

Draft Minutes for Faculty Senate

April 4, 2012

3:00-5:00PM, SC310A

Attending: M Reedy (ART), T Brewer (CHEM), R Quiel (CMTA), M Evett (COSC), D Crary (ECON), S Norton (ENG), C Mayda (G&G), J Koolage (H&P), G Dumitrascu (MATH), W Zirk (M&D), P Koehn (P&A), E Martin (PS), K Saules (PSYCH), R Orrange (SAC), S Gray (WGST), T Moreno (HPHP), M J Carbone (HS), M Bombyk (SW), M Rahman (ACC&FIN), D Chou (CIS), L Isenhour (MGMT), D Barton (MKT&LAW), P Francis (L&C), L Lee (SPED), P Smith (TED), J Texter (ET), P Majeske (TS), T Brewer (Grad Council), R Baier (LIB), K Schatzel (Provost)

Not attending: M Peters (AAS), B Winning (BIOL), Zinggeler (WL), S Nelson (NURS)

1. (3:00) Approval of agenda (approved)
2. (3:05) Approval of the minutes of the 3/21 meeting (approved as amended, one abstention)
3. (3:10) Nominations for Senate offices (vote will be 4/18):
 - a. Vice President (M Rahman, S Norton)
 - b. Secretary (P Koehn)
 - c. Membership Coordinator (S Gray)
4. (3:20) State funding of higher education [Leigh Greden] (after good-natured technology-oriented ribbing of our dear and irreplaceable President)
 - a. Public universities were cut by 15%, EMU got an \$11.6M cut.
 - b. Put caps on tuition as well.
 - c. EMU is the leader in tuition restraint.
 - d. Michigan is in the bottom 10 nationwide for educational spending.
 - e. We spend more on prisons (\$37K per inmate) than we do on students (\$5500 per student)
 - f. Three proposals out there:
 - i. Hold higher Ed flat (governor's proposal)
 1. New pool of money (\$36.2M), awarded via a formula. Formula includes degrees produced, STEM degrees produced, Pell grants and tuition restraint.
 2. Our share would be a 2.3% increase.
 3. There is a direct encouragement to go with 0%.
 4. Does not recognize prior tuition restraint.
 5. Transfers etc, fall out of the formula – we get no credit for them.
 - ii. Hold Higher Ed held (Senate Proposal)
 1. Pool formula includes 6-year graduation rate, retention, Pell grants, R&D spending and tuition restraint.
 2. Would get about the same amount of money.

3. Comment: Has anyone pointed out that we are a different animal than other universities in the state?
 - a. Every U is a different animal. This comparison, however, is easy for the legislators to handle.
4. Comment: Problem is that these criteria, if made a law, may be over-applied, creeping into base amounts.
- iii. Budgets reduced by 1%. (House proposal)
 1. Performance pool divided based on degrees produced (good for EMU)
 2. Subject to Stem Cell reporting, no student health insurance mandate, transfer agreements, dual enrollment agreements, and customized tuition restraint (including prior restraints – good for us!)
- iv. Next steps: Appropriations committees vote in late April.
- v. FY14: No increase in funding, and performance metrics likely to become stricter.
- vi. Comment: What is up with the Governor and his lack of support for higher Ed?
 1. Fair question. Even business owners (mostly Republican) are calling for more spending on Education.
- vii. Followup: We can reduce prison population based on courses taken in the institution – take education to the prisons.
 1. We have programs like this, at least in some departments.
- viii. Comment: Slide said that we shouldn't be pitting Universities against each other – why aren't we working together to find solutions?
 1. We're all against the proposals. We are making the same argument that the business leaders are, but the response is "That's too complicated."
- ix. Comment: Congratulations on educating people about graduation rate. These formulas don't last – there used to be one that gave you credit for doctoral programs, so we made doctoral programs. The formula went, the programs stayed. Perhaps a "per student enrolled" criteria might work. "Degrees produced" equates to skilled employees, and that is a good thing.
 1. There are a large number of people in Michigan that have some college, but no degrees.
- x. Comment: The governor is not against Higher Education, and actually wants to be a university professor after his terms end. We need to stop pandering to them.
 1. There is no scenario where we would go below our current levels.
- xi. Comment: What is the maximum bonus we can get?
 1. A few million. (a few percent)

- xii. Comment: What do these increases in tuition do to our image?
 - 1. That number (9.6%) is a cap, we likely won't go there.

