senate appointed positions to university boards and councils. Senator Pommier (Wilson) motion to approve the appointments. Yes: Allison, Ashley, Benedict, Brownson, Carpenter, Comerford, Fischer, HaileMariam, Kilgore, Monipallil, Ogbomo, Pommier, Stimac, Wilson, and Wolski. Motion passes.
  3. Elections Committee: no report.
  4. Student-Faculty Relations Committee: no report.
  5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: no report.
  6. Distinguished Faculty Award Committee: In response to a question from Senator Fischer, Senator Pommier informed the Faculty Senate that the committee has not yet addressed the question of keeping folders of nominees ore than one year.
  7. Budget-Transparency Committee: no report.
  8. Drafting Committee: no report.
  9. Other: Senator Allison informed the Senate of interviews for the Facilities, Planning and Management position were being held. Senator Wilson also informed the Senate that interviews for the AVPAA position were being held on Wednesday.
- B. Motion (Allison / Comerford): “With regard to Eastern Illinois University’s search for a men’s basketball coach and for all subsequent university-wide searches, the Faculty Senate recommends following usual and customary procedures, including timely release of candidates’ names before candidates arrival on campus for interviews.” When asked to comment of the proposed motion, Senator Fischer, chair of the search committee, that the short list was seven individuals and the on-campus interview schedule for those being brought to campus wasn’t ready until Monday at 1 PM of the interviewing week. The committee did have a discussion as to how to release the names, and in order to have the maximum publicity, it was decided to hold names until the day of the interviews. That would result in three articles. Senator Ogbomo stated that it sounded as if the Athletic Department was receiving some type of special treatment. Senator Stimac informed the Senate that during the last week’s Executive Committee, President Hencken assured the committee that the method in which the names were released in no way set a precedent. Senator Fischer also added that he was concerned, but a review of the IGP’s found no violation. Senator Comerford stated that with respect to openness, the search was not handled in the best of ways. Senator Wilson stated that feedback she had received indicated that many thought the method was done more for the community. Senator Wilson asked if the interviews could have been delayed. Senator Fischer replied that delaying the interviews would probably have meant losing some, if not all, of the candidates since they had other offers during that time. Senator Allison stated that the motion does not imply anything wrong was done, just that there are concerns over the procedures and that all constituencies should follow similar methods. Senator Ogbomo stated that the motion encourages openness. Senator Kilgore stated that he was “on the fence” with the motion since it was not about the names, but about the method. There should have been some time to check out the candidates. Senator Pommier stated there is a perception on campus that it may have been an unusual search - the campus is still in a state of shock over Coach Samuels release, then a quick search, and the unusual methods involved. Senator Monipallil stated that within the context of the search it is important for the Athletic Department to conduct the search in an open manner. In a corporate culture, the candidate is chosen without an openness. In an academic culture we need an open search. Although this search met the bare bones requirements of the IGP, the arguments for increased publicity are not good arguments. Senator Fischer stated that the search was open and accountable – comments were received after each interview ad taken into account. The guidelines were followed and there were a wide range of members on the committees. Senator HaileMariam stated that the motion appears to attack the new coach and that the motion should not be about the coach, but about the method. Senator Kilgore (Ashley) proposed that “With regard to all university-wide searches, the Faculty Senate recommends following usual and customary procedures, including timely release of candidates’ names before candidates arrival on campus for interviews.” Yes: Ashley, Kilgore, and Wolski. No: Allison, Brownson, Carpenter, Comerford, Monipallil, Ogbomo, Pommier, and Stimac. Abstain: Benedict, Fischer, HaileMariam, and Wilson. Motion is defeated. The question of the original motion was called: “With regard to Eastern Illinois University’s search for a men’s basketball coach and for all subsequent university-wide searches, the Faculty Senate recommends following usual and customary procedures, including timely release of candidates’ names before candidates arrival on campus for interviews.” Yes: Allison, Carpenter, Comerford, Monipallil, Ogbomo, Pommier, and Stimac. No:

