

11-17-2015

November 17, 2015

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "November 17, 2015" (2015). *Minutes*. 1081.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1081

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 17th, 2015, 2:00 – 3:50 pm
Booth Library Conference Room

Meeting called to order at 2:02 pm

Members present: Abebe, Eckert, Hugo, Ludlow, Ochwa-Echel, Oliver, Robertson, Rosenstein, Scher, Simpson, Sterling, Stowell, Waller, Wharram, Young

Guests present: Gary Aylesworth, Suzann Bennett, Jon Blitz, Cassie Buchman, Lola Burnham, James Conwell, Richard England, Glenn Hild, Jarad Jarmon, Blair Lord, Sally Renaud

Please note: these minutes do not comprise an exact transcript of the meeting.

Welcome

Approval of Minutes from November 3rd, 2015

Motion to approve Abebe/second Stowell; vote 12 yes/0 no/1 abstain. Motion passes.

Sen. Young enters at this time.

III. Committee Reports

A. Executive Committee

1. Chair Robertson's address to the Board of Trustees

Robertson—first a brief timeline of events leading up to today's meeting: after Robertson's address to Board of Trustees, during which he shared a content of Sen. Sterling's proposed resolution, Pres. Glassman asked Robertson for a meeting with Faculty Senate executive committee and Sen. Sterling for early Monday morning. In the meantime, Robertson communicated with campus counsel Rob Miller regarding the possibility of our meeting in Closed Session. Miller responded that he would have a full reply on Monday. At the meeting with the President, we discussed that some of the conversation around the proposed resolution might best be had in a closed session. At that time, Sen. Sterling withdrew his resolution. After the meeting with the President, Robertson posted the agenda for today's meeting. Later on Monday, Rob Miller replied with his advice that if Senate met in Closed Session, we might be in violation of the Open Meetings Act. Robertson did not have time to revise the agenda on Monday, which is why we have a revised agenda being distributed immediately before today's meeting. Apologies for that. Most definitely we will not be going into Closed Session.

Scher—Did Miller share his reasoning behind his decision? To me, it seems unclear whether we are subject to the Open Meetings Act anyway, and whether there are grounds to go into Closed Session. Did he share what does the Open Meetings Act say and who does it apply to?

Robertson—He did, as did the *JG-TC* and an advisor for the *DEN*, who both communicated that they would file a complaint if we went into Closed Session. Both had consulted legal counsel. There were specific examples, including a ruling about the Illinois State University Senate's having gone into Closed Session. They were ruled against. Miller's reading of the law was that, although our Constitution says we may go into Closed Session as long as we comply with Illinois law, we don't have any employees. Therefore there are no grounds for us to go into Closed Session to discuss personnel matters.

Scher—I agree with that interpretation and would probably have voted against going into Closed Session. The broader question, however, is does the law apply to us at all? Are we a public body, according to the law? I'd like to explore whether we are subject to the law and its exceptions.

Robertson—that is clarified in one of the emails sent this afternoon.

Scher—I'm not concerned with the Journal Gazette's interpretation of the law. They are not judges or attorneys, and they have a vested interest in our meetings being open. Rob Miller is the lawyer of the University and, in some sense, he is our lawyer. His interpretation I take much more seriously.

Ludlow—if the Illinois State Faculty Senate was found in violation of the Open Meetings Act, wouldn't faculty senates be subject to the act?

Scher—every legal case is judged on its own merits, on the specifics of that case. We don't know what happened in that case. The reporters have a reason for wanting our meetings to be open; they want to cover our discussions. That's what they do. I just want to know if the law applies to us. I'm not saying that it does or doesn't. My intuitive sense is that it shouldn't be. I'd like to explore that question more for future reference.

Robertson—So you have a printed copy of the revised agenda in front of you.

2. Exec. Committee and Sen. Sterling's meeting with President Glassman, Mon., 8 a.m.

Robertson—We had a very productive discussion with President Glassman, who shared with us his intention to take the referendum seriously and as information that he will factor in going forward. He also communicated to the Senate and the faculty at large that he would continue to communicate and respond as he moved forward. He mentioned ongoing changes in Dean's positions, and he will be overseeing the process by which those changes would be made. He wanted to communicate with us that those decisions would not solely be the Provost's.

