

## Eastern Illinois University The Keep

---

Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

4-7-2015

# April 7, 2015

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "April 7, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1021.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1021](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1021)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

07 April 2015 meeting

(The 2014-2015 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available on the Web at:

<http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>)

\* Note: These minutes **are not** a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting. (J. Oliver)

### I. Call to Order by Chair Sterling at 2:04 pm (Booth Library, Room 4440)

Present: J. Conwell, M. Dao, S. Eckert, J. Ludlow, M. Mulvaney, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, S. Scher, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, D. Viertel, S. Ahmad (Student VP).

Guests: Jeff Cross (VPAA), Brad Green (EIU Annual Fund), Diane Jackman (CEPS), Andrew McNitt (Political Science), Leah Reynolds (Civil Rights/Diversity)

### II. Approval of Minutes from 24 March 2015 Senate Meeting

- Revisions – none cited

- Minutes from 24 March 2015 Senate meeting were approved.

- Motion made by Senator Stowell, and seconded by Senator Viertel. All in favor? – 11/11-unanimous

### III. Communications

a. CAA Minutes from 3/26/15

b. Proposed By-laws revisions

c. Constitutional Amendment Documents: E-mail from Chair Sterling, Table and List versions of the revisions, E-mail from Senator Scher, Re: Meeting date confirmation  
Sterling – today's forum is dedicated to the Constitutional Amendments

d. Proposed Resolutions (revised) –

Sterling – I removed the CAA resolution – CAA will visit 4/21 to discuss and address it, and potentially vote on it

Sterling – I changed the language of the first to 'yes/no' terms at request of John Allison (author). If we agree upon a resolution today, it could be included on the same ballot with the constitutional amendments.

Stowell – one question – in light of our proposed amended Article 13, are we going to apply the proposed amendment to Article 13 right now?

Sterling – no – if approved, it would apply to Fall 2015.

Scher – but if recalling correctly, the language of Article 13 did not change anything, correct? Our actions last meeting just provided clarification what was already in the constitution

Stowell – 'context' provisions were added

Eckert – expresses agreement with Stowell

Sterling – clarifies procedural requirements that Senate would need to follow

Eckert – seeks clarification of the process because the 2 proposed resolutions may have originated outside of the Senate

Sterling – yes, but these two resolutions are being presented by me to the Senate – they are being presented by me

Mulvaney – I would vote 'no' in terms of putting them on the ballot. I am more concerned about the precedent rather than the content of the resolutions. I am not sure we want to get in the habit of creating resolutions for ballot voting unless there is a unique situation that potentially requires

swift action. Not sure if these situations are 'unique' – hesitant to move forward without the 20% of faculty that initiate a petition. I am uncomfortable with the Senate moving forward with these resolutions – could open the door for faculty to just come to us to put resolutions on a ballot rather than using the traditional petition process for the faculty

Eckert – I agree with the Athletics resolution. I would vote to push this forward. Or at least ask the broader faculty about this. We are all experiencing cuts in academic departments. I am appalled that EIU Athletics can go over budget without any repercussions. If Academics goes over budget, we pay out of our own pocket. A statement from Faculty Senate disagreeing with overspending by Athletics would send a message. Maybe even making further statements – encouraging possible NCAA divisional re-classification? Controlling spending on coaches? – seems like athletics can do what they want when needed while academic departments cannot. It seems nonsensical for an educational institution.

Conwell – it's been going on for a few years – no one knew about this – and Dan Nadler predicted that this would continue. They don't have a plan to cut back spending.

Dao – this action would be consistent with shared governance – that we make a statement – we owe it to the Senate and faculty at large – the overspending is shocking. It's unacceptable. Where is the shared governance? In the business world, the person overseeing the budget would get fired.

Robertson – to Mulvaney – I appreciate your perspective. We should continue to reach out to faculty to bring petitions with gathered signatures to the Faculty Senate. We don't want to sidestep the 20% faculty petition route. As an advisory body to the faculty at large, we also have the responsibility to bring campus-wide concerns to the faculty and make them aware of problems. I am also concerned about 'faculty fatigue' and the petition process – doing 'more with less' across the university. Faculty are burdened because there are fewer faculty doing more work with fewer resources. Hopefully the faculty senate occasionally initiating a petition would not discourage the grassroots petition approach originating from EIU faculty.