- Ashley, Benedict, Brownson, Fischer, Kilgore, and Wolski. Abstain: HaileMariam and Wilson. Motion passes.
- C. Child care at Eastern Illinois University. Senator Pommier handed out a interim report, *Child Care Prospects at EIU: Interim Report to the Faculty Senate, Spring, 2005 (attached below)*. Senator Pommier began the discussion thanking Senator Kilgore for his help in preparing the interim report and added that as of now, there are 105 respondents to the on-line poll. Senator Pommier stated, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, that he would like to submit the report to the administration. Senator Benedict stated that he thought the timing of the release wasn't appropriate. Senator Pommier stated that additional work would be required such as interviews and visitations to child care facilities. Senator Ashley added that the report is just a request to the administration. Senator Fischer agreed that the work needs to be expanded, but that the current report didn't look at all constituencies. The group sampled is too small and biased. Senator Ashley stated that the report did focus on all the constituencies and the report would just be a recommendation to the President asking for additional study. This data set used in this report mirrors data collected during the 1995 study. Senator Comerford stated the was not comfortable with recommendations #3, and #4. Senator Kilgore stated with was impressed with the EPSA, but he realized that recommendation #4 was a touchy issue. Senator Stimac stated he thought Faculty Senate should single out a single RSO for special treatment or funding. Senator Ashley stated that members of the EPSA were promised aid in hopes of recruiting them to campus. Senator Allison stated that if the report were to be submitted it would need much further adjustments and additional study. Senator Fischer stated that he doesn't believe that recommendation #1 would be beneficial. Senator HaileMariam stated that she was part of the committee, but had been under the impressions that the report was to be submitted only to the Faculty Senate, not the President. Senator Pommier (Kilgore) motion that the report be submitted to the President. Yes: Allison, Ashley, Brownson, Carpenter, Comerford, Kilgore, Pommier, Wilson, and Wolski. No: Benedict, Fischer, and Stimac. Abstain: HaileMariam and Monipallil. Motion passes.
- D. Motion by Senator Wolski (Stimac) "With the hope of increasing faculty participation in the election process and in order to allow the greatest number of faculty the chance to vote in elections, the Faculty Senate encourages the vice-chair of Faculty Senate to investigate methods of holding electronic elections." Senator Wolski began discussion stating that only ~41 percent of all eligible faculty had voted in the last election. Part of the problem was that many are now located off campus. Such a motion would allow off campus faculty to participate more easily in the elections. Senator Stimac stated that current by laws require the election to be held in a central location, and since the mainframe computers are centrally located, this should not be a violation of the by laws. Yes: Allison, Ashley, Benedict, Brownson, Carpenter, Comerford, Fischer, HaileMariam, Kilgore, Monipallil, Pommier, Stimac, Wilson, and Wolski. Motion passes.
- E. Motion by Senator Wolski (Stimac) "In order to be elected to any position during a faculty election, the minimum number of votes needed to be elected is ten percent of the votes cast for that position." Discussion began when Senator Wolski stated that this motion would require a by-law change. With so many write-in candidates this past election it might be a good idea to have some type of minimum number to be elected to a position. Senator Ashley stated he was reluctant to support such a motion based on his experiences, e.g., if this motion had been passed before the elections, there would have been a vacancy on Faculty Senate. Senator Comerford stated that if the elections were electronic, then voter turnout might increase, making this motion moot. Senator Fischer stated that we should look at the replacement question, since replacements are being held to higher standards of being chosen than some primaries. Senator Wolski (Stimac) withdrew the motion.

## VI. New Business

- A. Elections of Faculty Senate's Executive Committee for the 2005 – 2006 AY. For Chair, Senator Kilgore nominated Senator Pommier. Senator Monipallil nominated Senator HaileMariam. Pommier: Allison, Carpenter, Comerford, Kilgore, and Pommier. HaileMariam: Ashley, Benedict, Brownson, Fischer, Monipallil, Stimac, Wilson, and Wolski. Abstain: HaileMariam. Senator HaileMariam is elected chair of Faculty Senate for the 2005 – 2006 academic year. For Vice Chair, Senator Ashley nominated Senator Pommier. Senator Pommier declined the nomination. Senator HaileMariam nominated Senator Fischer. Senator Allison nominated Senator Ashley. Fischer: Benedict, Fischer, HaileMariam, Monipallil, and Stimac. Ashley: Allison, Brownson, Carpenter, Comerford, Kilgore, Pommier, Wilson, and Wolski. Abstain: Ashley. Senator Ashley is elected vice chair of Faculty Senate for the 2005 – 2006 academic year. For Recorder, Senator Fischer nominated Senator Stimac.