Sterling—We also talked about the referendum—what did it mean? were the numbers sufficient to have meaning? Pres. Glassman affirmed that he did think that there was a message that was sent.

Abebe—Before we go to the resolution, I want to ask this question in a direct way, and I would hope my good friend here (referring to Sen. Sterling) would respond to it honestly, as he always does. I am worried and concerned if there is a case of either intimidation or threat behind your withdrawing of the resolution.

Sterling—absolutely not. The president's concern was that we not give the impression that we have boxed him in by giving specific policy results in response to the referendum, and how this would be perceived by the campus community and people outside the university, including potential students and so on. But specifically, he assured me that he understood the concerns and that it was his intention to take specific steps in response to those concerns, especially in regard to the choice of interim deans of the College of Sciences and presumably next semester the College of Arts and Humanities as well. I withdrew the resolution because I thought the President had committed himself, if not specifically and in detail to doing exactly what the resolution called for, at least to take steps that coincide with the spirit of what I was concerned about in making the resolution in the first place.

Abebe—I'm not so much concerned about the result. I'm concerned about the process, and it affects all of us and that's why I asked that question. I think you understand.

Young—I'm glad Sen. Sterling circulated the resolution when he did. It gave us all time to think about it and have conversations about it. I had come to the conclusion that I did not want to box the President in. The resolution that I would want to support would be a resolution of confidence in President Glassman's leadership. I'm most impressed by the way he has gone about meeting people in all the departments, the way he presented himself when he spoke to the Senate. I see this as offering a consistent leadership style that is open and invites feedback and collaboration. What we want to convey to the community is that we are a great institution. We are providing a wonderful education for the citizens in Illinois We operate in a responsible way. We are not looking to be adversarial in our relationships between faculty and students, faculty and administration. We are looking for ways to pull on the oars at the same time. Obviously we are going to have disagreements, which is why it was so helpful that Grant articulated things as clearly as he did and gave us a chance to think about it.

3. Resolution

Ludlow—In the spirit of that, Sen. Young, after we met with the President on Monday and talked afterward, and after having conversations with other faculty, I propose this resolution in the spirit of providing the kinds of reassurances that you are talking about—collaboration with the President—and in the spirit of assuring the faculty that Senate is not going to just put out the results of the referendum and be quiet about it. We will continue to represent the faculty on this matter. That's one of the things people have been saying to me: "now what? now what are you going to do?"

Abebe—I am not against any declaration that states that we will work with the administration of the university. That's why we are here. That's what Senate does. This gives the impression that we had other plans and that we had to correct, to manage to change course. I don't think it's necessary.

Ludlow—After I wrote it and sent it to the Executive Committee, I said the same thing. I see this as having more of a performative function, to reassure people, than a declarative function to define. And perhaps people don't want to pass a resolution like that, and I am OK with that.

Abebe—I think the way we are going to show that the message has been received and that we are going to continue to look for changes is by what we do from this point on. Not by passing this sort of resolution that affirms what we are already doing. I'm here to represent faculty. And I'm also here to argue for the truth, if I can find it, and praise the administration when it needs to be praised. So to state what I am already doing and what I'm here for, I don't see that as being necessary, unless it adds something that I am not doing right now or intend to do.

Waller—I don't think this resolution says anything. Our job, as I understand it, is to make recommendation to the administration. We do that by proposing resolutions. I think we would be remiss if we did not pass resolutions making specific recommendations to the President on the basis of this vote. That's our job. I don't like it. This isn't a topic that I want to have a conversation about, but that's what they voted on us to do. We represent the faculty. They have spoken very very clearly. We need to make a recommendation to the President on that basis.

Scher—I don't think we need to pass a resolution to communicate to the President that 2/3 of the people who voted on this referendum voted no confidence in the Provost. That is very well known to the President; it's been in the paper, it was sent in an email, and he met with the Executive Committee yesterday. This resolution doesn't say anything. It reiterates what the vote was. But I don't think we need to do anything right at this moment. I think if

the President doesn't act at some time on this, we should remind him of the resolution and that some action is called for. As Sen. Young said, we should allow the President to take action before directing him to do something. Rosenstein—Are we going to have a discussion about the results of the referendum? to talk about the actual information that has been presented?

