9-13-2016

September 13, 2016

Faculty Senate

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

I.   Attendance and Welcome   2:00 PM
        - Welcome – Chair Robertson
        - Senators in Attendance = T. Abebe, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, N. Hugo, B. Hung, J. Oliver, J.
        Robertson, A. Rosenstein, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, J. Waller, C. Wharram, B. Young
        - Guests in Attendance = J. Blitz (Chem), B. Lord (AA), S. Musbaum (DEN)

II.   Approval of Minutes from September 6th, 2016   2:00-2:05 PM
        - Motion to Approve = Sterling
        - Discussion? = none
        - Motion Seconded = Eckert
        - In favor = Abebe, Bruns, Eckert, Gosse, Hugo, Oliver, Robertson, Rosenstein, Sterling, Stowell, Wharram Young
        - Opposed = none
        - Abstentions = Corrigan, Hung, Waller

III.   Committee Reports
        1. Executive Committee   2:05-2:15 PM
            a. Update from Friday - September 9th CUPB Meeting:
                -   Robertson – Senator Stowell and I reviewed the Faculty Senate resolution for CUPB
                    consideration, and summarized previous discussions related to the resolution. Jack Cruikshank
                    made a motion to reconstitute CUPB to potentially reduce the # of members. I seconded that
                    motion. Since then we have had conversations about a proposal that will be made to CUPB for
                    discussion related to the motion. Final decisions need to be made regarding reducing
                    representatives to reduce the overall size of CUPB (29 members) – much larger than the
                    research-recommended number of no more than 12 for committee/group size. A proposal will
                    be made to CUPB for their discussion/consideration. We will do our part to move that
                    proposal forward. Jack Cruikshank has specific ideas about this as well. The CUPB executive
                    committee has come up with a list of proposed bylaw changes. They were attached to the Aug
                    22 faculty senate meeting docs. They have been given to the full CUPB for consideration.

            b. Elections Committee – Stowell – we received the name of a volunteer (Julie Dietz) to serve on CGS for
                one semester. No other volunteer names were received.
                * Motion – Abebe, 2nd (Wharram) – No further discussion – Unanimously approval
                Nominations Committee – Rosenstein - no further changes needed.
                Robertson – you (Rosenstein) and I need to clear up Enrollment Management committee membership
                with Billie Rawlings to finalize the committee. She has a different list of members than we do.

            c. All other committee reports will be suspended until the September 20th Faculty Senate session.

IV.   Full Senate returns to 4440   2:15 PM-
        1. Discussion of President's Sep. 7th address and "Vitalization Project"
                -   Nominations for faculty to be involved in the workgroups will go directly to the president. The
                    process is highlighted on the project's website - https://www.eiu.edu/vitalizeproject/ .
                    Nominations can be submitted straight to the president. He did not go into great detail about
                    specific components of the project, but he did provide clarity on a few points = VPs will not
                    be on individual workgroups. The CUPB executive committee will oversee individual work
                    groups, including #1 student services, #2 technology, #3 enrollment management, #4 EIU
                    athletics, #5 Facilities, #6 Marketing and University Branding, #7 Academic Programs – of
                    particular concern to this group. Academic and visioning workgroups also involved – with
                    slightly different tasks. In short, the president's goal is to work on our faculty-student ratio
                    (*where it is now compared to where he would like it to be – 16:1 by FA 2018). He also wants
                    to see an increase in staff-student ratio. Preferably improved through growing the student body
                    rather than staff cuts. This is the thrust of his vitalization project - grow the student body. In

his opinion, we cannot depend on Springfield long-term for reliable funding, we must increase our own financial independency.