Stimac: Allison, Ashley, Benedict, Brownson, Carpenter, Comerford, Fischer, HaileMariam, Kilgore, Monipallil, Pommier, Stimac, Wilson, and Wolski. Senator Stimac is elected recorder of Faculty Senate for the 2005 – 2006 academic year.

For the 2005 – 2006 Academic Year: Assege HaileMariam, Chair; Jeff Ashley, Vice Chair; John Stimac, Recorder.

- B. Senator Allison (HaileMariam) motioned that “The Faculty Senate extends deep appreciation to Dr. David Carpenter for his ten years of exceptional service, four as Chairperson, to the Faculty Senate.”  
Yes: Allison, Ashley, Benedict, Brownson, Comerford, Fischer, HaileMariam, Kilgore, Monipallil, Pommier, Stimac, Wilson, and Wolski. Abstain: Carpenter.
- C. Senator Allison (Ashley) asked that Roberts Rules be suspended in order to make a by-law change.  
Yes: Allison, Ashley, Benedict, Brownson, Carpenter, Fischer, HaileMariam, Monipallil, Pommier, Stimac, Wilson, and Wolski. No: Comerford and Kilgore. Motion passes. Senator Ashley (Allison) motioned that “The portion of the by-laws (II. B. 8) that states “provided that nominee received at least seventy-five percent of the fifth seated senator’s vote total” be stricken from the bylaws. Yes: Allison, Ashley, Benedict, Brownson, Carpenter, HaileMariam, Kilgore, Monipallil, Pommier, Stimac, Wilson, and Wolski. No: Comerford and Fischer. Motion passes.

## **VII. Adjournment at 3:50 p.m.**

### **Future Agenda Items:**

Future Agenda Items: Board Trustees' Visit To/With Faculty Senate; Faculty Representation on BOT; Community Service Programs and Opportunities; EIU Foundation; Faculty Participation in Establishing Fundraising Priorities

Respectfully submitted,

John Paul Stimac

## **Faculty Senate Appointed Positions on University Boards and Councils 2005-06**

### **Academic Tech Advisory Committee (ATAC) (2-yr. Term)**

- Brian Poulter

### **Achievement and Contribution Award Committee (1-yr. Term)**

(Faculty Senate submits two names by April 15)

- John Stimac
- Jean Wolski

### **Apportionment Board (2-yr. Term)**

- John Stimac
- Jeff Snell
- Jim Davis

### **Campus Recreation Board (3-yr. Term)**

- Stacy Ruholl

### **Development Communications (1yr. Term)**

One Position Open (Faculty Senate appointment)

### **Distinguished Faculty Award (1-yr. Term)**

Three Positions Open (Faculty Senate appointed in fall)

### **Enrollment Management Advisory Committee (1-yr. Term)**

One Position Open (Faculty Senate appointed in fall)

- Ann Brownson

### **Financial Aid/Grants Committee (3-yr. Term)**

- Rajit Mazumder
- Nancy Marlow
- Keith Wright

\*\* (one serves first year as alternate)

### **Health Services Advisory Board (3-yr. Term)**

- Keith Wilson

### **IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee (4-yr. Term)**

No Positions Open

### **Institutional Review Board on Human Subjects in Research (IRB)**

### **Intercollegiate Athletic Board (3-yr. Term)**

- Sally Turner
- Jim Davis

### **Judicial Board (2-yr. Term)**

- Sally Turner
- Cheryl Warner
- Tim Mason
- Thomas Moncada
- Lynn Wilkerson
- Ann Brownson
- Dawn VanGuten
- Melinda Mueller
- Barbara Poole
- Keith Wright

- Christopher Hanlon
- Debbie Cunningham

**Library Advisory Board (3-yr. Term)**

One Position Open from Arts/Humanities: Chris Mitchell  
 One Position Open from CEPS: Peggy Holmes Layman  
 One Position Open from Biology: Marian Marjanovic  
 One Position Open from Bus/App Sciences: Sam Guccione

