

9-20-2016

September 20, 2016

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "September 20, 2016" (2016). *Minutes*. 1067.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1067](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1067)

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](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

EIU Faculty Senate Session Agenda  
September 20th, 2016, 2:00 – 3:50 PM  
Booth Library Conference Room

- 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, K. Hung, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, J. Waller, C. Wharram, B. Young
  - Guests in Attendance = B. Berglund (Student Senate), B. Lord (AA), Luke Young (SVPAA),
- II. Approval of Minutes from September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2016 2:00-2:05 PM
- Motion to Approve = G. Sterling
  - Motion Seconded = J. Stowell
  - Discussion(?) = none
  - Vote to Approve = unanimous
- III. Committee Reports
1. Executive Committee 2:05-2:10 PM
- a. Update/review of September 18<sup>th</sup> EIU Board of Trustees meeting
- Robertson – summary of the BOT meeting. Approved bidding process for classroom extension for Tarble Arts Center. Lengthy presentation by EIU Athletic Tom Michael that the organization was within budget during the past academic year. Also mentioned were athletic and scholarly achievements by student-athletes this past year, including former EIU quarterback Jimmy Garrapolo. He also mentioned that upon his arrival that EIU athletics was \$900,000 over budget and many groups/individuals on campus were ‘preoccupied’ with that deficit. I then addressed the EIU BOT, and mentioned that we had a number of high achieving students in the classroom, including student-athletes and non student-athletes. These students often go unrecognized and don’t have the resources available that other students might have. I thanked the BOT and President Glassman for confronting the vitalization project. I brought up one point about the work groups – need for transparency throughout the process, especially with the findings of the work groups. Also referred to the Faculty Senate Constitution – and asked for President Glassman to please refer to the document in case of any conflict with the recommendations resulting from the vitalization process. I also brought up the ‘administration/student ratio’ as a viable goal. A current student who was a previous DEN reporter suggested to me that President Glassman is looking into this.
  - Bruns – for context, the EIU athletics received a substantial increase in student fees this year – extra money was built in to this fiscal year - not a surprise that they were ‘in budget’. <http://www.eiu.edu/finaid/fees.php>
  - Hung – they received a substantial amount of ‘new’ money
  - Sterling – based on student enrollment, close to \$900,000
  - Hung - I think we all should celebrate achievements of students, including J. Garrapolo, but not just NFL players. All types of students dealing with all types of situations. Great what Jimmy G has done, but let’s not forget about student success stories that don’t receive significant public recognition.
  - Eckert – I don’t follow American football. I only have read about Jimmy Garrapolo. Has he been covered in national press/media?
  - Robertson – On NBC Sunday Night Football telecast last weekend – free publicity. Not sure it will transfer into increased enrollment (?)(Garrapolo ‘bump’).
  - Bruns – mentioning that EIU was the top rated regional institution in Illinois would also have been nice.
- b. Provost’s Address: Provost Blair Lord 2:10-2:15 PM
- Lord – good BOT meeting. Not much directly affecting academic affairs. IBHE board meeting a week from today in which two academic programs will be approved (MS in Cyber Security and BS in Computer Information Technology). AVP for Enrollment Management search committee has provided is moving forward. Recommendations for candidate campus visits coming soon.
  - Robertson – a few weeks ago the President asked for support to remove ‘interim’ tag from Lynnette Drake’s title? Any update?
  - Lord – President did request that from the BOT. Not a voting action item. She would now be ‘Interim VP’ – she will still be ‘interim’.
  - Robertson – status of Redden Grants?
  - Lord – in process – they will not be held up – awards will be granted – may be a few more weeks before paper notifications received

- Robertson – reason why I ask is that some of those awards are used to bring in guest speakers – can't schedule those until we know if awards are coming.
- Stowell – asks question about Undergraduate Research & Creative Activity Awards – foundation money?
- Lord – actually ledger 1 money – will need to be modified/scaled back unless we receive unexpected money from the state – Dean is looking for donor for that money
- Wharram – future public forums for the Enrollment Management VP position?
- Lord – yes, those will be scheduled in the very near future.

