



Eastern Michigan University
Faculty Senate Minutes (approved 2/13/19)

Session-9

3.00—5.00 pm January 23, 2019 310A Student Center

Present: Reedy, Winning, Kashliev, Hayworth, Neufeld, Kahn Welsh, Curran, Peavler, Sheerin, Elton, Staunton, Millán, Spragg, Isenhour, Barton, Lee, Mannari, Ferdousi, Becker, Pittsley-Sousa, Patrick, Waltz, Karpiak, Willis, Leon, McVey, Pressley-Sanon, Kustron

Guests/Non-Voting: Longworth, Kullburg, Gray

- I. **Call to order** 3:06 pm

- II. **Approval of the Agenda** 3:06 pm
Motion made to approve minutes as amended (with the addition of item V.F.) and seconded, motion carries

- III. **Approval of the Minutes 01/09/2018** 3:05 pm
Motion made to approve the minutes with minor corrections and seconded, motion carries with 2 abstentions

- IV. **Committee Representative Elections** 3:10 pm
 - A. Global Engagement Council (GEC) - COE Representative
Tabled until next meeting

- V. **Discussions**
 - A. Vote on revised Data Retention Policy (Tornquist and Chawla) 3:15pm
Motion to approve the revised policy and seconded
Discussion: Answered question regarding faculty questions about particular aspects of the policy; agreed to change “supervised” to “will advise”
Motion to approve policy with wording change carries (Yes -27; No – 0; Abstain – 1)

 - B. Update on Division of Business and Finance and Proposal on Housing-- (Valdes) 3:25 pm
(handout – housing report)
 - Four key areas: Planning and budget for university (annual operating budgets, capital budget, and things that are related, like tuition and transparency); Controller’s Office (financial accounting, grant accounting, payroll department, accounts payable); procurement; student business services. Gave an update about what this office has done to date about housing and reiterated that no decisions have been made yet.
 - Request for Qualifications (RFQ) were due January 22. This is a formal means through which parties express interest and articulate their ability to execute the project. Eight firms responded. EMU admin identified buildings that are to be included in the plan (17 buildings) and gave info about when they built, when they were last renovated. The RFQs are to address entire housing stock at EMU. By seeking RFQs, qualifications are compared against EMU’s ability to make the changes themselves.
 - The team that will review FRQ consists of administrators
 - Valdes stated that the university is still exploring the four options original presented to UBC (and shared in Senate)

- Considerations involve not minimizing the impact on our operating budget and on-campus rental rates.
- Stated that EMU doesn't have enough on-campus apartments (at current prices) to meet student demands
- Provided overview of the timeline moving forward: received RFQs, committee will review those, and UBC will look at the committee's review/findings for additional input, after which a recommendation will be made to the President (need to first identify: 1) whether to pursue private partnership, and if answer is yes, then 2) which of the RFQs should submit proposals)
- Pointed to slide 12 of the handout, which says that students who chose not to attend EMU open-ended questions – 10.7% said dissatisfaction with housing was the reason why, and this was the largest response category

Discussion:

- Some expressed concern that the process has not been deliberative and that the process has been guided by a pre-determined decision (to partner with a private firm to renovate housing). As a result, the potential negative effects of privatizing housing were not fully considered by the administration.
 - Valdes - RFQ is there to gauge what other companies might be able to do to address EMU housing, but noted that our budget may not allow for us to make the renovations alone; difficulty of getting accurate information from other universities that have renovated their housing; we want to fix our housing, but the question is how
- Need more data on the outcomes of public-private partnerships, which, when they fail, often hurt the public entity more than the private entity
- Transparency is important—need to involve the on-campus stakeholders to the table (like faculty) during the decision-making process; Bringing more people into the decision making process may alleviate concerns about how decisions are made
- Affordability seems to be the biggest issue for students, so any renovations or changes to on-campus housing need to take into consideration cost (so, you can give students fancy upgrades, but if you charge them more for it, they won't want to pay it)
- Student Government: 3 things any partnership would need to have: Prices do not rise (cannot afford for them to increase or we'll lose students), retain student housing staff (need to retain student-to-student connection), any potential contract needs to say that EMU retains a certain number of beds for RAs and housing scholarships. If contract is based specifically on facility management, then this would be something that students would support.
- Stressed the importance of listening to students throughout the process (and after any decision has been made); Student Government stated that they have provided input (all-student forum, etc.) and that they are willing and eager to continue giving input
- Expressed concern about the lack of diversity on the committee evaluating the RFQs
- Seems that university is making a good faith effort to involve faculty and students in the process and that any decision needs to protect students and financial viability of the university
- Sharing language of the contract prior to signing it may also help assuage concerns about the agreement, should a private partnership move forward
- Some disagreement about whether the UBC is not a contractual input body and whether it is the best entity for providing input given only 1/3 of its membership is faculty
- Need to also consider the academic ramifications to housing due to the large graduate students working in housing as GAs, a partnership should not impact GA positions because it will hurt graduate programs

Discussed what actions the Senate would like to take on the revised resolution.

Motion to pass resolution seconded and carries (unanimous)

D. Senate Goals for the Semester (Gray, All)

Tabled

E. Restructuring of University Level Committees (Gray)

Tabled

F. Resolution in support of winter health and safety

4:49 pm

Conditions on campus were unsafe this morning, and failure to not clear walkways and parking lots prior to campus opening poses health and safety risks.

Motion to pass the resolution

Discussion: Wording of the resolution was revised

Motion to pass resolution seconded and carries (unanimous)

VI. **Questions for Committee Chairs** (Barton, Curran, McVey, Karpiak, Trewn, Evett, Carpenter)

4:35pm

Tabled until next Senate meeting

VII. **Provost's Minutes**

4:50 pm

VIII. **Announcements**

4:55 pm

- Seeking University Assessment Committee co-chair
- Faculty Representative for Athletics - selection process this semester

IX. **Adjourn**

5:05 pm

