

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

11-3-2015

November 3, 2015

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "November 3, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1082.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1082

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.

Faculty Senate Session Minutes
November 3rd, 2015, 2:00 – 3:50 pm
Booth Library Conference Room

I. Attendance and Welcome

2:02 call to order

Present: Abebe, Bruns, Eckert, Hugo, Ludlow, Oliver, Robertson, Rosenstein, Scher, Simpson, Sterling, Stowell, Wharram, Young

Guests: Gary Aylesworth, Cassie Buchman, James Conwell, Jesse Guinn, Diane Jackman, Sara Jaraczewski, Kallie Koester, Provost Blair Lord

NOTE: these minutes do not comprise a full and accurate transcript of the meeting.

II. Approval of Minutes from October 20th, 2015

Stowell moved to approve/Sterling seconded; motion passed: 12 yes/0 no/1 abstention

III. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee

10/29/15 met w/ President Glassman. Topics of discussion:

- a. CFR Constitutional Amendment—Scher meet w/ R Miller
- b. Redden Grants
- c. logo—VP Martin will be speaking with us on Dec. 1
- d. athletics—PG reasserted his concern w/ fiscal responsibility moving forward; he's on it
- e. CATS/ITS—reorganization plans; nothing firm yet
- f. budgets—potential changes for the future: prioritization and strategic planning
- g. student safety/campus climate—President Glassman is meeting with student leaders and with community leaders to think about how we can improve the campus and community climate

2. Nominations Committee

Rosenstein—2 committees need volunteers; Senator Rosenstein will send a call to Sen. Ludlow to send to faculty.

Student Standards Board needs one.

The Spring nominations cycle is coming.

Sen. Rosenstein will meet with Sen. Eckert re: who is supposed to assign representation.

The committee on committees is finding discrepancies we need to attend to.

3. Elections Committee

Stowell—the voting process

A couple of minor problems: some (2) people didn't show up on the roster. Server was down for a bit today; ITS has it running again. 39% response rate as of 11:30 this a.m.

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee

no report

5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

no report

6. Awards Committee

Hugo—dropbox link is up; waiting for votes from Awards Committee members

7. Faculty Forum Committee

Bruns—10/28/15 forum attended by 18 faculty

Mueller reported on 2011 report/committee

lot of good suggestions re: shared governance:

space for faculty's professional socializing

Hugo (clarifying)—Faculty Cafe in Klehm 1418—TWR 11-1 pm

committees that aren't meeting—committee on committees will be helpful here

faculty input into IGP process and hiring committees
have a President's report as well as a Provost's report at Faculty Senate meetings
360-style evaluation process for administrators
all summarizes into: we want to improve communication, information, and transparency
Faculty Forum could be a regular shared governance clearinghouse
Stowell—report from 2011 had some good ideas; wasn't followed up on by Pres. Perry; perhaps we could start with it and move forward

8. Budget Transparency Committee

Sterling—requested info; have not yet received it. No report.

9. Constitution and By-Laws Review Committee

- a. Voting Constituency Resolution Discussion—refer to Item IV.2, below
- b. Bylaws Revisions—refer to Item VI, below

10. Committee on Committees

no report

11. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

Rosenstein—we met. We divided up the IAB report. We will meet again Nov. 19 and develop questions for moving forward.

Glaring issues we've already identified: lack of line-item budgetary information; discrepancies in expenditures; budgets proposed, then actually spent, then revised and re-proposed. And also comments students had about everything from nutrition to committees that once existed to help them appeal scholarship rescissions.

Robertson—Does the ad hoc committee have a chair?

Rosenstein—No. We are working with situational leadership, in a nonhierarchical collaborative relationship.

Oliver—Have you considered involving Jim Davis, author of the document, in your discussions?

Rosenstein—Yes. We will need to do this because some things are not clear. Also, we thought we would like to include a student member. And we want to be clear that our committee is not about going after any one or any program but to interpret the document. We recognize that this is not Professor Davis's day job. We want to go through the report first and analyze it so we can ask thoughtful questions, not come across as challenging it. We plan to ask him questions and give him time to respond.

Oliver—You have faculty colleagues on IAB; you should reach out to them, too.

