

1-10-2017

January 10, 2017

Faculty Senate

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 10, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1061.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1061](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1061)

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 Minutes  
January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017, 2:00 – 3:50 PM  
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:02 PM  
- Welcome – Chair Robertson  
- Attending Senators – T. Abebe, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, N. Hugo, B. Hung, J. Robertson, J. Stowell, G. Sterling, J. Waller, CC Wharram, J. Oliver, B. Young, L. Young (SVPAA)  
- Attending Guests – N. Bartholomew (visitor), J. Blitz (UPI), J. Brown (DEN-Photographer), M. Izadi (LCBAS), B. Lord (AA), C. Miller (DEN),
- II. Approval of Minutes from December 6th, 2016 2:00-2:05 PM  
- Motion to Approve? = Eckert  
- Motion Seconded? = Abebe  
- Discussion/Edits? =none  
- Vote? = unanimous
- III. Committee Reports 2:05-2:15
1. Executive Committee  
- Robertson – will share recent docs from 12/9 CUPB meeting at next week’s Senate meeting
- a. Provost’s Report: Provost Blair M. Lord  
- Three personnel updates for you. #1 - Bill Elliott will be replaced with an interim - Austin Cheney (School of Technology) will serve while maintaining his role as Chair of Technology. #2 – Dwight Vaught left EIU as of last Friday as director of Doudna Fine Arts programming. Dan Crews will step back in as an interim director of Doudna Fine Arts – probably longer than one semester. #3 – Josh Norman has been named Associate VP for Enrollment Management. Much time spent during the break attempting to fill these positions.
2. Elections Committee 2:05-2:20  
- Stowell = We have an open position on UPC that needs to be filled by mid-Feb. Vacancy is longer than 1 semester so an election needs to be conducted.
3. Nominations Committee  
- Robertson (in place of Rosenstein) = still in need of replacements for Apportionment Board with their proposed Thursday night meeting schedule this semester.
4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee  
- Waller = no report
5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee  
- Corrigan = no report
6. Awards Committee  
- Hugo = DFA announcement was emailed to EIU Faculty – Due date for nominations – Feb 24<sup>th</sup>.
7. Faculty Forum Committee  
- no report
8. Budget Transparency Committee  
- Sterling = no report
9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics  
- Wharram = no report
- IV. Communications
1. Faculty Senate Minutes from December 6th, 2016  
2. Communication from UPI President, Jonathan Blitz

- Hung = concern = we were given such limited time to read a very lengthy report.
- Stefan = concern = only minor changes made from initial submission in December to final report released yesterday after many departments responded to the initial workgroup recommendations. Reviews events in the Vitalization timeline – shares quotes from President’s Glassman’s visit to Faculty Senate in October about members of workgroups. Conclusion = Final recommendations seem to contradict President’s reassurances back in October. With all due respect to committee members – the process and results are flawed – primarily focused on P/Ls, limited consideration of quality.
- Waller = I spent significant time reviewing the final recommendations. I completely agree with Eckert’s sentiments. The final report is incredibly sloppy. For Philosophy, we provided detailed data and response to the original Workgroup 7 recommendations, but literally the same ‘finalized’ report was released.
- Abebe = two comments – 1) the Economics faculty took the time to respond to the initial workgroup recommendations. We don’t believe the workgroup read our response = very dispiriting.
- Abebe = comment #2 relates to ‘institutional flaw’ – refers back to the ‘First Choice’ program and compares it to Work group suggestions. Five programs rated as ‘first choice’ programs are now categorized in #3 (develop a plan to enhance operational efficiencies) = a significant contradiction, indicating institutional planning and direction is at cross-purposes at times. Programs certainly need to be reviewed periodically, but which program review decisions do we trust now? (First Choice or EIU Vitalization?). Cross purposes of actions proposed – creating confusion.
- Eckert – please review ‘First Choice’?
- Abebe – reviews the First Choice initiative established by a previous Dean to promote greater student recruitment and enrollment. Resources followed ‘First Choice’ designation achieved by programs. Now the Vitalization report suggests that 5 First Choice programs have been negatively evaluated = alarming result..
- Stowell – different criteria being used?
- Abebe – Or maybe none at all? We don’t know what criteria have been used? Looks like all the workgroups looked at is enrollment. No excuses for the contradiction are acceptable at this point.
- Eckert – reiterates the fact that President Glassman reassured the Faculty Senate back in October that profit/loss documents would not be the ONLY criteria used. It’s obvious that quantitative data drove the recommendations.
- Waller – refers to the workgroup analysis of the Philosophy Dept – isn’t Philosophy central to a university? There is minimal non-P/L ‘qualitative’ comments and feedback added to the workgroup report about Philosophy???
- Hugo – refers to discrepancies in the report, vagueness, contradictions, etc. Greater concern was that my colleagues were not aware that the report was even available. Limited information on the vitalization process website has resulted in limited awareness that the finalized report was available for review.
- Corrigan – suggests that ‘centrality to the mission of a university’ is a false criterion to be used by the workgroups – All academic depts are central to the mission of a university – everything else is not – this seems to be lost/forgotten by the workgroups.
- Eckert – referring to workgroup #4 – pleasantly surprised of the thoughtful discussion and analysis included – somewhat surprised and somewhat encouraged. Expresses serious concerns about the proposal to ‘outsource’ courses of one department to another (PHIL > HIST?). We are not a high school. What about expertise in a discipline?
- Gosse – I have empathy for those threatened by the report – I have survived two reorganizations – both very painful - we are in this position because of Springfield and the budget crisis, which hangs over this organization. Budget cuts are needed because of it. What action items can flow out of this body? What should be our actions in response to the final reports? Can we ask the President to come back to clarify? I would make that motion.
- Hung – we need to figure out an appropriate response from the Senate, just like departments need to do this as well. This was reiterated when President Glassman visited the Senate in October. We could support the programs that have been identified for consolidation and/or elimination. We can also make a statement on the entire process. Or we can focus on individual work group reports. We have an opportunity to engage the campus regarding the workgroup recommendations and/or the process as a whole.
- Abebe = I think a statement is a beginning of where we need to be, but I have a larger concern – this Senate over the years have talked about Shared Governance, but this Revitalization process may have followed the ‘letter’ of the law in terms of shared governance, but not necessarily the ‘spirit’ of shared governance. Example – posting a meeting agenda online to satisfy legal requirements but not providing minutes from the discussion? This process has resulted in a step backwards in regards to shared governance on this campus. This is an issue that ought to be addressed.
- Eckert = the process was not an open or transparent process. Do we trust the process? Can it be used for action? What about a faculty referendum related to process and recommendations of workgroup #7?
- Gosse – that would be an ‘action’
- Hung – any recommendations of elimination would have to go through the Program Elimination Review committee