- Robertson – I want to spread the word about the importance on serving on these work groups to faculty colleagues. First I want to clarify a few quotes that I made on the project that were printed in the DEN. We need to make sure that the 'right voices' serve on the work groups. Depending on the actions of the work groups, this process could reshape our university. I genuinely feel that the president has good intentions for the university with this process. Realistically, some changes are probably needed on how we conduct our business as a university. Let's have a conversation about your initial impression/thoughts of the project.
- B. Young – I like the term 'vital' – it has philosophical meaning – it is what we (as a university) are all about – the mission of the Senate is to support the central mission of the university – to educate the students – it behooves us to come to our own consensus on what 'educating students' means and to clearly articulate the meaning to the work groups of the 'vitalizing' project. Our university has been challenged by an abrupt and brutal financial period. Maybe our philosophy colleagues can assist us with how we 'frame' and 'position' our argument around educating students and how that must include the core disciplines here on campus.
- Rosenstein – it's interesting that Pres Glassman is working to revitalize the university but not with Faculty Senate at the forefront. He has aligned with CUPB initially, not Faculty Senate. Reviewing the timeline, Pres Glassman is asking for recommendations in a variety of areas, with financial variables at the heart of each. Adds more comments about the process. These plans clearly focus on financial variables – enrollment and tuition revenue. This looks and sounds like a 'pruning' process rather than 'vitalization'.
- Hung – part of the reason for this may be how the project is structured – 1/7th of the project is focused on academic programming, 6/7th is not. 1 to 7 focuses on dollars – cost/benefits of academic programming. 8 & 9 focus on a broad-based academic vision of programming future. Not clear how the two sides (business and education) are meshing together. Not seeing much articulation on how the two sides will blend together
- Gosse – the difficulty is determining a break-even point to support programs. The number (break-even point) is somewhere in this process.
- Rosenstein – President has retained control over populating the committees. Very excited to see the initial structure, but then began to understand the implications.
- Gosse – question on working group makeup
- Robertson – comments on not serving on the CUPB executive committee this academic year. I think it would be appropriate to recommend who serves on the working groups to the President.
- Waller – concern - at least five of the committees will be identifying cuts. The president will get five separate reports with cuts suggestions, but with limited advising to each other. Maybe an order of recommended cuts would be helpful, synthesized into a single final report.
- Hung – this process might fall under the 'liaison committee'?
- Waller – guidance on a starting point would be helpful
- Bruns – transparency is critical to whether or not this process will be successful. I am concerned about the vagueness of how workgroups will be populated. Outsourcing is mentioned – almost always results in lower quality for more cost. Concerned about the fact that outsourcing is being considered. Faculty/student and student/staff ratios are also a focus. What about administrator/student ratios? That is a concern as well.
- Abebe – I have a little different view. Please don't consider this negligent policy advocacy. The president has chosen how to organize this process. He has chosen CUPB executive committee to partner with. However, this is the same organization that we feel has been ineffective. That is key to me. Second - our constitution stipulates that our most significant concerns are focused on curricula issues. Our focus should be on whether the president follows the constitution closely, and making sure that eventually (since we are an ombudsman) we can make public statements at the end of the process. In the meantime, we can encourage participation but I would recommend that faculty senate does not directly participate in this process. I don't recommend the process, and we may have to make public statements at the end of the process.
- Hung – please elaborate the last point more clearly. I am hearing you say that if we participate, it may create complications if we need to make public statements at the end of the process.