Mulvaney – I am not hung up on the 'content' of the resolutions being discussed, but more on the 'process' of bringing forward a resolution in this way. I am worried about how we start determining which resolution we decide to include on a ballot and which ones we don't. The process involving 20% of faculty signatures might help to better generate awareness about the pending issue.

Stowell – we are in a position as a faculty senate to determine if a petition is sent out or not, even if it comes from 1 member of the senate unless we are forced by 20%+ of the faculty. There is some measure of balance here because convincing only 1 faculty senator to include a petition on a ballot does not mean a proposed resolution will end up on a ballot. We still have to vote on it here.

Conwell – a petition is not a 'nuclear' option (immediate action), unless we motion on it as a faculty senate right now. We also want to extend the right to faculty to vote on petitions placed on a ballot. The majority of a Fac Sen quorum has to vote in order to get a proposed resolution on a faculty ballot. This is a good idea for the people (faculty) that we represent. And based on timing of this or other issues, a situation like this can be lost in the annual change of Fac Sen leadership. We need to send a message.

Eckert – this is also not a vote of no confidence for any one in particular, and this is about budget transparency as well

Conwell – shared governance should promote budget transparency which is directly involved in this process

Viertel – I am inclined to agree with Mulvaney on this. The narrow scope of this process and setting a precedent at this time concerns me. This process could open the door to less neutrally worded resolutions being submitted in the future. And the outcome is almost predictable, isn't it? So what are we actually finding out with including this resolution on the ballot?

Dao – Faculty Senate members should be able to properly handle frivolous petitions or rumors, otherwise I don't think we deserve to be serving. We need to make sure resolutions have substance.

Viertel – but if this resolution is so important and we are so sure about it, why aren't we just taking action? Just skip the voting and go right to the problem and take action?

Scher – I have concerns similar to Mike – how do we determine which resolutions/petitions to include on ballots – but as reps of EIU faculty we are in an important position to try to determine which are most applicable to faculty. I am also concerned about 'voter fatigue'. I don't want to wear out EIU faculty through too many voting processes this month. I do think that if we approve the 2<sup>nd</sup> petition we need to use a yes/no approach rather than a scale. I also agree that the impact of these resolutions has the potential to be quite small. How much will they accomplish? Maybe an indirect effect – maybe awareness and publicity on the issues, but probably not a major impact.

Ludlow – if we vote 'yes' on these two resolutions, I think Faculty Senate need to (and should be expected by EIU faculty) take leadership on campus regarding these issues.

Scher – I agree, but maybe Viertel's comments are true – maybe we just act (do something) now?

Conwell – the lack of budget transparency is a key issue with #1.

Ludlow – but is it not reasonable to assume that careful budgeting was not in place?

Stowell – wasn't part of the problem with the reporting to the IAB?

Conwell – but weren't IAB members chosen by Dr. Nadler?

Viertel – not directly, chosen by the IAB but in consultation with Dr. Nadler

Sterling – IAB members are chosen by Jim Davis in consultation with Dan Nadler. And now a member of the Faculty Senate nominations committee will be involved

Oliver – I serve on IAB this year. I am concerned with the budget review process between EIU Athletics and the IAB. Although reviewing the athletics budget is a clear responsibility listed on IGP #84 – Intercollegiate Athletics Board, I get the sense that the current chair and members of the IAB (maybe including myself?) are not fully understanding how significant that duty is. There is not much emphasis placed on it. I'm not sure if any of IAB members are prepared to ask the 'tough' budget questions that need to be asked. At the most recent IAB meeting last week, there seemed to be some confusion among IAB members on 'why' budget review is listed as the #1 duty of the IAB on IGP #84. And the VP of Student Affairs even suggested that that responsibility be removed from the IAB's list of duties, even though that is a typical function of Athletics Councils across the country. So I am not sure about the motives of the VP of Student Affairs after he made that suggestion? He was, in fact, the interim director of athletics during the 2013-2014 academic year when the result was a \$1 million deficit, but he did not share that until Faculty Senate invited him to speak. In terms of the IAB member selection process, I have confidence in Jim Davis. I think having a Faculty Senator involved in the IAB selection process will be a positive step in terms of shared governance.