- Eckert – yes, so this has pushed some into ‘survival mode’. The process seems to have countered what was promised during his visit to Senate in October.
- Robertson = I can request a future visit or meeting with President Glassman
- Eckert = yes, but we need to discuss the recommendations in more detail and more in public – work group #7 worked behind the scenes – not transparently. In summary, the President has authority to make final decisions, but reports and the process was flawed. He promised a thoughtful process but that was not the end result.
- Waller – agreed – this report is so sloppy that the administration cannot make any credible decisions from this doc
- Gosse – where are the dept responses to the initial recommendations? Where are they posted? Availability?
- Wharram – dept responses are not available on the finalized report for workgroup #7. What is occasionally included are notes in red, which are edits to the original report from the workgroup. This relates to one of our main concerns – depts took significant time to respond to original recommendations, but we don’t have any evidence that those reports were even reviewed or considered in the final copy of the report (released yesterday).
- Robertson – are we aware of any department being approached by the President for consideration for deletion? The deadline to enable the Prog Elim Committee is Jan 20<sup>th</sup>.
- Senators – not that we are aware of
- Robertson – reviews timeline for the Program elimination committee and if/how they can respond.
- Sterling – there is little power in the Program Elimination committee – lots of pressure placed on BOT to move forward with any elimination decisions from the President – there needs to be some way to have an intelligent discussion about this possibility before any public announcement. How is a department supposed to prepare for that possibility?
- Robertson > to Provost Lord – has the president indicated to you about decisions related to program elimination?
- Lord – the president has talked to the VPs about the need for this type of discussion – this suggests that there is a longer timeline needed beyond 1.5 weeks. I agree with Gosse > much of this situation is imposed on us by Springfield – difficult to navigate with producing angst. I support and promote our academic programs.
- Abebe – chairs have noted that they have not seen any role from the Deans in this process. Faculty and chairs are now asking what the Deans are doing/role in this process – to grade programs?
- Lord – we did discuss this with the Deans recently – they asked about what their role is in the process – Deans have responded to the original workgroup recommendations. Deans submitted this back to the workgroups.
- Abebe – where is the feedback from the Deans?
- Lord – it was provided to workgroups through Ryan Hendrickson.
- Abebe – first time we have heard of this.
- Lord – in addition, the role of the Deans at this very moment is still somewhat still to be defined...but they have participated
- Gosse – next BOT meeting?
- Lord – Jan 27<sup>th</sup> – no agenda item related to this – must be added at least 10 days in advance
- Eckert > Lord - for a program to be eliminated, the Academic Program Elimination Review Committee (APERC) must be called into action by Jan 20<sup>th</sup>?
- Lord – I would have to review the UPI contract – we have never gone down this path before.
- Blitz & Sterling – the APERC must be contacted and provided relevant data by Jan 20<sup>th</sup> if the decision involves the potential layoff of a UPI member.
- Eckert – does the APERC have the power to approve or disapprove a program being eliminated?
- Lord – the APERC advises, but the president has the power to make the recommendation and the BOT makes the final decision.
- Waller – in your opinion, if the president was going to cut a program to save \$, do you think the president would review financial data to make sure there really will be a cost savings?
- Lord – yes – a thorough revisit
- Sterling – this is what troubles me the most – Springfield has created a mess, but this final report is not an intelligent response to how we can save \$. Eliminating depts on the list would not save EIU \$. It’s not about if the workgroup had a difficult process to complete – the recommendations don’t bear any logical relationship to an attempt to repair the final condition of EIU – cutting specific departments, like Philosophy or Pre-Engineering, that are not losing money should not be recommended. The report is wrong/flawed by every standard. It is a haphazard collection of faulty recommendations.
- Gosse – this is what we need to articulate
- Abebe – no one is listening...that is the problem...we are being ignored...we are not against the review of programs...if two simple steps would have been included in the process, faculty would have been more on board, but the facts have changed and I have changed my mind about the entire process.
- Gosse – decisions have not been made, poor recommendations have been made. But we want to know when decisions will be made.