Robertson—Yes, during the elections committee report.

Waller—The President knows that the results of the referendum are. Now he must decide what to do about them. He is going to receive advice from lots of people. One of the people he will receive recommendations from is this body. We should give suggestions, same as other people will, in light of the vote. We can't force the President to do anything. We can just make recommendations.

Stowell—I think this resolution affirms to the faculty that we've listened to them, we've heard their concerns and will move forward through continued collaboration with the President and other motions we may make. There may be more specific directions that we put forward. This is important because there are two sides that we interface with. One is to affirm to the faculty that we've heard your concerns. We don't want to not do anything. But we can do other things in addition to this resolution. It says "continue to serve its constituents."

Ochwa-Echel—If I heard you right, the executive committee discussed this with the President and that's why the Senate is starting with this resolution. So if what you are saying is true, I don't see why we should have this again, since we already presented the results to him. So unless what you are saying is not true and that is why.
<laughter>

Sterling—I agree that we do not need to do anything at all to convey to the President what happened in the referendum. The President is quite aware of what the vote was. He has drawn conclusions about what the vote means. I also don't think we need specific resolutions laying out specific details regarding what he does next. I'm sympathetic with Sen. Scher that if at some future time it appears that nothing is happening, then we can revisit that. On the front end, the petition was brought to us by faculty. It was not our petition. It was our job, according to our Constitution, to carry out the vote. This resolution says that. But I am hearing from faculty who say, "OK, but now that the results are in, Faculty Senate ought to at least say something about what it means." There is the appearance that, on the front end, we went out of our way to say, "this is not our resolution." I don't want the perception to be that on the back end, we only transmit the results of the vote, that this has nothing to do with us. I would like us to pass a resolution that is a little stronger than this resolution, because this one really does just say, "here are the results and will work with the President." It does not say that we have any concerns that the President would need to address, or we have any ideas about what the President could do. I would be more comfortable if we could go to other faculty and say, "yes, Faculty Senate heard you" and recognizes that they said something. So far, we haven't done that. Anything we say would be controversial, of course, it would be an interpretation. But I would like it if we could say, "yes, we think these numbers are not just numbers. We think they say something."

Waller—For me, this is not personal and it is not about one person. It's about respecting the people who voted for us. They have clearly spoken, and we represent them. Whether I have particular views on this topic is not directly relevant. My job is to make the voice of the faculty clear.

Rosenstein—I want to return to the results of the referendum. The language we are using here is "faculty have clearly spoken, faculty have clearly spoken." Well, 50% of the faculty have spoken and only 60% of that group voted "no confidence." Of the entire faculty, only 39% actually said "no confidence." When you look at the entire faculty body, 60% either voted "yes confidence" or no opinion because we didn't take the time to vote. How can we take 60% of 50% and say that is clearly "no confidence," but not consider 60% of the whole body as saying "confidence"? Only 57% of faculty at the university even thought this was a worthy discussion. Who are the people who are going to go out and vote? The people who have an opinion. We keep saying "the faculty have spoken," and they have no confidence. I don't know if I agree with that. I am hearing from people that this might be more of a personal than an institutional issue. They're wondering why we're looking at one provost and not others, given what we know about events going on at our university. I think there's a lot of things we're really not talking about, and I don't know if it's because they are uncomfortable topics. I'm not really sure why we're not approaching all of this in various ways. If I'm looking at this as a researcher, I can say, statistically, that 60% of the people who voted don't have confidence. We all have to remember that not everyone on campus is speaking about this the same way.

Robertson—Pres. Glassman acknowledged all this. What he expressed was that there is a scale between a completely unambiguous result and there being a fair amount of ambiguity. He expressed that there was information there; it was not unambiguous, but it was still useful and valid. He understood the limitations of the voting process and that only a certain percentage of people will choose to participate. I will add my personal opinion that some of the people who did not participate chose not to because they had only an A or a B option and had no opportunity to submit a comment that was either affirmative or negative. They could have voted and then submitted a comment, but there was no option C. I think we all understand that.