IV. Communications

1. Email from John Henderson Requesting Faculty Senate Appointment to ATAC (Academic Technology Advisory Committee)

Robertson—Does this need to be a sitting senator?

Eckert—No.

Robertson—Could we include this position in the email to be sent out from the nominations committee? Also include a call for Sen. Eckert's senator position while he is teaching abroad next term.

Rosenstein—I think Rigo Chinchilla is our person on ATAC (referring to webpage).

2. Email from Senator Grant Sterling Regarding Voting Constituency Resolution

Sterling—we wanted to include Unit B faculty; our explanation was appended to the process.

Our Constitution was interpreted to include Administrators with faculty status.

He reads from his communication: 3 combined resolutions.

Sterling—I would prefer that it be in effect for the voting that has already begun, but if that is not possible, then certainly moving forward. Voting membership usually also indicates eligibility to hold offices. We need not only to clarify who can vote but also who is eligible to serve on committees.

Scher—Should we specifically state that Assoc. Deans and above are not members of the faculty as defined by Faculty Senate for voting purposes? Clarification: who is eligible to be "Unit B"? How is that status defined in the contract?

Sterling—Someone teaching two semesters at half-time or more.

Stowell—Reading from the language of the Constitution.

Scher—proposes an amendment to the resolution to be clear who we mean.

Sterling—"Full-time teaching faculty and dept. chairs only"?

Rosenstein—What happens when someone is appointed, temporarily, as an administrator?

Scher—When someone is an administrator, even temporarily, their influence is different; therefore they should not vote while they are administrative.

Sterling—contrasting the language with the UPI contract. Faculty Senate Constitution is our document that says how we intend to carry on our work. We submit changes to that document to the President and Board of Trustees; we should interpret our constitution to include what we clearly meant when we wrote it.

Rosenstein—Agreed; we don't want to lose the history of the conversation.

Young—I am satisfied with Grant's language.

Bruns—Are librarians "teaching faculty"?

Sterling—I think it would be easier to say Unit A and Unit B and Chairs.

Bruns—Should this be one motion or three?

Sterling—I have no preference.

Vote: Sterling moved to approve/Young seconded; motion passed: 13 yes/0 no/0 abstention

Sterling—For clarification, what exactly was the process that got us the expanded definition?

Stowell—Jeff Cross sent the request to Enrollment Management who created the list for us.

Robertson—this was an "unintended consequence" of our Constitution change. When we were informed, we thought it was too late to make changes. Perhaps we should think of this as an act of shared governance—we are paying it forward, giving some people the opportunity to be involved in this process, even if we didn't intend to. We are actually sharing governance, in a very true sense.

Ludlow—We are also making assumptions about who is voting how.

Conwell—Do we know how many extra administrators there are? I'd like to know how many people snuck in to this vote. I'd like to know if there are fifty administrators who snuck in on this vote. You may be magnanimous but it was our petition.

Bruns—Should we just reset the vote—throw out all the votes, reset it with the new definition, and start over?

Stowell—We would be looking at two weeks before the vote if we did that.

Rosenstein—How many administrators are on campus?

Abebe—The question is how many administrators have faculty rank? There are also administrators who do not have faculty rank.

Rosenstein—Do the Unit B folks know that they are eligible to vote?

Ludlow—Yes.

Aylesworth—People who signed the petition signed something with the understanding that this would be a faculty/chairs vote. So it looks like there has been a bait-and-switch. There was already a lot of mistrust among faculty about these processes and their transparency, and this is just going to add to that mistrust, which is at the heart of the issue which people are voting on. Having said that, though, if we could just have a number—how many people were allowed to vote on this referendum who were not originally intended to vote—then people can interpret the result as they see fit. With an asterisk.

Scher—This would only be helpful if we could determine if they really did vote and how they voted; unless we can go in and say "look, these people did vote," that would give us some sense of how to interpret the vote.

Ludlow—I advise against looking into the voting to that degree. I think doing so would decrease some faculty members' confidence in the voting process.

Oliver—Problems with the current process might provide an opportunity to reset. The most recent email about a glitch in the system—can we use that communication to reset the process and purify it?

Rosenstein—We have to set the same standards for ourselves as for our students and researchers. If we've messed up we have to start over. In the spirit of transparency, we have to say we messed up and we're starting over. To err is human; to fix it is what researchers do. When the email first came out, it was unclear what the vote was for.