- 4.5: Former Student Body President spoke, described the Dream Act. The Dream Act requests in-state tuition rates for undocumented immigrants. Motion to put a resolution on the table for our next meeting (two weeks), seconded.

Comment: What is Eastern allowed to do?

State has deemed that each university may set their own residency requirements.

Comment: How would this appear to the legislature?

(L Greden: Need to review it before commenting)

Comment: So as an undocumented individual, going through the university would seem to document a person. Resp: True.

Comment: Is anyone else doing this?

Western has a similar policy, there a movements at UM for this.

Comment: How is Western's policy different?

Western has an endowment to fund undocumented individuals.

- 5. (3:50) Resolutions (1st reading) supporting internal leadership training [Mahmud Rahman]
 - a. Resolution 20120404.1: Internal candidates for administrative positions. Text of resolutions attached
 - i. Other institutions have contributed leaders to our organization (provosts, president). We have contributed none to other institutions.
 - ii. We risk becoming a "debtor institution" when it comes to leadership positions.
 - iii. Last few national searches have not gone well.
 - iv. Leadership should come from within, via internal searches.
 - 1. Comment: The last two department heads for my department were the results of national searches. They were internal candidates but they were competing on a national level. If we are concerned that not enough people are competing for administrative positions, we should be encouraging our members to compete at this national level.
 - 2. Comment: What did you mean by "not contributing anything?"
 - a. In CoB, national searches are the norm, and existing faculty are not encouraged to run.
 - b. We are not sending leaders outside of our institution.

3. Follow-on comment: A number of our former administrators have moved on to other posts. It is not fair to say that we are contributing anything.
 4. Comments: Institutional inbreeding has been the practice here at EMU. New ideas from the outside are a good thing. And, giving internal candidates preference in a national search is illegal. We are not doing enough to promote from within, however. We also don't train our department heads sufficiently. A leadership training course would be a good idea, and may set up a way to encourage faculty to move upward.
 5. Comment: Internal candidates can and do compete in national searches. The competition validates the candidate.
 6. Comment: The idea that an additional faculty line is created is interesting. National candidates that come in and crash inflate our salary statistics. This needs to be adjusted somehow. The issue is getting the right leadership. Let the internal candidate compete.
 7. Comment: When it comes down to the salary issue, that's an administrative concern. When it comes down to training, we need to be honest with department head candidates about expectations.
 8. First reading, we will not be voting this week. Leadership training needs to be improved. External candidates brought in as an administrator may return to departments as faculty, perhaps where they are not needed. We will revisit this in two weeks.
6. (4:10) Resolution regarding university committee appointments (Resolution 20120404.3)
- a. Significantly revised after the first reading.
 - b. Text of resolution attached.
 - c. Comment: If this goes to the table, the administrators will not care. It is odd that the Bargaining Council is arbitrating a disagreement between faculty councils. It is upsetting that this fight exists.
 - d. Comment: Thanks for changing the resolution, it reads much better. The CAC has valid points, and we need to continue to discuss this.
 - i. Part of the resolution calls for surveying the faculty.
 - e. Comment: Concerned that we are having a one-sided conversation. We need to be clearer about what our representatives do.
 - f. Comment: This proposal also goes to the college councils, with nothing but paper conversations. There is no face-to-face conversation.
 - g. Comment: We **do** represent our departments here. When we appoint members to committees, we are **not** asking those

- appointees to represent their college. This piece is missing somewhere in the proposals.
- h. Comment: Perplexed by an earlier comment, as the Bargaining Council took this issue up. Makes sense, it's a contractual issue. Seems like a problem in terminology.
 - i. This resolution does not call for bargaining council involvement. The CAC has already brought this forward in an appropriate format for BC involvement.
 - i. Response: The resolution has been tabled. Part of the resolution was presented to the Research and Leave subcommittee.
 - i. Our resolution does not call for a vote.
 - j. Comment: Glad that the Union has a seat here, this conversation is enhanced thanks to their participation.
 - k. Comment: This is the wrong way to fix one committee (URSLC).
 - l. Comment: It is the purview of the senate to appoint these members. If the Bargaining Council starts arbitrating in senate affairs, it sets a bad precedent.
 - m. Comment: As a body, we do a horrible job of doing these appointments. We are working on getting this organized, but we're not doing a great job of it. Calls for nominations go out two days before the vote –this is not enough time. We must do a better job.
 - n. VOTE: 22 for, 0 against, 3 abstentions. Resolution passes.
7. (4:20) Provost Office's "Minutes"
- a. Interested in hearing discussion about department heads. Working on more transparent policies and contracts regarding department head salaries. Recognizes that this results in salary number inflation.
 - b. College of Technology: Sent around an announcement that Dean Boone will step down effective June 30. An interim will be appointed (input from faculty of that college is welcome).
 - c. Program review update: Trying to better understand the program review process. There are differences in terms of how the colleges go about their review processes. These differences make it difficult to put together an overview. Can we identify an upper-level framework within which college differences will fit?
 - d. Interims: Appreciates the feedback regarding appointing interims. She completely understands and respects the ideas concerning competition. She is a new provost, however, and pragmatism dictates a different approach. Contract negotiations, international initiatives, advocacy of the graduate schools, changes to advising, and new Deans are keeping the office busy. There is much change that she needs to manage to maintain stability. Although she appreciates our input and understands our point of view, she still wishes to remove the interim titles.
 - i. Comment: Don't trust the AP's to disseminate information.
 - ii. Comment: What are your plans for graduate school for the next year?