Scher—The interpretation that those who did not choose to vote either have no opinion or have confidence is problematic. There are any number of reasons why people might not vote. Some people may have had no opinion. Some may have had a very strong neutral opinion. The number who voted no confidence is a large number to vote no confidence in someone. And there are a number of interpretations for why someone might not vote.

Rosenstein—Right, I withdraw that comment. We don't know why they didn't vote. But we know they didn't vote.

Robertson—<reading the numbers from the previously emailed report> 261 did not vote; 113 voted confidence.

18.5% voted yes confidence. 236 voted no confidence. That's 67.6% of those who voted and 38.7% of all eligible voters. In any democracy, you are going to get a certain percent of people who are just not going to participate.

Waller—I respectfully disagree with Sen. Rosenstein. Decisions are made by those who show up, and they did have a third option, which is doing nothing. So I don't consider these results ambiguous. I think this is a very clear result.

Young—I think we made a mistake when we chose not to put an abstention vote on the ballot. If we had done that, we would have less ambiguity. I don't agree with Senator Waller that the results are so compellingly unambiguous that it becomes our responsibility to make specific recommendations. I would prefer Sen. Ludlow's resolution.

Oliver—Do we know, of the 77 eligible administrative voters, how many voted yes?

Stowell—No. We didn't try to crack that shell. I ran two possible "worst case" scenarios. If all 77 administrators voted yes, that leaves about 30 to 40 faculty who voted yes, and all the rest would have been no. In that case, "overwhelming faculty disapproval." The other worst case scenario is that all 77 administrators voted no, which meant that 113 faculty voted yes confidence, which still leaves us with fewer faculty members voting yes confidence than no confidence.

Sterling—First, I'm not clear how it would have helped things if there had been a third option, an option to abstain. I assume the vast majority of those who didn't vote would, had they voted, have chosen "abstain." That would not change my perception of the outcome of the vote. If they cast no vote, I assume they had no strong opinion, given the circumstances of this referendum and that they had ample opportunity to cast a vote. Furthermore, lumping all non-voters into one voting category does not tell us anything about the vote. The last presidential election, I don't remember seeing any headlines that said, "Obama loses in a landslide because, if you took all the eligible voters in the United States and assume that you could lump them in with his opponent, well, then it was a disastrous defeat. Well, no. The people that do not vote, by and large, do not have a strong opinion one way or another. I, too, have heard the charge that this is a "small number of disgruntled faculty who have a personal grudge." I hope, if nothing else, the results of the referendum are unambiguous in that sense. There were 231 no confidence votes; that cannot reasonably be a "handful" or a "small group" or a clique or whatever. That can't reasonably be just people in one specific college or one specific department are dissatisfied. It seems to me that the most reasonable interpretation of the results is that an overwhelming number of the people who have strong opinions on the matter have no confidence in the current provost. If this is too ambiguous, we might as well revoke this part of our constitution. This is the highest voter turnout that I've ever seen in any faculty vote, and this majority is one of the biggest percentage majorities I've seen. If this doesn't reach our standard for "meaningful results," no referendum ever will.

Scher—People who didn't vote quite literally abstained. What it means—why they did that—cannot be determined. I agree with Sterling who said that these are the best results we are going to get.

Young—it can be determined in at least one case because the *DEN* published the comments of the chair of Economics yesterday. Although he didn't say whether or how he voted, as I recall, he did say that he had reservations about the vote because of the timing. He thought that at this time, with all that is going on, it is not good for our university to have stories going out about how we are divided. I accept the logic Grant has put before us—it's a strong and compelling logic and I have no disagreement with it—but from anecdotal evidence, perhaps even people to did vote no confidence have concerns about the timing. I certainly do. How this is relevant to Sen. Waller's suggestion that we have to follow up and come up with a specific resolution is that I think we don't need to. The vote has been taken. You had your meeting with Pres. Glassman. I think, if we are going to resolve something, we should resolve along the lines of this resolution, that we will continue to do our very best to help bring the campus together and make communications work; we don't need to be more prescriptive than that.

Motion to approve the resolution: Young; 2nd Stowell.

Robertson—After my Board of Trustees statement, a Board member shared in a very direct statement that he did not appreciate the timing of this vote. I think we should make some sort of resolution, in the spirit of moving forward collaboratively, without making demands, and including as many voices as possible.

Waller—We cannot demand, we can only request and advise, which is our job.