**Luis Clay Mendez Distinguished Service Award (1-yr. Term)**

Three Positions Open (Faculty Senate appointed in fall)

**Parking Advisory Committee (2-yr. Term)**

- Dawn VanGunten
- Melinda Mueller
- Nancy Marlow
- Ed Treadwell

\*\* (one as alternate)

**Parking Appeals Committee (1-yr. Term)**

- Russel Gruber
- Thomas Moncada

**Publications Board (3-yr. Term)**

- Terri Johnson

**Radio-Television Center Board (2-yr. Term)**

- Chris Mitchell (first year as alternate)

**Records and Registration Advisory Committee (1-yr. Term)**

- Dawn VanGunten

**Technology Enhancement and Management (TEAM) Grants Council (2-yr. Term)**

One Position Open from College of Education & Professional Studies: John Henry Pommier  
 One Position Open from Lumpkin College of Business & Applied Sciences: Sam Guccione  
 One Position Open from Booth Library: Karen Whisler  
 One Position Open from Council on Academic Affairs: Mark Borzi  
 One Position Open from Council on Graduate Studies: Melanie Burns

**Textbook Rental Advisory Committee (2-yr. Term)**

No Positions Open

**Tuition and Fees Review Committee (1-yr. Term)**

- Karla Kennedy-Hagan

**University Union Advisory Board (3-yr. Term)**

No Positions Open

Child Care Prospects at EIU: Interim Report of the Faculty  
Senate, Spring, 2005

Introduction. The Faculty Senate began to discuss and study the child day care needs of the EIU community in the fall of 2004, and with the appointment of a Child Care Subcommittee, continued discussions through the spring. The issue is a complex one, affecting large numbers of students, faculty, and staff, and the Senate and Subcommittee have had limited time to focus on it. Further study of the whole issue is urgently needed. Nevertheless it seems appropriate and useful to present our findings and recommendations to this point, with the caveat that these are necessarily tentative.

**Section I: Findings**

1. **History.** Energetic discussions of this issue have gone on intermittently at EIU since at least 1980, testifying, in our view, both to the extent of the need and the difficulty of addressing it; clearly, this is an issue that will not go away.

Of particular significance in this regard is the work of the Child Care Center committee that, under the direction of Lynette Drake and Jayne Ozier, completed three years' work in the spring of 1996. That committee's final report, which remains a valuable document for current discussions, envisaged the construction of a Child Care Center with space for 120-150 children, to be constructed south of Campus Pond, that would include such features as multiple classrooms, playgrounds, a meeting room, and even a resource library for parents. Corporate providers would oversee the construction and operation of the center, and care would be available at a very reasonable cost of \$75-\$95 dollars per week per full-time child, with assistance available to staff and students. Bids from prospective providers were already under consideration, and the Committee's hope was that the Center could open by Fall of 1997.

The plan, in short, seemed very well thought out and feasible. Why was it never acted upon? We are far from knowing the full particulars of the episode, but it appears that the key factors were the following:

- Cost: the center would have required an initial outlay of nearly one million dollars and — crucially — a continuing subsidy of roughly that amount each year.
- Risk: though the proposal was founded upon a careful preliminary needs assessment, via a questionnaire distributed to the entire university, there could be no guarantee of sufficient enrollments to sustain a center, so that a very large initial investment would have amounted to risk capital.
- Campus planning: the new building would cut down on space available for other uses.
- Community relations. A center on this scale would necessarily compete with the many existing private child care providers in the Charleston area, almost certainly driving many of them out of business. Dedicated and kind people who had devoted many years to small-scale centers might suffer unfairly as an unintended consequence of EIU's initiative.

Our own thought, as we look to the future, is that while the 1996 report remains a valuable planning document, the 1996 plan would probably be too ambitious in the present context. Though a newly constructed center remains an ideal solution, we should also look for the possibility of finding solutions on a smaller scale that could then grow incrementally. In particular, the possibility of using existing facilities for child care should be thoroughly investigated.