1. Spending more time recruiting than we need to be doing right now. The graduate office is being re-focused to handle graduate issues.
 - iii. Comment: Where do you see the role of graduate colleges and students here at EMU? Do we want to grow this?
 1. This has not been answered by strategic planning. EMU calls themselves an undergraduate institution. Graduate programs need to fit within our mission, and need to be looked at carefully as these programs can require a different kind of faculty.
 - iv. Comment: With the increase in graduate tuition trickle to the faculty?
 1. At Dearborn, the differential went back to the individual colleges.
 - v. Comment: EMU does not have a university-wide foreign language requirement. The students are being deprived of opportunities at the international level because of this.
8. (4:30) Committee Reports
 - a. EEFC [David Crary]
 - b. Univ. Budget Comm. [Mahmud Rahman]
 - c. Student Success Council [Marti Bombyk]
 - d. eFellows/FDC [Randy Baier]
 - i. When Pray-Harrold was renovated, the VCRs were eliminated.
 - ii. Should we eliminate all of them?
 - iii. Comment: we need more information, budget effects, etc.
9. (4:50) President's Remarks
 - a. Encourage committee volunteers
 - i. Please encourage your department members to participate.
 - b. April Board of Regents meeting
 - i. Next meeting 4/17. Matt will speak at the formal gathering.
 - c. Search for Chief of Police (see below)
 - i. Go to the forums, listed in the agenda.
 - d. Next FS meeting: April 18 in SC310. Next FSEB meeting is April 11 in SC304.

Resolutions

Resolution 20120404.1

First Consideration to Internal Candidates for Administrative Positions:

For all administrative positions within the academic division, internal candidates shall be given first consideration before external candidates are invited.

Discussion

As a newly appointed Provost coming from UM-Dearborn, Dr. Schatzel is wise to desire that her associate appointments not be chosen from external candidates or strangers to EMU. An internal candidate would be invaluable in providing her with continued institutional memory and informed insights into EMU issues and concerns.

Our ranks for the top leadership positions seem to be continually filled with external candidates. Promotion from within has been sparse, and does not seem to be our default mode. This implies a belief that an exceptional leader can only be recruited from non-EMU candidates and that they will better guide us than internal candidates.

Our last two presidents, both external hires, had short, disappointing tenures. The previous provost was also an external hire and did not fare any better. Obviously a national search is no guarantee of a successful hire.

Most would agree that our current provost is highly qualified, and has succeeded so far. Her career advanced quickly after joining UM-Dearborn as a tenure track faculty. Our previous provost also enjoyed remarkable career advances within UM-Flint. Their success stories would be highly unlikely had they joined EMU at the entry level. It is not a reflection of their qualifications, but our own inability to recognize outstanding internal candidates and promote from within. Those two campuses recognized that qualified internal candidates do not have to go to different institutions in order to advance their careers.

Our current president and provost are both from UM-Dearborn. Most of our high-level appointments have come not from a national pool, but instead from regional neighbors like Grand Valley, UM-Flint, and UM-Dearborn. Are we to concede, then, that these institutions better create top leadership than does EMU?

If we continue to recruit from outside, to the exclusion of internal candidates, we will weaken Eastern in two ways:

- One: Stunting the growth of leadership from within. The best places to work for are usually the ones that afford opportunities for career advances to their most qualified employees. The best leaders are the ones who foster the growth of their own replacements—and are not threatened by it. Eastern’s future success rests not just in the career advancement of our students, but also in that of our faculty.
- Two: EMU will be unable to contribute top leadership to the larger world of academia. Because we are not providing ample opportunity for internal candidates to gain leadership experience, we will forever remain a debtor in the economy of leadership, not a provider.