Robertson—I would like to add that we are in open session today in part because we apparently have to be. There were concerns that our discussion today would have been damaging to the university and damaging to the process of moving forward.

Abebe—I have heard comments from you and now through you from the President and a Board member about the timing, as expressed here. People could have stopped this a long time ago, if they wanted to. So I am not accepting that explanation. I am not accepting that comeback at the Senate or at the faculty of the institution.

This could have been stopped a long time ago if people had wanted to stop it. That's my comment.

Oliver—In the language of the resolution, can we use words like recommendations? Are we a recommending body?

Robertson—we are an advisory body.

Oliver—Can we make a recommendation based off the data, versus simply restating what our faculty colleagues assume we are here to do?

Discussion on the resolution's language ensued: several amendments were suggested, and each was voted on separately.

They are presented here in the order in which Senate considered them.

Abebe amendment, moved by Abebe, seconded by Rosenstein; failed on roll call vote 5 yes/7 no/2 abstain

yes: Abebe, Eckert, Rosenstein, Wharram, Young

no: Hugo, Ludlow, Oliver, Robertson, Scher, Sterling, Waller

abstain: Ochwa-Echel, Stowell

AMENDMENT: After the first para., delete everything in the resolution and insert the following: "Faculty Senate hereby accepts the results as they occurred." Period.

Rosenstein amendment 1, moved by Rosenstein, seconded by Ludlow; failed on roll call vote 5 yes/9 no/ 0 abstain

yes: Hugo, Ludlow, Robertson, Rosenstein, Young

no: Abebe, Eckert, Ochwa-Echel, Oliver, Scher, Sterling, Stowell, Waller, Wharram

AMENDMENT: In para. 3, change "results showed 67.6% of voters reporting no confidence in the Provost;" to "results showed 67.6% of voters, which is 39% of the total faculty, reporting no confidence in the Provost"

Rosenstein amendment 2, moved by Rosenstein, seconded by Scher; passed on roll call vote 11 yes/2 no/1 abstain

yes: Eckert, Hugo, Ludlow, Ochwa-Echel, Robertson, Scher, Sterling, Stowell, Waller, Wharram, Young

no: Oliver, Rosenstein

abstain: Abebe

AMENDMENT: In the last para., change "serve its constituency by maintaining open" to "serve its constituency by advising and maintaining open"

Robertson amendment, moved by Robertson, seconded by Sterling; passed on roll call vote 7 yes/4 no/3 abstain

yes: Hugo, Ludlow, Robertson, Scher, Sterling, Stowell, Young

no: Ochwa-Echel, Oliver, Rosenstein, Waller

abstain: Abebe, Eckert, Wharram

AMENDMENT: In the last paragraph, change "committee will continue to serve its constituency by advising and maintaining" to "committee has heard the voice of the constituency who voted in the resolution and will continue to serve this constituency by advising and maintaining."

Final, approved resolution, passed on roll call vote 10 yes/1 no/3 abstain

yes: Eckert, Hugo, Ludlow, Ochwa-Echel, Robertson, Scher, Sterling, Stowell, Wharram, Young

no: Waller

abstain: Abebe, Oliver, Rosenstein

WHEREAS EIU's Faculty Senate fulfilled its obligation to its constituency, the faculty, and held a referendum on the petition regarding a vote of confidence/no confidence in the Provost; and

WHEREAS that referendum garnered a 57% response rate among eligible voters; and

WHEREAS the referendum results showed 67.6% of voters reporting no confidence in the Provost;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate and the Senate Executive committee has heard the voice of the constituency who voted in the resolution and will continue to serve this constituency by advising and maintaining open communication with President Glassman about this matter, inviting faculty feedback and responses regarding this matter, and representing faculty concerns to the President, Board of Trustees, and other entities on campus as the matter is addressed.

B. Nominations Committee

Rosenstein—no report at this time. I am working with Sen. Eckert and the committee on committees regarding some questions.

Ludlow—Were we going to send out an email for a committee report?

Rosenstein—The intent was to do that. The question is still open.

C. Elections Committee

Stowell reporting—We had a successful election of a representative from LCBAS for a member of the Academic Program Elimination Committee. The winner of that election was Frances Murphy. She has been notified.