2. **Cost.** In our investigations of other institutions that have onsite day care, a somewhat counterintuitive picture emerges: universities are by no means able to deliver child care at rates near those of the private sector, but typically incur costs nearly double those of private providers. The point is important, because an obstacle to moving ahead with day care is the widespread tendency to assume that the university has natural advantages that should make the problem rather easy, i.e., capable of being solved a low cost. In

fact the university's advantages prove illusory: the physical plant, supposedly available for free, is in fact being used at capacity, or is not suitable; the students who can work for free while earning course credit cannot (it turns out) be counted into adult-child ratios required by state law. Private providers are able to use their own homes as day cares and may be subject to less stringent licensing requirements.

The one existing institutional day care in the county, at Lake Land College, operates at a continuing subsidy in the 50% range, and the center proposed in 1996 would have required similar support. In looking at self-sufficient centers at other universities, we have seen prices that range as high as an incredible \$1795 *per child per month* (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 25, 2005) for infant day care. Onsite daycare at EIU can be much less expensive than that, but it will always be more expensive than in the private sector. Almost certainly, it will require an ongoing subsidy from some combination of grants, student fees, alumni donations, and other sources identified by ingenious administrators.

But the *value* of onsite daycare would in our view make such expenditures completely, eminently worthwhile. Parents would benefit immeasurably from having their children close by, in a center where adult-child ratios were much higher than in private centers (due to the presence of students not "counted" by the state). Students would benefit from enhanced internship and work-study opportunities. The university would benefit from increased employee productivity and improved recruitment and retention of faculty and students.

3. **Needs Assessment.** A campus-wide study of child care needs conducted in Spring 1995 found a very high level of interest in and perceived need for onsite day care, with 48% of responding parents indicating that they had changed day care providers in the last year, 60% indicating that they had missed work or class due to child care complications, and 73% indicating that they would use EIU child care if it were available. These results apparently tracked rather closely with those of a much earlier study, conducted in 1986, cited in the later report.

Our own needs assessment was a more modest venture, more a quick poll than a systematic estimate. We wanted to determine whether there would be *any* likely support for EIU-sponsored daycare. To this end we collected the names of interested EIU parents, including students, faculty, and staff. A collateral benefit of this approach was that we now have a mailing list of some 145 parents who have expressed an interest in on-campus day care and in discussing their child care needs and options. In March, 2005, we e-mailed all members of this group and invited them to complete an online questionnaire relating to their child care needs and present arrangements.

The results of this survey suggest that the current need for childcare on campus is even greater than when previous surveys were conducted. The data are represented by 69 individuals from the 145 parents on the list-serve. The 69 individuals responded within a 1-week timeframe (please note that additional surveys have been completed since then though constraints imposed to the committee (i.e., lack of time, etc.) have negated the inclusion of such additional data). Demographics of the respondents include:

- 79.7% of the respondents are female and 20.3% are male.
- 17.4% are faculty, 43.5% are staff, 37.7% are full-time students, and 1.4% are part-time students.
- 14.5 % live on-campus, 50.7% live off campus – Charleston, and 34.8% live out of Charleston.
- 29.1% have childcare less than one mile from campus; on the other hand, 27.3% have childcare more than 10 mile from campus.

The data demonstrates that:

- 90.9% of faculty & staff who do not require childcare do nevertheless strongly to very strongly support on campus childcare.
- 79.1% of faculty and staff believe that childcare problems strongly to somewhat affected their or their coworkers productivity.
- 94.1% of student who do not require childcare do nevertheless strongly to very strongly support on campus childcare.
- 89.1% of the respondents who have or plan to have children would take advantage of a childcare facility if available at EIU.
- 17.2% are completely satisfied with childcare, 34.5% are almost completely satisfied, 39.7 are somewhat satisfied, and 8.6% are less than satisfied.