- Abebe – precisely - we should avoid participating directly – if we do, our actions in the process may contradict our statements at the end of the process. Someone is going to get harmed by this process. What I am suggestion may not be a good strategy, but we may want to consider it.
- Abebe – 75% of the president's speech is about marketing the institution. I still did not pull out a vision from his speech. In the absence of a vision from him (maybe an agenda with political implications). I'm not sure I wish to participate in the process. Maybe a radical position to take?
- Abebe – if all else fails, I don't think we should go along with the notion that programs should 'go on watch' – the moment we do this the program gets killed. No student will sign up. This process usually leads to decreased enrollment and reduces student confidence in academic programs if they realize the program is being reviewed.
- Wharram – I am concerned about this 'flow chart' based process. Concerned with 'watch lists', 'outsourcing', etc. It feels like the emphasis is on 'elimination', which will circumvent innovative thinking and proactive action on the part of faculty and staff. The stress seems to focus on the 'elimination' rather than 'innovation'.
- Waller – agreed – the reason we are doing this is that we do have to cut back. That's the only plausible interpretation of this initiate.
- Rosenstein – a bit of a mixed message. It echoes what Rep Phillips mentioned last year, which was not completely accurate ('nothing innovative happening at EIU'). There were new programs being developed and innovations happening at EIU. And now we are going to turn around and cut other programs? Lots of mixed messaging.
- Sterling – I took part in the program analysis process a few years ago. That process failed to achieve the goals of the initiative. Three reasons why it failed – and they have already been brought up here today about the new process. One reason is that some people went into the process with a goal to protect their area from cuts. That produced different, inconsistent visions of the university within the various subcommittees. When the process was completed, there was no coordination to prioritize and apply recommendations. No prioritizing - nothing. Suppose that the 'students-services' sub-committee sees their job as to protect this area from cuts, while a different subcommittee seriously looks for opportunities that could be eliminated. Recommendations are submitted by both subcommittees but from different approaches to the task. I don't see any guarantee that subcommittees of this project will approach their task in a consistent manner, with no consistent guarantee of the coordination and prioritization of input from the various subcommittees. This critical step may be left up to the President, who would have been provided with reports derived from inconsistent approaches from different committees. When it is all said and done, there is no guarantee that input will have been consistently coordinated, collected, and prioritized.
- Hugo – is it possible to request further information about how the working groups will be populated? – for example - the nomination process for the working groups? Based on expertise? Based on experience? Concerns about bias and how participant selection.
- Rosenstein – when CUPB conducted program analysis, how many members on each group/subcommittee?
- Sterling – 8-10 per group
- Bruns – in order for this process to work, we must be partners in the process. If we start to feel like there is an end result already intended, and this is just going through the motions, this could become destructive.
- Hung – paradoxically, the problem with the suggested committee/working group population process is that it still may be the best way to combat 'turf protection'. The President has the power to populate each committee. However, the power can swing the other direction. I think there is great potential in the process, but also pitfalls. I feel like we need to at least 'wait and see' after sharing these concerns about potential pitfalls with President Glassman, before the committees are populated. So when the nominations and working groups are announced, and any problems do arise, we can at least say that 'we did advise you'.
- Hung - Another point is that I do like the committee size of each working group (4-7 people). I think the inclusion of students on many of the working groups is commendable. Because of the small numbers, it will be difficult for equal rep on each working group, which could be both positive and negative. Note - I don't see a restriction on each working group to solicit feedback/ideas from the campus community. Becoming a channel rather than a 'lone voice'- bringing opinion of the campus to each smaller committee would be important. I agree there is

a negative perception of what the process will probably point to. However, at least there is one possible outcome (1 of 4) of 'increased investment' in programs.