Viertel – does not CUPB have responsibility in terms of the review of the EIU Athletics budget?

Oliver – I don't know for sure? I think both the IAB and the CUPB have been assuming that the other was fulfilling the role of 'budget checkpoint' for EIU Athletics but neither was actually reviewing their budget.

Conwell – do they need a new chair of the IAB?

Oliver – No. But I think the current chair needs to be the one to ask some of the 'difficult' budget questions to EIU athletics personnel. I have confidence in Jim Davis that he can do it, but he needs to start doing it. But he also needs to receive the budget documents from EIU Athletics in a timely manner. But if EIU enrollment has dropped this year, and if athletics spending habits have not changed this year, what scares me is what the budget deficit might be for the current year?

Conwell – offers additional related comments

Sterling – to Scher – in terms of ‘formal power structure’ the Faculty Senate has the power and authority to do essentially nothing. On the other hand, although not required by the President and EIU BOT, it is rare for the administration to completely ignore what the Faculty Senate suggests. But if the sentiment of this body is to put forward a faculty senate resolution (either of the 2 being discussed) we can move forward with it. If either goes to the faculty and the faculty votes on one or both, it could send an even stronger message to the administration.

Scher – I somewhat disagree with some of what you have said – the administration seems to ignore us more often than not when we make suggestions. Not as optimistic as your perspective. But I am all for doing something.

Sterling – let me try to clarify – makes comments

Scher – in terms of actual real change, I don’t have as much confidence in the administration as you. Expresses concerns over IAB and IGP 84.

Oliver – again, I have confidence in Jim Davis as FAR but I do have some concerns over the reasoning of the current VP of student affairs after the recent IAB meeting (wanting to remove ‘budgetary review’ from IGP #84?)

Scher – expresses additional concerns over IAB selection process

Oliver – suggests that IAB and Faculty Senate have reached a compromise in terms of selection of IAB members.

Sterling – running out of time to discuss resolution #2 – we can make a motion on resolution #1 or defer to the Fall

Ludlow – makes motion – put resolution #1 on ballot. If passes, we pledge to write a more detailed resolution that provides suggestions to improve oversight and accountability of EIU Athletics.

Conwell – 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion

Sterling – roll call vote – 9 yes, 2 no (Mulaney, Viertel)

Sterling – time to adjourn for the Faculty Forum in Coleman Hall

e. Proposed 2017-18 Academic Calendar (two versions) – Sterling – please review the attachment

#### IV. Presentations to the Senate: (None scheduled). Andrew McNitt & Brad Green-New Scholarship Fund

McNitt – we have established a foundation for a scholarship fund – provides handout – titled EIU Community Commitment to Excellence Scholarship Fund. Endowment to funds for scholarship majoring in any area. Prerequisites – ACT of 22, GPA of 3.0. 1<sup>st</sup> part - \$25000 needed to establish endowment. 2<sup>nd</sup> part-cash in/cash out to provide immediate short term support. Donors will be given the option.

McNitt – we need more members of the committee – we are recruiting from different EIU committees – Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Honors Council, and Council of Chairs.

McNitt – introduces Brad Green

Green – I am new interim director of EIU Annual Fund. We have decided to do a 2015-2016 staff campaign. We have identified ‘leaders’ across campus to promote this campaign across campus and in department. Goal – leaders will reach out across campus to help in the process of recruiting quality students. I will then reach out to alums in a different campaign – but I want to show alums what EIU faculty and staff have already done with this new campaign. Based on this proposal, this fund should become a perpetual funding source. Initially this will be a supplement to existing scholarships.

McNitt – all four committee reps will help create a broad connection across campus in order to raise awareness and money. Time for EIU to initiate efforts to control more of it’s own destiny because the state of Illinois is becoming less and less reliable. Large donors is the goal, but smaller donations will help get this started.

McNitt – we have seen considerable initial interest in starting this fund from campus groups – from

both faculty and staff. Hopefully we can generate enough enthusiasm. I am very happy that the EIU Foundation has embraced this proposal.