2. Elections Committee 2:15-2:30 PM
  - Stowell – no report
3. Faculty-Student Relations Committee
  - Waller – no report
4. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee
  - Corrigan – we have not met, but I am willing to volunteer to serve as the chair
  - Motion – Bruns, Seconded – Hung – Unanimously approved – Senator Corrigan chair of this committee
5. Awards Committee
  - Hugo – no report
  - Robertson – quick question - call for Mendez award has gone out – please encourage colleagues to apply
6. Faculty Forum Committee
  - a. Forthcoming proposal by Senator Bailey Young to be introduced and discussed
    - Young – suggestion = invite local candidates to attend & speak to constituents sometime during the month of October (R - Phillips, D - Malak)
    - Bruns – are you interested in inviting co-sponsors? (student senate, staff senate)
    - Young – in the tradition of past forums where UPI has co-sponsored, yes – student senate could co-sponsor the event as well.
    - L. Young – yes, we would be interested in co-sponsoring. I will present it before student senate. We are also conducting a voter registration drive to encourage students to vote in this county.
    - Bruns – I will reserve a room and we (Young and Bruns) will contact both candidates
    - Hung – question - what's the format? Open-ended? Debate? 15 minutes each?
    - B. Young – give each candidate time to present their views on the political situation and how they will help EIU. Then time for audience questions.
    - Bruns – should we handle it with one candidate at a time? – to avoid sparring with each other – rather than both candidates in the room at the same time?
    - Sterling – I like the split format so that all questions won't be directed to one candidate
    - Bruns – the open format might encourage candidates to attend – avoiding a contentious debate
7. Budget Transparency Committee
  - Sterling – no report
  - Robertson – one email I sent last week contained summary of budget information from CUPB meeting. If not received, I will send again via email.
8. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics
  - Wharram – scheduled to meet one week from today at this time
9. Nominations Committee 2:30 PM -
  - a. Vitalization Project - Resumption of tabled discussion from September 13<sup>th</sup>
    - Robertson – S. Rosenstein cannot attend today. Other committee members can conduct discussion
    - Hung – by working groups...working group #1 – 5 members, 2 student reps – no nominations received
    - Bruns – we don't know candidates that have gone directly through the President – should we recommend for working groups with no nominations?
    - Waller – yes, we should if we don't have nominations
    - Abebe – I will have a motion later to forward names to the President identifying individuals to nominate for each work groups
    - Hung – what about student senate? How are they managing the nomination process?
    - L. Young – presented to Student Senate two weeks ago. Tomorrow I will be encouraging self-nominations at Student Senate. (Was reminded that deadline is tomorrow).
    - Hung – reviews student seats on work groups (\*see <https://www.eiu.edu/vitalizeproject/>) - work group # 1 - 2 student reps; Work group #3 – enrollment management – 1 student rep; Work group #4 – Intercollegiate Athletics – 1 student rep; Work group #6 – marketing/branding – 1 student rep; Work groups #8 and #9 – two members each.
    - Hung – workgroup #2 is university technology
    - Stowell – asks to clarify the purpose of this vetting process? – narrowing down to specific nominations?