D. Faculty-Student Relations Committee
no report

E. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee
no report

F. Awards Committee
Mendez Award Recipient

Hugo—We had so many strong people who were nominated for this award. The people who were nominated made our job extremely difficult. Our awardee is Dr. Linda Ghent from the Dept. of Economics.

Motion to confirm that decision, moved by Hugo, seconded by Abebe. Motion passed unanimously.

Oliver—Please invite recipient to submit a short bio and photo for our Faculty Senate webpage.

G. Faculty Forum Committee
no report

H. Budget Transparency Committee

Sterling—We still have not received the information I requested from VP McCann, so I will be nudging him again.

I. Constitution and By-Laws Review Committee

Scher—I had a meeting with Rob Miller, University Council. We revised the language that the faculty passed that was not approved by Pres. Perry regarding the Council for Faculty Research. That change was simply to take out any reference to the EIU UPI contract. If Senate agrees this is appropriate, I will run it by CFR members and will bring it back to Senate. My interpretation, unfortunately, is that we will have to go through amending procedure again; we can include this on spring election cycle.

Robertson—Could you read the language to us?

Scher—Section V in our list of committees: “Council on Faculty Research (CFR) shall have the following responsibilities:

A. When appropriate, CFR shall review University policies with respect to research and creative activity and recommend changes to administrative procedures to the President and/or Vice President of Academic Affairs; B. CFR shall consider proposals by faculty for research and creative activity projects that fall under CFR’s purview and make recommendations to the appropriate academic administrator for funding of such projects.”

Motion to accept this revision Scher, seconded by Ludlow; vote passed unanimously.

J. Committee on Committees

Eckert—At this point, I do not have information to report to the whole Senate with recommendations. The idea is to identify committees that we can delete. If a committee has an IGP attached to it, then officially we cannot change it.

There are some committees that, at this time, do not seem to exist. There are also committees that officially are on the books but do not seem to be constituted. I will send information and recommendations for a future meeting. Some of this will require action on the part of the Senate.

Rob—Should we budget some time in next meeting to discuss this?

Eckert—yes.

Scher—Do we have an active Textbook Rental advisory committee?

Eckert—Yes, supposedly. I’ve received information from the VPSA that the Textbook Rental Advisory Committee is “to be announced.” Even the past meetings are “to be announced.” This means that the committee has ceased to exist, but it is supposed to be potentially revived. I think the Committee on Committees will suggest that it should be encouraged to be revived.

Scher—I am prompted to ask that question because of a particular thing I’ve been dealing with with TRS. I think we need to have a broader discussion on campus around TRS and electronic materials. I’m in the process of choosing a new textbook for one of my classes, and trying to work out student access to electronic materials with the TRS system in place is not easy, if you are at all concerned about what the students are actually spending. For \$85 for each student, I could get them a really great package, but I am not willing to do that. As the publishing industry moves more and more to online/electronic materials, the system we have in place for how students get access to materials needs to be reconsidered or reconfigured in some way. We’ve been doing the same thing in the twenty years I’ve been here, and a lot has changed in twenty years.

Stowell—There was an ad hoc textbook electronic materials committee a few years ago. There is stuff there they could start with.

Scher—In my experience, there is no standard way of doing this. For example, I suggested that for less money we could get the students the ebook instead of the hard copy. Then they would have access to both the text and the

electronic materials. But we would have to pay for the licensure every semester, and TRS said that was not possible. They wouldn't even discuss it. I am hoping to reopen that conversation between textbook rental and the sales rep. But this kind of thing is going to become more and more important as time goes on.

Rosenstein—I would agree. There are IGPs that define representation from a variety of campus sources on these committees. The questions you have raised are also important for working with our students with disabilities. If we had access to electronic materials, we would decrease the pressure on CATS to create materials for each particular disability.

K. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics
no report

IV. Communications

Proposed Resolution for Senate Debate authored by Senator Teshome Abebe

Abebe—I anticipated that there would be quite a bit of debate on resolutions this afternoon, so I have a few things I wish to say in support of the resolution before I lay it out in front of you. Given our chance for a referendum, the faculty sent a message last week. Having done so, however, now they need to be certain about the future, and our leadership in that regard is going to be very key. If we were the ones who initiated the petition, we would have been forced to ask a very important question before we embarked on that task. That question is what would we look like after the referendum? Failing to answer that question would not serve EIU and its faculty very well. So, I state it again. What took place in the last few weeks is, in my view, a rendering asunder of a very important relationship, the relationship of the faculty with its most important advocate and spokesperson. And until a new vision and a new horizon appears before us, we do not want to be disenchanted or disillusioned, and start looking backwards. Several problems and concerns popped up in the course of the conversations and debates over the past few weeks regarding the failures—perceived failures—in the system of administrative evaluations. This resolution therefore is a natural progression of events and actions and is intended to address one mention of the prevailing issues. And there will be more resolutions in the future, I'm certain. We should advance it with the hope that the president will read it carefully and that he will take appropriate action as he deems necessary. Among the perceived weaknesses of the evaluation system include: it has failed to address visible weaknesses of administrators at all levels; it is a relic of the past and has not adjusted to the demands of the time—today it is relatively easy to gather input from a wide range of constituencies rather than just from close staff members and close associates only; it suffers from an inherent weakness of possible collusion or reciprocal gratitude between the administrator and the employee; it completely ignores the faculty, who are the direct stakeholders and impact-bearers of the decisions of provosts and deans; some administrators are not evaluated on a yearly basis, and the 360 is only done every three years; those with the capacity for the most damage are evaluated least. As a consequence, the resolution I offer reads as follows:

Acknowledging that the University has employed “Performance Evaluation of Administrative Staff”, aka, the 360 model of personnel evaluation, over the past many years as stipulated in IGP # 31; and

Noting that the faculty perceptions of the 360 model of performance evaluation is that it has not served the institution as intended, and, as a consequence, is further perceived as being unfit for purpose; and

Recognizing that the manner in which the evaluation method is being used may have created or has the potential to create the prevalence of reciprocal gratitude among administrative staff, namely, the “employee” and the “supervisor”.

It is resolved that the Faculty Senate advise the President of the University to significantly revise and improve or identify and implement an alternative system of “Performance Evaluation of Administrative Staff” that is transparent, effective, and less open to misuse.

I would be happy to take questions.

Scher—Do you have any suggestions for alternative evaluation methods?

Abebe—I didn't want to identify those in the interest of not--

Scher—I don't think that should be in the resolution. It's just that 360 has benefit of, at least in theory, getting feedback from everyone who might have contact with the employee, so I'm curious about what other things might be out there, and I haven't done any research on it.

Abebe—The 360 is only part of the administrative evaluations system here. Every year, administrators who are between zero and five years—in other words, after five years—are evaluated yearly based on a number of objectives that have been outlined in IGP 31. But 360 kicks in only once every three years. The intent of the 360 is open, clear, nonpersonal type of conversation among employees who are being evaluated along with their

supervisor. I have not looked at other methods that are capable of serving similar to the 360, but I'm sure the administrators know there are a number of them out there.

Rosenstein—I think this is a thoughtful response to the vote we just had. I am not familiar with the evaluations. If anyone can shed light, that would be helpful. Is the 360 designed to happen only every three years, so you get perspective on a stretch of performance? or could it be used more frequently? If it does in fact include a variety of perspectives and is anonymous and serves a good purpose, is it designed only to be used every three years? Does anybody know?

Abebe—That is the way it's been used here. But remember that there are annual evaluations of administrative staff. But the 360 is supposed to include these conversations. For example, when you evaluated your chair, I am sure they have employed the 360, and you have responded to some request for information. And that is the only time you have been asked to respond to the performance of your chair. That happens also with the deans. So up until the first five years, every administrator is supposed to be evaluated. My concern, and I think the concern of a lot of people on campus is that, while the 360 may have worked and the evaluations have done their job of acquiring information about those who are being evaluated, the specific concern we should have is that the 360 particularly does not include faculty in the evaluation process. We can not evaluate deans. We have no opportunity to evaluate deans. When this was initiated, it was argued that it is very difficult to gather information from faculty—this was quite a while back. Today it is much easier to send a survey form. For example, the provost could ask individual faculty members about the performance of a particular dean—not just chair, but dean. I think that is the most important concern here. It is possible that the President could look at this and say we could include the faculty to have an input on the performance of deans. That would be an improvement on the current system that we have in place.