Sterling—Although I proposed the resolution we just voted on, I'm afraid that resetting will lose voters. If we'd had only 5% turnout, I might be sympathetic to the idea of resetting. If the outcome is significant, the number of administrators' votes would not make a significant difference. The Rives no confidence vote was close. Realistically, I think we are talking about a dozen or so people.

Robertson—A very small number of administrators.

Young—Analogy: U.S. census has algorithms to figure out how many people are falsely reported or didn't report. It's hard to get things perfect. I share Sterling's reluctance to push things off at this point.

Conwell—As a compromise: rather than dissect out the administrators' votes, report the electors via rank (instructors, asst profs, asst profs, profs, chairs, admins). Let the people who interpret the vote see that information.

Robertson—We should stay away from saying "this many Unit B voted."

Conwell—We can't get that. Anyone who can do arithmetic can do the math regarding the mix of the distribution.

Scher—It's not really that meaningful of information. There's no way to interpret this. An ethical administrator is not going to vote. They know the vote isn't for them.

Sterling—I know that on two different occasions, administrators specifically encouraged other administrators to vote.

Bruns—I think we should offer an apology for the situation to professors Aylesworth and Conwell. This process has gotten mucked up. It's not anyone's fault, but I do think you are owed an apology for it.

Aylesworth—I don't feel like I'm owed an apology. I'm just disappointed. Trust and confidence are at issue here. People are going to have less trust and less confidence because of this.

Conwell—We need to encourage the full-time Unit A and Unit B faculty to vote.

V. Provost's Report: Blair Lord

Provost Lord—*Chicago Tribune* story: Dr. Glassman is quoted out-of-context. It implies that we can't make it through next semester. Here it comes again. We are open. We will be open. We will stay open. The state impasse is the foundation of our difficulties. There was a similar *Times Courier* story on Carbondale—the problems are not unique to Eastern.

Board of Trustees meeting on Fri., Nov. 13; there will be one new degree program to vote on (Public Relations Program in Communication Studies).

Dean Ornes' retirement: for the remainder of semester: former Dean Hanner will fill in (part-time). We will need to identify continuing coverage through the normal procedure.

Questions?

Abebe—my comment is only related to what I am going to say, and nothing else. I have three questions:

- a. You couldn't find anyone in the College of Sciences to serve?
- b. What does this say about the College of Sciences? Is there such a dearth of leadership in the College of Sciences?
- c. You brought back a former dean whose unflattering opinion about faculty we already know. This came as a surprise to people in the College of Sciences. I'd like to enlist your assurance that you will include people of color in future appointments.

Provost Lord—It is the middle of the term. College of Sciences personnel have classes, obligations, etc. We didn't think we could find someone who could step in at the last minute. She served for ten years, and the college ran quite well for that time. We will identify someone internally to the College to take over that responsibility until the President says that we can move forward with an external search.

Sterling—Do you have a process for Spring for the temporary person?

Lord—IGP has 2 paths: one (the one I have used in the past) says I am to make it known a position is available, invite nominations and self-nominations, and invite comments from all the faculty in the College.

Sterling—You mentioned that the budget situation made it difficult for you to identify someone. I have spoken to a couple of chairs in the College of Sciences who have already said they don't feel they can put their names forward in Spring for the same reason. I would hope to encourage you to find a way to reassure department chairs that they would be able to hire a Unit B person or keep a Unit B person on or in some other way arrange it so a current department chair could put their name forward. I'd have made the same decision, but it does distress me that you didn't call in the department chairs and ask for their advice and recommendations. The outcome might have been the same, but I would have been more comfortable with the process had it been made with more consultation with the chairs in the College of Sciences.

Lord—For the spring, I'll be as creative as I can be for individuals. So far as consulting: I did convene all the chairs (a week ago Monday) and said I have this opportunity and think it is a good idea. I asked if anyone had any comments. No comments were brought forward at that point. This is perhaps not the consultation people wanted, but I did make an effort.

VI. Bylaws Revisions

Tabled.

VII. Future Guests:

November 17th: Chris Dearth, Director of Admissions

December 1st: Bob Martin, Vice President for University Advancement

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 pm.