- 52.8% found it very difficult to difficult in finding current childcare, 32.7% found it not difficult, and 14.5% found it easy to very easy to find current childcare.
- 85% feel that it is very to extremely important that EIU offer campus childcare to use by children of faculty, staff and students, 15% feel it is fairly important, 0% feel that it is not important.
- 89.8% feel that they would be very to somewhat likely more attentive to work/school demands if they had more satisfactory childcare arrangements.
- 93.2% feel that they would be very to somewhat likely to have lower stress levels if they had more satisfactory childcare arrangements.
- 77.9% feel that they would be very to somewhat likely able to take off less time from work/school because of problems with children if they had more satisfactory childcare arrangements.
- 71.1% feel that they would be very to somewhat likely be late for work/school less often because of problems with childcare if they had more satisfactory childcare arrangements.
- 71.2 % feel that they would be very to somewhat likely more likely to remain in their job/school at EIU if they had more satisfactory childcare arrangements.

4. **Child Care Resource and Referral; Lab School.** At our meeting of January 18, we were joined by invited guests Tami Duzan, of the Child Care Resource and Referral Project at EIU; and Dr. Mikki Meadows, Director of Eastern’s Lab School, both of whom spoke very informatively on how their particular work affects the child care equation at EIU.

CCR & R, funded by external grant monies, is a referral agency that helps parents in a six-county area locate day care providers. The terms of the grant forbid evaluating or recommending one provider over another, so this is strictly a listing agency. In the first half of this fiscal year, 10 EIU staff members and 35 students have made use of the service. We were, in general, impressed by the way this kind of information sharing presents a creative complement to the bricks-and-mortar approach to the child care issue—another important piece of the puzzle. Clearly, those who have launched the Project deserve the community’s gratitude for the service provided. However, looking at the work of CCR & R from the point of view of the needs of the EIU community, we noted that the inability to offer qualitative advice is a serious limitation; for quality is of course the chief concern of parents. Perhaps for this reason, the level of use of the center by the EIU community—just 45 inquiries in six months—appears to be low.

The work of Eastern’s Lab School is, strictly speaking, tangential to our concern with child day care. As Director of the Lab School, Dr. Meadows stressed repeatedly and eloquently that the Lab School is and must be a classroom dedicated to the education of EIU students, and not a child care facility serving the needs of EIU parents. The service it provides to parents and children is that of educational enrichment, not of child care or babysitting; its chief purpose in any case is to further the education of enrolled EIU students who are there to supervise and observe the children in the course of completing course work. For this reason the Lab School operates limited hours (two hour sessions in the morning and afternoon) that keep it from functioning effectively as a day care facility, and there seems to be no special concern with keeping the sessions enrolled to capacity. Extended sessions have been offered to parents at least once in the past on a trial basis, but there appeared to be insufficient interest to support such a program.

The premise that the Lab School exists to benefit students first and children and their parents secondarily, and to provide educational enrichment rather than day care *per se*, seems to us quite appropriate and right as far as it goes. Such clear focus on classroom goals is the heart of excellent teaching. Nevertheless, we hope that discussion of the role of the Lab School will not end here. It is valid as well to look at the facility from the point of view of the larger community and its needs, asking whether its full potential has been realized. Far and away the most child-friendly environment on campus, the Lab school may be, from this community point of view, somewhat underused, and we recommend a more systematic study of possibilities for expanded usage. The invitation to parents to enroll children for extended sessions should be repeated, and it seems to us that it would be very worthwhile to begin a dialogue with parents of Lab school children as to their suggestions for the facility and the program.

5. **Eastern Student Parents Association.** At our April 5 meeting, we were joined by invited representatives of a new campus organization, The Eastern Student Parents Association. The President, Teresa Lindsay; secretary, Aliyah Levi; and treasurer, Kelika “Kelly” Slaughter all spoke very informatively of the

challenges they and members of their organization have faced as students with young children. All concurred that the difficulties they have experienced have been greater than they expected and — a matter of particular concern — greater than they had been led to believe at the time they made the decision to come to EIU. Apparently there is a vague but fairly widespread misconception that onsite day care is in fact available at Eastern. The confusion, arising from the existence of the Lab School and the proximity to campus of two large child care centers, is quite understandable, but needs to be scrupulously debunked in recruitment of both students and faculty.

The narrative evidence of the ESPA representatives generally confirmed the data in our informal survey. Student parents report experiencing great difficulty in finding day care that is close to campus, begins when the school year does, remains open whenever class is in session, and is generally dependable and of high quality. All three visitors reported very significant difficulty in meeting academic obligations within the framework of family needs, to the point of having seriously questioned the feasibility of continuing as Eastern students. Students have sometimes found themselves forced to miss class or to bring children to class; the lack of adequate public transportation in Charleston can make it very hard to get the family shopping done. Our visitors felt that such concerns may seriously impact EIU's ability to attract minority students.