Motion to approve the resolution by Abebe, seconded by Rosenstein.

Young—I have a question: administrative staff, then, includes everyone from president down to what level? It includes the chairs?

Abebe—It includes the chairs because they become administrators the minute they are appointed as chairs.

Young—There is faculty input where the chairs are concerned.

Abebe—True, which is why I say [the process] omits the faculty with regard to evaluation of deans or vice presidents. We [faculty] evaluate chairs every three years, but not the deans or the vice presidents.

Rosenstein—Even that, if you look at this from a performative perspective, an annual review like our portfolios allow us to see patterns in our performance. If that's not happening with our chairs, where is the checkpoint for them? It would be valuable for them to have something. Even after you are tenured, you still submit a written accounting.

Abebe—You are evaluated every year.

Rosenstein—And every semester, by our students.

Abebe—And by an administrator every year.

Rosenstein—We could perhaps see patterns of behavior in our administrators that we could address is a formative way before it ever gets to a no-confidence issue. It could be preventative.

Scher—The 360 degree feedback is not only way administrators are evaluated. It is possible that there might be other ways that are more parallel to the portfolio system. According to IGP 31, an administrator is supposed to be evaluated at least every third year.—all administrators. So if they are not being, that's a big problem. It says here (reading from IGP 31) annually from zero to five years, every other year six through ten years, and from the eleventh year on, every third year. It sounds to me that the problem is not specifically with the 360 system but with who is considered in the 360 degrees.

Abebe—That is debatable. That's not the focus of this resolution. The focus is to have a meaningful evaluation system that includes the stakeholders and the impact bearers. This resolution gives great latitude to the president of the university. He may have ideas about what evaluation system to put into place.

Stowell—Do you want to be more specific about the role of faculty in the evaluation system? I'm not getting that from the current language. If that's really what we want to say, that the stakeholders are the faculty, we might want to say that.

Abebe—I would be very happy if we could include that.

Ochwa-Echel—Can you talk about paragraph three, “has the potential to create reciprocal”—can you talk to that, and give some specific examples?

Abebe—I can give you an example where, hypothetically, a vice president is evaluated by deans. That vice president's evaluation is positive in return, of course, for the vice president's evaluation of the dean. This is the way it is set up right now. We are saying there is a potential for reciprocal gratitude: you do something for me and I will do something for you. These things are not stated, and they don't need to be stated. So, there is a potential for that to occur.

Oliver—Maybe toward the last sentence, add in faculty involvement.

General wordsmithing leads to: “that is transparent, effective, less open to misuse, and includes faculty involvement.” Abebe—I see that as a friendly amendment. I would only add that I think our actions speak well with regard to the faculty, who have just gone through a very important experience. What we do is how we show that we are listening to them, which is why this is an important step. It is also an important step because we are not dictating, and we are simply advising. So we are identifying a problem and saying here is a solution. Oftentimes, the Senate talks about issues and identifies a problem and there is no solution suggested. Here is one solution, and I think this could be viewed quite positively.

Resolution passed on roll call vote: 11 yes/0 no/3 abstain

yes: Abebe, Eckert, Ludlow, Ochwa-Echel, Oliver, Robertson, Rosenstein, Sterling, Stowell, Waller, Wharram

abstain: Hugo, Scher, Young

Final, approved resolution:

Acknowledging that the University has employed “Performance Evaluation of Administrative Staff”, aka, the 360 model of personnel evaluation, over the past many years as stipulated in IGP # 31; and

Noting that the faculty perceptions of the 360 model of performance evaluation is that it has not served the institution as intended, and, as a consequence, is further perceived as being unfit for purpose; and

Recognizing that the manner in which the evaluation method is being used may have created or has the potential to create the prevalence of reciprocal gratitude among administrative staff, namely, the “employee” and the “supervisor”.

It is resolved that the Faculty Senate advise the President of the University to significantly revise and improve or identify and implement an alternative system of “Performance Evaluation of Administrative Staff” that is transparent, effective, less open to misuse, and includes faculty involvement.

V. Provost’s report

no report

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted,

Jeannie Ludlow, acting recorder