- Hung – good question – unless there are more names, we don't have a surplus of nominees – provides additional comments
- Hung – provides background on work group #1 – technology – two nominees – Andrew Cheetham and Jeff Stowell. Both are strong candidates.
- B. Young – both candidates are strong and I am willing to support both.
- Hung – any comments on A. Cheetham?
- Robertson – provides supportive comments on A. Cheetham and his leadership with integration of technology in CAH. He is an innovative thinker and would be a great fit for this type of work group.
- Abebe – Process question - I think discussing/debating the strengths of the nominees may not be helpful. Why don't we just submit all the names of volunteers because President Glassman ultimately has the power to finalize the committees. This takes up time and makes it look like we are getting involved in the merit of the individual service rather than volunteering for the process.
- Hung – Understands concern - I do think this process has merit – otherwise it does not seem to me that we are not contributing.
- Bruns – President Glassman has requested input from Faculty Senate
- B. Young – have all of these individuals agreed to serve?
- Waller – we could streamline the process by asking for question/concerns on any of these candidates
- Bruns – agreed – and focus thoughts on each particular workgroup – like #7 – very involved and independent faculty voices
- Corrigan – asks question on the selection process – are we putting forth candidates who are interested in more than one work group?
- Hung – if we are reviewing candidates, the Faculty Senate should make specific recommendations for each candidate
- Abebe – Not trying to complicate the process - I'm not sure we are endorsing, we are nominating individuals. Endorse implies 'accredit' - Let's keep the spirit of this process in-line with previous discussions we have had so that we don't complicate things.
- Robertson – maybe that is the point we need to debate and decide on next
- Bruns – not sure we have clarified that yet – table at our last meeting
- Corrigan – 'nominations' will be requested, not endorsements
- Bruns – but should we be an independent voice in this process to have a greater impact?
- Sterling – We must decide if we are endorsing or nominating? If all we are doing is forwarding names, we can keep this very simple and quick. We have to know what we are doing before we start.
- Robertson – I think this is the point where we begin today. I make a motion that we are endorsing, not just nominating, candidates for work groups for the Vitalize EIU project. OR we could just forward a list of nominations as well.
- Bruns – I second the motion.
- Stowell – but we don't have access to the full list of nominees for each work group because many candidates may have self-nominated directly to the president.
- Bruns – I don't have an issue with that – there are multiple pools of candidates
- Oliver – we don't know what other candidates are in the 'pools' for each work group
- Abebe – I have nominated a colleague outside of this proposed senate process – I think we should stay with the language that the President is using – the language of 'nomination' - keeping the duties and rights of the Senate in it's proper place.
- B. Young – whatever we do, we should include a statement expressing S. Abebe's point/concerns.
- Hung – the role of the Faculty Senate in this process is to gather nominees - part of the issue is the ambiguity of the President's language – we are looking for an appropriate role for the Faculty Senate – if not endorsement, a clear proactive action – not just a clearinghouse of names gathered
- Waller – we could keep it simple – we could forward names with 'no objection'
- Hung – some type of symbolic statement – there are weaknesses in the timeframe and process. Acknowledges concerns by Senator Stowell and Oliver about Faculty Senate not knowing the full candidate pool. That is a larger problem than if the Senate puts forth some list of endorsed 'nominees'.
- Waller – I do have a problem 'endorsing' candidates without knowing the full list of candidates. I like the idea of forwarding list of names with 'no objection'.
- Bruns – I agree that the incomplete list is a problem. But shared governance is needed in this process. Forwarding the list with 'no objections' does not seem engaged enough in shared governance.
- Bruns - Do we, as a body, have strong feelings/opinions about who serves on which committee?
- B. Young – I have a strong opinion about the membership of working group #7 – it must be an accredited academic. Not appropriate for non-teachers to serve on #7. I feel strongly about that.

- Robertson – the President responded about that concern – membership on #7 may extend beyond faculty.
- Waller – to Bruns – agree with your thoughts on shared governance but this is not organized as a ‘shared governance activity’ – it’s more ‘papal’ – President Glassman has the authority to assign names to work groups.
- Hung – its comparable to dept. search committees - hiring department analogy to emphasize a shared governance point – the final decision is in the hands of the provost but it is still a shared governance activity. But feedback and ideas from faculty are considered.
- Sterling – but if all we are doing is forwarding names...that is not shared governance
- Bruns – my thinking is that forwarding names without objection gives President Glassman significant leeway
- Oliver – if being involved in the population of the working groups is important to us, why don’t we ask
- President Glassman for a full list of all nominees and endorse/make recommendations for each group?
- Wharram – 20/20 hindsight - we may have ‘boxed’ ourselves last week by tabling the discussion last week
- Hung – we ran out of time, and we are running out of time
- Corrigan – President may or may not accept or value our endorsing or nominations
- Bruns – don’t necessarily agree with that assessment
- Corrigan – ‘forward names’, not ‘endorsing’
- Bruns – I think we need to be proactive, not reactive as others has been suggested
- Gosse – if we think it is important, would the president be willing to share the list of nominees
- Robertson – not really, he will be working with the CUBP exec committee to finalize the work groups
- B. Young – not comfortable with evaluating the entire list. Don’t want to complicate the process, and we don’t really have the time to do it, but I do want the Senate to participate.
- Robertson – idea - we could simply stipulate on this nomination list that we are comfortable with these candidates.
- Waller – I like the idea of reviewing names after the full list, but Pres Glassman may not support
- Hung – President Glassman will have to release composition of each work groups, we could make a statement concern regarding the population of any of the committees
- Abebe – I will go with whatever you want, but President Glassman has asked for nominations from us as well as other bodies. So why don’t we leave it at that – keep it simple, avoid creating problems. Let’s not get involved beyond the authority that we have been bestowed. Let’s provide a list of nominees.
- Gosse – we don’t own the process. Let’s not go beyond what he has asked. We should nominate candidates. Let’s do what the president has asked – nominate.