What was particularly interesting and impressive in our visitors' presentation was their account of how they have responded to these difficulties. Their RSO has provided advice and moral support for student parents, and a network within which parents can exchange baby-sitting with trusted fellow student parents. Though ESPA would welcome subsidized onsite day care as an ideal solution, their own informal, low-profile efforts have already effected dramatic improvements in the lives of at least some student parents. Teresa Lindsay in particular declared that she would have left Eastern if not for having found babysitting through ESPA.

## Section II: Recommendations

These are given in very rough order of priority, starting with the most important and firmly recommended. Once again, however, we would stress the tentative nature of our findings and advice: all recommendations should be considered subject to revision or retraction in light of further study.

1. **Re-commission the ad hoc committee on child care.** EIU should immediately establish a Child Care committee to continue work on this issue. The committee should have regular weekly meetings and full institutional support, in the form of release time or reduction of other duties for at least the chair and the vice chair. The committee's charge would be to create within the year explicit, detailed plans for facilities or programs or both that would significantly improve the quality and availability of day care for Eastern faculty, staff, and students.
2. **Investigate the possibility of partnerships with local day care centers and in-home providers.** The subject of such partnerships has arisen repeatedly in our discussions and in those of the committees before us, but seems never to have been extensively pursued. In the past the effort to construct our own center foundered on the issue of cost. An alternative approach might be to provide direct subsidies to local providers that care for the children of EIU parents, taking advantage of what seems to be the inherently greater efficiency of the private sector. Subsidies could be given both on a per-child basis and in the form of grants for equipment (e.g., swingsets) and improvement of facilities. In return Eastern could ask for the right to monitor and evaluate all participating providers, in a non-intrusive way, by giving questionnaires to participating EIU parents. Such questionnaires could be used to give parents the kind of qualitative advice that CCR&R currently withholds, and to provide useful feedback and recommendations to the providers themselves. In the process some of EIU's academic expertise in child care would find direct application in the community.

Such a program could be started rather quickly and on a small scale, then expanded over time. Properly administered, it could improve campus-community relations and provide many of the same opportunities for internship, laboratory, and work-study experiences as an onsite center.

Though an on-campus center remains our preferred and ideal solution, this “Plan B” deserves serious consideration.

- 3. Obtain immediate and permanent funding for the Eastern Student Parents Association, and give it stronger institutional standing.** This student group has made substantial progress in addressing the child care needs of its membership. Accordingly, it deserves reliable and vigorous support from the university. ESPA differs from all other RSOs in that its work concerns the most vital concerns of its members—the welfare of their children—and addresses the most crucial factor in their academic success at Eastern. Accordingly, it should be separated from other RSOs, protected from the uncertainties of University Board funding, and more fully integrated into the institution, on the model of such organizations as *The Daily Eastern News* and the athletic teams. The possibility of earning academic credit for work in the organization should be explored, as should possible ties to classes in child care.

Funding for ESPA for AY '05 might address such items as a get-acquainted banquet or mixer in August; a parents-and-kids party at some point; shopping field trips for the members; T-shirts; and the printing of an Eastern Student Parents directory for the year. Budgets for future years would depend on the scope of the group's activities.

- 4. Explore the possibility of extended sessions at the Lab School.** Education of Eastern students must remain the Lab School's primary and overriding priority, but within this constraint it might still be possible to expand the sessions to cover full half-days, with substantial benefits to the work and study schedules of participating parents. The experiment, which has been tried once before, seems at least worth repeating.

In general, it seems worthwhile to look at the Lab School from the community-benefit standpoint as well as the academic-mission standpoint. Quite possibly, the facility is already at or near its optimal usage from both standpoints. But we have not been able to pursue the question, and believe that it merits further study.

- 5. Set up an online discussion group, using the parents' list compiled for our pilot study.** Such a listserv would allow members to share information and advice about child care in Charleston, and also to discuss the pros and cons of initiatives like those outlined above.