Ludlow – the money donated for the annual cash in/cash out fund does not count towards the \$25000 endowment, correct?

McNitt – correct

Ludlow – what do you mean by ‘if it should go away’?

Green – this fund would supplement current scholarships already in place that are funded out of appropriated dollars from the state. If large state cutbacks occur, this scholarship will hopefully be able to compensate for any loss of that.

McNitt – I think it is clear that we need to expect some reduction in state funding for AY 15-16

Scher – how are Commitment to Excellence Scholarships recipients selected?

McNitt – explains/reviews that process – almost automatically processed based on ACT and GPA scores of incoming freshmen. There are 5 Tiers established based on the combination of these 2 scores.

Scher – how much money does EIU award with the existing scholarships?

McNitt – not sure, but probably around \$500000

Scher – So \$25000 will not produce many scholarships

McNitt – understandable – this is the first step – we want to build it up over time – but we have to start somewhere. Strong desire of CUPB to raise money through sources other than appropriated \$.

Green – we have decided to make this the actual ‘faculty/staff’ fundraising campaign

Stowell – do you project the actual fund performance around 7-8%? And will that go towards the scholarship each year?

McNitt – 4-5 % goes towards scholarship fund, 1% to maintenance, and remaining back to maintain value of fund. Usually about ½ of the earnings will go towards the fund balance.

Green – provides additional details about where and how the contributions will be applied. If you would like additional info on fund requirements, I can send the info to Grant Sterling.

McNitt – the academic performance prerequisites for this fund will be comparable to Tier 3 of the existing Commitment to Excellence fund – slightly higher with ACT – 22.

Green – I will be contacting some of you as potential ‘leaders’. We hope for support from Faculty Senate and eventually staff senate. We are getting organized and hope for a launch in the near future.

Mulvaney – do we know what % of faculty/staff campus-wide annually give to fund campaigns?

Green – 25% or below. But we have never really approached the faculty in this way before. Hopefully faculty will realize that scholarships is a key to get more students here. If we succeed, the results will help encourage alums to give as well.

McNitt – provides a few more background details about the plan

Sterling – do we have a volunteer now?

Oliver – I will volunteer as a Faculty Senate representative for this Faculty/Staff campaign.

## V. Old Business

### A. Committee Reports:

#### 1. Executive = Sterling – we met with President Perry and Provost Lord.

Scher – Did you talk to the President about the Constitutional amendments

Sterling – separately I have talked with him about this topic

Oliver – we also requested an opportunity to meet with President Glassman

Scher – maybe – it’s a bit of an awkward situation – President Perry is on his way out and the new President is on his way in. Neither may be in a great position to consider it fully.

Sterling – we have also sent copies of all Constitution/Bylaw proposals to EIU BOT – we have not heard back yet.

2. Nominations = Sterling (speaking for Rosenstein) – call for nominated committees is ready to send out following the completion of the Faculty Senate elections and results.

3. Elections = Ludlow – Vote! – Elections runs through 11:59 pm on Wed. We will send out a reminder tomorrow. We should have results by Friday. A sincere ‘thank you’ to Cole Walters and Andy Anderson from ITS for their assistance in this process. Dao offers additional comments about the process

4. Faculty-Student relations = Conwell - no report

5. Faculty-Staff relations = no report

6. Awards = Robertson – no report. Oliver – to Robertson - please send me award recipient info for website – recipient biograph and image. Robertson – will do

7. Faculty Forum = no report – Sterling – convening in Coleman Hall 1255 for forum today

8. Budget transparency = no report

9. Constitution and Bylaws Review = no report

10. Committee on Committees = no report

11. Other Reports:

a. Provost’s Report: Jeff Cross – in place of B. Lord – we received 12 applications for interim grad school dean – they are being reviewed by the committee.

b. Other - no

B. Other Old Business: none

VI. New Business

A. Future Agenda: Spring 2015 Meeting Dates:

April 21 (Election of Officers for 2015-2016, CAA follow-up?, Summer FAC SEN meeting?)

B. Other New Business – none

VII. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 3:25 pm.