- Waller – I do think the legitimacy of the process, to some extent, is undermined because the President will be picking who serves on each committee. This could result in claims that the process was 'rigged' from the beginning.
- Young – I think this body should go on record demanding involvement in populating workgroup #7 – the 'academic programs' working group. It should be faculty, including chairs and deans. It would be inappropriate for members outside the academic community to serve on this committee.
- Stowell – remember, if nobody volunteers than you can't represent this body and/or the faculty. At the CUPB meeting, a long-time member of the committee commented that are duty has changed over the last 20 years from 'how to spend' the surplus to 'how to save' money.
- Rosenstein – I would hope that the entire campus community is concerned and invested in this process. It would be difficult to imagine that we would go into this process without thinking holistically about the university and what would be best for the future of EIU. We all want to save EIU, and we want to save our jobs, but we realize that cuts need to be made, and finding creative ways to make it work.
- Abebe – I don't think there is opposition to what the president is saying. What we are voicing here are concerns about the process, and the validity of claims that will likely be made. Question - should the Faculty Senate be involved in the process of nominating individuals?
- Bruns – we want this process to work and that's why we will be bringing these concerns about the process to President Glassman. We want to partner with him and we want the process to work.
- Robertson – regarding the nominations process, we could take different pathways. 1) we could nominate colleagues who could serve well on each of the different working groups, 2) we could agree that some of us would directly volunteer for some of the groups, 3) or we could step back completely. Active or Passive approach? What are your thoughts?
- Waller – I think Fac Sen should be involved, not sitting on the sidelines. I would like the process to be cooperative rather than adversarial.
- Corrigan – we are obligated to be involved. If we don't, wouldn't that send a negative PR message about Faculty Senate to the campus community-unwillingness to participate/support?
- Robertson – should we serve or nominate others?
- Hung – thinking about potential conflict discussed by Senator Abebe. Can we separate our role from Fac Sen and serve as a member of the faculty? If we can and we are selected, we would be representing the faculty of EIU, rather than the faculty senate. None of these seats are reserved for faculty senators. I think we can 'walk that line' and be ok.
- Bruns – are we encouraging faculty to be nominated for all of the working groups? Are faculty support to be active in all of the working groups?
- Corrigan – that part is unclear to me as well - details requested
- Hung – we need to ask for it (membership involvement) – let's not assume
- Bruns – interest in transparency – please request a list of nominations for all committees
- Robertson – we will ask the president if he would accept our suggestions on nominees for each committee
- Rosenstein – however, it sounds like the president will be partnering with CUPB on populating the committees
- Hung – we have a voice on CUPB, correct? Gloria Leitshuet
- Gosse – do we know if the working groups will receive an optimistic/pessimistic budget? I need an operational definition of transparency. Does that mean we will have a budget?
- Hung – committees will have access to relevant records and data, and can request more if needed
- Gosse – we need a realistic budget in front of us – will we have an optimistic or pessimistic budget available for each working group?
- Rosenstein – probably no answer to this question – difficult to determine what is an 'optimistic' budget – uses hypothetical of 'daughter's wedding' budget to illustrate. Differences between 'baseline' and what actual spending becomes.
- Robertson – I will send faculty senate projected budget docs that were given to CUPB this past Friday