- Robertson – vote to ‘endorse’ candidates (not nominate)

Hung – nay, Bruns – yes, Robertson – yes, Stowell – nay, Waller – nay, Sterling – yes, Young – nay  
Eckert – yes, Abebe – nay, Waller – nay, Gosse – nay, Corrigan – nay, Hugo – yes, Oliver – nay

\*\* Yes = 5, No = 9 \*\*

Robertson – should we fill in the list of nominees with at least one nominee for each work group?

Eckert – only if we have names to provide today

L. Young – all student senators have been asked if they have names or are willing to serve.

Hung – if we don’t have pocket nominations, we may have work groups without candidates

Robertson – should we add nominees that we sent directly to the President to this list?

Abebe – I have sent a name, but he has also been nominated here by someone else?

Waller – should we ‘nominate with enthusiasm’?

Abebe – motion – reads motion – Bruns – second (\*need copy for minutes)

Hung – seeks clarification on ‘and/or’ or ‘or’?

Eckert – comments on language

Waller – friendly amendment? ‘nominate with enthusiasm’?

Abebe – accepts editing suggestions – makes edit on the motion

Robertson – should we list the motion on the top of the document?

Abebe – yes

That the Senate forward, enthusiastically, to the President the names and work-group preferences of faculty senators and other faculty who wish to be considered for service on any of the Vitalization work-groups. The Senate reserves to itself the rights and duties under its constitution.

Hung – yes, Bruns – Yes, Robertson – yes, Stowell – yes, Waller – yes, Sterling – Yes, Young – yes, Eckert – yes, Abebe – yes, Wharram – eye, Gosse – yes, Corrigan – yes, Hugo - yes, Oliver – yes

\*\* Yes = 14, No = 0 \*\* (\*Unanimous\*)

- Hung – a discussion point – based on the charge of some committees, there are some working group compositions that are not optimal – for example – Senator Young’s point – members of workgroup #7 should know how to deliver classes. Student services working group – could benefit with members from student staff (ie - dining services). Should we explore this topic again – recommendations for work group compositions? Faculty Senate recommendations for credentials for members of work groups.
- Robertson – tempted to put forth a motion regarding work group #7 – only faculty members are suited to work on this work group
- Young – such as ‘appropriate academic credentials’ to legitimize the membership on work group #7, and on other work groups depending on their focus.
- Hung – this may also extend to work group #8 (staff from enrollment office? and #9 – but the initial focus is on #7 for this body
- Robertson – can we nominate a small work group to author the resolution?
- Abebe and Bruns – nominate Senators Hung and B. Young
- Bruns – should we discuss possible nominations for working groups without nominees?
- Corrigan – do we think a faculty rep is needed on every work group?
- Bruns – yes, because they all deal with issues relevant to faculty/academic affairs
- Sterling – I also think some of these separate groups relate strongly together – enrollment management vs marketing/branding – they should be working together - provides additional comments
- Stowell – perspective – in Psychology Department enrollment management used to mean ‘how can we raise academic requirements to control the number of majors’ – times have obviously changed
- L. Young – when you nominate people, do you ask them in advance?
- Bruns – this list represents a list of individuals that have already indicated a willingness to serve on the work groups – otherwise some colleagues would not be pleased with us
- Corrigan – concern - colleagues I have talked with are already very stretched – difficult to find ‘willing’ reps
- Sterling – fact - President Glassman has received over 100 nominations from total sources
- Bruns – any self-nominations from among our group?
- L. Young – I am willing to serve on enrollment management or marketing/branding as a student rep
- Robertson – your preference?
- L. Young – work group #3 - enrollment management
- Bruns – critical area – I will self-nominate for the same committee – work group #3
- Bruns – I nominate Ellen Corrigan for work group #5 - Marketing/Branding
- Corrigan – I unenthusiastically accept your nomination (smile)
- Robertson – that leaves two more groups with no faculty nominee – student services and facilities - what about work group #5 – Facilities – someone from the Sciences?
- Wharram – share Senator Sterling’s concern about communication between the work groups – based on my research emphasis I am interested in the Liaison committee – but not sure if President is accepting nominations for ‘non work group’ membership? That’s the place where significant connections and communications will need to take place for the work groups to function together effectively.
- Robertson – reviews Vitalize EIU FAQ – although not explicitly listed
- Wharram – adds additional concerns and comments regarding the importance of communication and faculty on these work groups and committees
- Bruns – I would suggest that a member of faculty senate serve on each of the working groups so that we can report to each other here on the happenings of each committee.
- Robertson – I will submit your name for consideration for that committee.
- Sterling – unenthusiastically?! (smiles)
- Wharram – I accept your nomination
- Robertson – maybe a candidate from the Sciences serve on the Facilities work group #5 – Senator Hung?
- Hung – I accept the nomination to serve on work group #5.