Advocates for a national search over internal candidates have meritorious arguments as well. Let us consider two:

- One: internal candidates perpetuate the existing culture (or politics). This centers on the negative aspects of EMU culture and dismisses the positive. Why might better argue that those who are vested in our community can propagate a sense of pride, history, and tradition. Discounting internal candidates because they might perpetuate the negative aspects of Eastern’s culture is akin to throwing out the baby with the bath water.
 - Two: Eastern benefits from bringing in outside talent. This is a good argument, but must be made within a context. We are a regional university and so our focus should be to excel in serving southeast Michigan. To do this our leaders should have vested interests and commitments to this area. A pool of 700+ tenured or tenure seeking faculty members, many of whom are also nationally recognized, and who call this region home, is where the talent search should begin.
-

Resolution 20120404.2

Department Heads to Be Filled Internally Where Possible

Department Head (DH) positions are to be filled primarily with internal candidates. Only if an internal search fails should an external search be authorized.

Discussion:

There are at least four arguments for promoting internal candidates to the DH level:

- One: DH positions are the entry level administrative positions. This is the first step into the administrative ranks. Without this experience, the remainder of the administrative ladder remains inaccessible and we do not create a rich pool of internal candidates for higher level appointments.
- Two: The two most important missions of the university are executed at the departmental level: learning and scholarship. Faculty members are the ones

primarily responsible for these. Consequently none are better qualified for leading those missions than the faculty who are already vested with an indefinite tenure in their departments.

- Three: If DHs are hired from outside, they are usually appointed at the full professor rank with tenure. However, soon after the appointment, they may step down to assume faculty status. That has happened many times at Eastern. We are then stuck with an expensive faculty position that might have been filled with a different candidate had we been hiring a faculty member rather than an administrator.
 - Four: Promoting from within and filling the vacancy with a new tenure track position provides the best of both the worlds. We oxygenate our faculty talent pool with the latest graduates and in the area of specialization that we most need. Entry level candidates offer high productivity as they work through the tenure and promotion process. As an institution focused on teaching, this offers the best bang for our buck, and, in the process, we create a new academic leader amongst us.
-

Resolution 20120404.3

Against Changing the University Committee Appointment Process

The College of Arts and Sciences' College Advisory Council has introduced a proposal to the AAUP Bargaining Council to change the way faculty members are appointed to some university committees. The current Contract language is, "[the] Faculty Senate shall have the right to select or appoint Faculty representatives on all university-wide committees, commissions, councils, or task forces." The CAC proposal would change this to, "when representation from a particular College is required, the appropriate College Council shall select or appoint the representative." (For the rest of this letter the term "college" will refer to the five colleges as well as the library.)

The Senate respects and appreciates the work of the college councils. Many Senate members have previously served on college councils, and council resolutions often serve as the basis for Senate resolutions and actions. But the CAC proposal would constitute a significant change to the faculty governance and input system and so should be considered carefully, especially when this change is being evaluated in the context of contract negotiations. Below, we outline reasons why we do not support the proposal at this time.

Currently the Faculty Senate appoints all faculty members to university committees except the EPEO Advisory Committee. The administration is free to invite other faculty members to participate on committees, but only those appointed by the Senate constitute input according to the EMU-AAUP Contract. The number of faculty members on each committee varies and is defined by that committee's charter or

charge. Some have only one faculty member, while others have six or more. For most of the committees having six or more faculty members, the Senate negotiated with the administration to obtain such a high level of faculty participation by arguing that such numbers would allow the Senate to provide broader perspectives by reserving one slot for each of the colleges. It has not been the intent of the Senate that committee appointees advocate for or represent a particular college. Faculty members are expected to advocate on behalf of *all* faculty. The purpose of having members from different colleges on a committee is rather to provide a more fully informed faculty voice.

The proposal's primary argument in favor of having the college councils appoint committee members is that the existing system is "undemocratic" in that the full Senate membership may vote on whom to appoint to a position reserved for a particular college. Thus, for example, senators from all the colleges may decide on which of two candidates to name from the College of Business to a committee.