- Bruns – if we bring these questions to President Glassman and he is forthcoming and have transparency, our responsibility is to support him with the project – we become partners and if he is successful, it benefits us.
- Hung – what is the alternative model/option for this type of challenge? – we read about what is going on other campuses across higher education on other campus, faculty are usually not consulted or involved, even in the pretense of consulting the faculty. I think this is a slightly better model that provides a chance for the campus to be involved. Not the worst model.
- Young – I would go further and commend the President for his energy and vigor in an attempt to come to grips with the current problem. He has come to the faculty senate and engaged the campus community while having to make difficult decisions under significant pressure in an attempt to vitalize EIU. We all have an interest in the success of the enterprise now and into the future. The president seems committed to the cause. I give him credit for this.
- Stowell – it sounds like we have some items to bring to the president.
- Robertson – I will summarize the main concerns mentioned today to share with the President.
- Wharram – I do have concerns about the 'options' template – two of the four potential recommendations for each working group send subliminal messages about eliminating programs or cutting resources. Increasing resources will be difficult at this time. Increased enrollment will help avoid significant cuts and should be the top priority of this process. I do want to make sure that each of those groups should emphasize proactive attempts to focus on 'innovation' that will increase enrollment.
- Rosenstein – the president may also want to emphasize that Charleston is a safe campus and we have not reduced our acceptance criteria. We have tried to reinforce quality in the process of admitting students while maintaining quality of programs. This is info that should be shared in a positive way. We have the 'feel' of a private, competitive institution in this state. We have good things to offer students and they need to be publicized as much as possible.
- Robertson – do we agree that I will summarize the main concerns mentioned today for the president to consider, and follow-up with S. Sterling about the pitfalls of program analysis?
- Bruns – what is the deadline of working group nominations?
- Bruns – we have not decided on whether we should nominate, serve, or both on working groups.
- Eckert – the president includes us in his request of potential nominees, correct?
- Abebe – Nominations should come through CUPB, Fac Senate, Student Sen, etc.
- Robertson – perhaps we could take the roll of each of our standing committees – and each of our committees could bring a recommendation to the senate next week for each working group of this process? Would this work? Just a streamlined idea.
- Young – I invited colleagues in my department to serve on the working groups, and no one has followed up with me about it. Note - 57 positions are available. 30 positions in groups 1-6.
- Stowell – I might suggest that we put a call out via Faculty Senate email list requesting nominations for the working groups.
- Robertson – would that create confusion about the nominations process? (self-nominating)
- Robertson – another path is to individually contact colleagues
- Bruns – but don't you think the President is asking for Faculty Senate and CUPB for help in encouraging colleagues to self-nominate. Other comments about the nomination process.
- Hung – only the working groups are subject to nominations
- Bruns – for example – I would nominate Grant to be on working group #7
- Hung – adds another example of the process that could be followed – with Faculty Senate ranking and recommending from list of multiple candidates to fill positions on each working group = an endorsement from Faculty Senate
- Young – do we have enough time to do that? Not sure.
- Bruns – recommendation - should send out a general email 'reminder' to self-nominate, and as a body we should make recommendations for each working group
- Rosenstein – supports this procedural recommendation
- Stowell – and are those names that we get from the president?
- Hung – no, our recommendations collected next Tuesday
- Corrigan – do we wait for volunteers to step forward? Or do we proactively nominate?
- Robertson – we can submit recommendations to the president, suggesting we approach/contact each candidate proactively.

- Abebe – even if we do nominate, the president will probably not select all of the faculty senate recommendation for each working group. Maybe 2 or 3 will be selected. That is a serious tradeoff between not being able to make a statement at the end of the process.
- Wharram – probably difficult to get all seven recommended nominees appointed
- Rosenstein – motion to send out 'self-nomination' reminder to all faculty
- Young – motion seconded. It's our duty and roll.
- Robertson – it would serve as a reminder
- Vote –unanimous
- Bruns – we need to decide between making recommendations vs statements at the back end
- Corrigan – but the front end influence is important to consider - 2 or 3 recommended nominees out of 7 is better than 0/7.
- Waller – faculty senate not getting involved on the front end could be criticized later
- Robertson – the process could have flowed through the Faculty Senate, not the CUPB. But that was decided in August when I was out of town and not present at the CUPB meeting. This entire process was finalized without faculty senate knowledge and input.
- Rosenstein – I make a motion to table the discussion until next week to decide about whether we will endorse particular candidates.
- Bruns – second the motion – it provides time to hear back from the President on our concerns
- Hung – point of discussion - senators should come with a slate of names if FAC SEN ends up endorsing names for the working groups
- Vote on motion – 14/15
- Nay – Sterling
- Wharram – mentions previous EIU BOT board meeting. how do we find EIU BOT minutes? On their website? - http://www.eiu.edu/trustees/documents.php
- Robertson – Yes. EIU BOT meeting on Friday. Let me know if you want me to relay thoughts to the BOT on this process.
- Lord – on EIU BOT minutes – they don't get posted until they are accepted. That conversation happened during a day-long working session.
- Motion to adjourn – Hung
- Seconded - Rosenstein

2. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

V.   Communications
   1. Faculty Senate Minutes from September 6th, 2016

VII.   Future Dates:

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

Fall 2016: Sep. 20th, Oct. 4th & 18th, Nov. 1st & 15th, Dec. 6th