- Hung – nomination of Andy Eggers for work group #1 – provides background on Andy Eggers current role on campus.
- Hung – the language for work group #7 – Academic Programs – reads statement created with B. Young.
- Bruns – we need to be more blunt about this – ‘vital’, ‘strongly recommended’
- Stowell – wording still a little ‘fuzzy’ – suggests more specificity
- Robertson – stronger word than ‘considers’?
- Abebe – are you including Chairs, Deans, and Program Directors that have faculty rank in this work group? Did you want teaching faculty? Or administrators with teaching credentials? Be specific.
- Stowell & B. Young – provides clarity on definition of faculty according to the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws
- Sterling – provides historical context on the definition of Faculty = Unit A & Unit B – as defined in Article 1 of the Faculty Senate Constitution.
- Hung – so I will specifically reference the definition in this statement.
- Wharram – shouldn’t this go without saying? If we are worried that we have to say this, we don’t trust this process at all, do we?
- Bruns – response - I think we are just being honest and specific.
- Robertson – the President made it clear that he would not limit it to teaching faculty.
- Corrigan – makes comment about how the President was asked regarding population of working group 7.
- Wharram – To me it should be obvious what the constitution of that committee should be. The majority has to be faculty – no question. If there is only 3 or 4 faculty = clear sign that there is a problem.
- Bruns – the potential downside of being blunt with this statement?
- Sterling – comment on if limited faculty get assigned to work group #7.
- B. Young – I think it is appropriate for us to clearly state our position – the President will then do what he wants in terms of populating work group #7
- Hung – reads updated ‘statement’ – (\*need copy for minutes)
- Abebe – what if the President decides there is a community member who should serve on this committee? Would we consider this committee population as a ‘failure’?
- Hung – I will exchange ‘success’ with ‘vital’ – reads statement again
- Abebe – question about ‘only faculty with appropriate credentials’ – what if that is not what the President wanted to do?
- B. Young – the point is that all committee members should have appropriate academic credentials – more discussion follows. I’m not sure we need to hammer this any further? We can be blunt without being heavy-handed.
- Gosse – are we trying to control a process that we can’t? Send recommendation but avoid being heavy-handed.
- Hung – the statement is trying to be specific, especially with workgroup #7
- Gosse – use the language of ‘recommend’ – the Faculty Senate recommends.....
- Stowell – if you use the phrase ‘all faculty’ – you might overlook a candidate with expertise/experience that could be helpful to the process.
- Robertson – suggests the term ‘primarily’...
- Robertson – motion to approve this statement?
- Sterling – motion, Eckert – seconded

**The Faculty Senate recommends that, for the optimal functioning of work group 7, the group should be composed primarily of teaching faculty.**

- Hung – yes, Bruns – yes, Robertson –yes, Stowell – yes, Waller – yes, Sterling – yes, Young – yes, Eckert – yes, Abebe – yes Gosse – yes, Corrigan – yes, Hugo – yes, Oliver – yes, Wharram – nay
- \*\* Yes = 13, No = 1 \*\*

b. Forthcoming proposal by Senator Teshome Abebe to be introduced and discussed (\*see above\*)

#### IV. Other business, if time allows

##### 1. Faculty Senate future staffing level and representation discussion

a. Forthcoming proposal by Senator Jemmie Robertson to be introduced and discussed

#### V. Communications

##### 1. Faculty Senate Minutes from September 13th, 2016

2. CAA Minutes from September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016

VII. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

Fall 2016: Oct. 4<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup>, Nov. 1<sup>st</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup>, Dec. 6<sup>th</sup>