Every representative system can be said to be "undemocratic" to some extent. Each is an approximation of a direct democracy (i.e. every person gets one vote). Our local, state, or federal representatives often do not vote the way we would. Famously, a U.S. senator from North Dakota (pop. 683,932) has just as strong a vote as does a senator from California (pop. 37,691,912). Here at Eastern, on the CAS's College Advisory Council, the English Department (52 tenure-track faculty) has the same number of representatives (1) as does the Department of African American Studies (4 tenure-track faculty). We accept something less than direct democracy because there are advantages to the representative form, and the direct form may be unwieldy or untenable.

The question, then, is whether the benefits of having the college councils name representatives to university committees outweighs the additional costs of distributing that responsibility among six colleges, rather than keeping it centralized at the University Faculty Senate.

Here are some of the costs:

First and foremost, this will lessen the perceived power of the Senate in the eyes of the administration. The Faculty Senate has worked for more than thirty years to strengthen the faculty's position vis-à-vis the administration. Over and over again the administration has claimed that they received "input" from committees because they included faculty members who were not named by the Senate. Many of these situations have resulted in grievances filed through the AAUP.

After many years it finally seems that the administration has learned (though continued vigilance is necessary!) The Senate president regularly receives requests for the creation of committees and for appointments to committees from all levels of the administration. In the eyes of the administration the Senate is a crucial partner in the workings of the university. If we make the change suggested by the proposal,

the various branches of the administration will now have to look to six different administrative bodies when managing committees. In their eyes this can only lessen the importance of the Senate and decrease its voice in our discussions with the administration. We will be speaking with a divided, rather than a united voice.

Second, the responsibility of determining which committee positions are open, and of advertising and making assignments to those positions is currently centralized in the Senate. The Senate currently appoints members to more than twenty committees. This results in a significant amount of work (*many* hours) that would now be duplicated across every college. The university already struggles with inefficiencies. The proposed change would move us in the wrong direction.

Third, adopting this change as part of contract negotiations puts the faculty at a disadvantage. The proposed change will increase the burden on the administration. When naming members to a committee, the administration will have to contact six college councils, instead of one Senate. The timeliness of appointments will be constrained by six meeting schedules. This will inevitably lead to more miscommunications, and possible grievances. This proposal is being brought up at the Bargaining Council. If we put this item on the table, the administration will see the potential new governance structure as being more work for them. They will want a quid pro quo. Are we willing to give ground somewhere else to see this change made to the Contract?

Lastly, what problem is addressed by the proposal? Is there a perceived weakness with the committee structure that this proposal would redress? All other proposals in the Bargaining Council are aiming to strengthen the position of the faculty or faculty benefits. This proposal seems to do neither.

If we are to change the way committee appointments are made, it would be better to make that change through the Senate's by-laws, rather than through the cumbersome mechanics of the faculty contract. If departments are unhappy with the committee appointment process, their senators should bring this matter for discussion to the Senate. We suggest that as soon as is feasible the Senate conduct a survey of the entire faculty as a first step toward holding a deeper discussion as to ways to improve the shared governance structure.

In the meanwhile, if the college councils want to have a stronger voice in appointments to committees, please consider that they are welcome to nominate candidates for any committee position. Such an endorsement would *significantly* improve a candidate's election prospects within the Senate.

In closing, it is not right to characterize Senate appointments as "undemocratic". The Senate members always strive to act in the best interest of the whole faculty, and this includes, by definition, the faculty of all colleges. Devolving the committee appointment process to the college councils would materially weaken the Senate's power in the eyes of the administration. It would yield a more complicated, less

efficient appointment process with a higher potential for grievances. Lastly, asking for this change at the bargaining table will quite possibly require that we make a corresponding concession in another area.

Police Chief Candidate Forums:

- **Amy Walker** - Chief of Police, City of Ypsilanti. Public Forum: Tuesday, April 3 at 2 p.m. in Room 330 of the Student Center.
- **Daniel Pfannes** - Undersheriff, Wayne County; and former Chief of Police, City of Westland. Public Forum: Wednesday, April 4 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 330 of the Student Center.
- **Bob Heighes** - Interim Chief of Police and Executive Director of Public Safety, Eastern Michigan University. Public Forum: Tuesday, April 10 at 2 p.m. in Room 350 of the Student Center.
- **Mark Reiss** - Chief of Police, City of Riverside (Ohio). Public Forum: Wednesday, April 11 at 2 p.m. in Room 302 of the Student Center.
- **Scott Pavlik** - Police Captain, City of Warren. Public Forum: Friday, April 13 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 330 of the Student Center.