- Young – one important thought to mention – the vitalization project includes two other committees (#8-#9) that are ‘vision’ groups. We have a final doc in front of us with very limited change from initial recommendations, with one large concern - Quality has not been factored into the recommendations. The workgroup #7 was unable to assess quality within the constraints of the methodologies of this process. We hope that no decisions will be made before work group #8 & #9 have time to carefully review the recommendations. We want to avoid short-sighted decisions to be made.
- Hung – not sure if workgroups #8 & #9 have additional data that would be helpful beyond data available to workgroups #1-#7, and their charge is different than the other workgroups – adds more comments about the differences in charges of the workgroups.
- Corrigan – is it possible that we are so focused on the flaws of the workgroup reports that we are forgetting about the important roles of #8-#9 and that it may be possible that no elimination actions may actually take place?
- Hung – that would have to be an unlikely, best-case scenario at this point
- Stowell – there could be some possible conflicts between workgroup #8 & #9 recommendations, and recommendations from workgroups #1-7. Charges are different. In workgroup #8 we haven’t looked at any P/Ls. No constraints of a budget. Uses Pre-Engineering as an example – Program growth potential exists. It would be short-sighted to make elimination decisions now without considering the possibilities of some of these programs if they were re-structured, re-positioned, etc.
- Eckert – President Glassman could act within the next few days and the APERC could be activated.
- Corrigan – it seems so unlikely or unreasonable that this would happen due to such a small window.
- B. Young > to Sterling – have you calculated how much \$ might be saved if the Philosophy department is eliminated?
- Sterling – one problem is that we don’t know what the specific recommendations of work group #7 are? There were various suggestions made by the workgroup for the future of Philosophy. 1 person – Delete. 1 person - Merge, 1 person – maintain. Cost differences between eliminate, merge, & maintained. Costs of chair and office assistant salaries? If you fire all Philosophy faculty, those classes will still have to be taught by other faculty from other departments – costing most likely more money because Philosophy faculty are historically underpaid. Our classes generate tuition revenue = gen ed classes are profitable.
- B. Young – so the Philosophy data that we read in the report are completely unreliable?
- G. Sterling – yes, and I met with two members of the committee to discuss this, but not a single word was changed between their initial report and the finalized report after we met with them.
- Hung – another issue is ‘who’ would teach Philosophy courses that have the expertise? A possible labor violation? The only way to save money is to lay-off faculty.
- Corrigan – that is why this area is receiving such scrutiny by the workgroups.
- Gosse – we are talking about eliminating a major – the students will leave.
- Abebe – the moment we start to discuss the future of the program, the program begins to be ‘killed’
- Sterling – reiterates this point – students have already started to ask about the future of the program – program has been damaged just by being mentioned in this conversation.
- Hung – refers to Wisconsin situation – serious challenge by legislators of certain courses being taught on certain campuses = an ideological attack on academic freedom. Will this happen in Illinois? When the legislature puts your courses (such as controversial courses) or programs under the ‘heat lamp’ through threatening tactics, it threatens all.
- Waller – refers to Western Illinois University eliminating Philosophy department and other programs on the grounds that they would save money. In reality, no \$ was saved. EIU needs to avoid making the same mistake.
- Robertson – I see 4 possible paths to proceed on:
  - A – Faculty resolution to faculty
  - B – Faculty referendum to faculty
  - C – Request for follow-up conversation with President Glassman next week or with Executive Comm
  - D – ‘Wait & See’ approach
- Robertson – what path should we take?
- Eckert – makes motion for faculty referendum related to flaws in the Vitalization process
- Waller – seconded
- Eckert – we were promised an open and transparent process, but were not provided one. It has become a ‘divide & conquer’ approach. I want to hear from the entire campus, as well as possibly hosting a faculty forum to discuss what is at stake.
- B. Young – most colleagues are not informed about the final report – a forum may be the best route to take to inform and promote awareness.
- Stowell = what would the language of the referendum be?
- Eckert = ‘I have confidence or no confidence in process used by workgroup #7
- Abebe = adds recommended edits for the referendum – ie - ‘high confidence’

- B. Young = we understand we need to move fast – but do we have enough time to host a faculty forum?
- Eckert = I like this approach to communicate with the President the level of confidence the faculty has in the process relevant to work group #7.
- Hung – possible issue – not everyone on campus is aware of the flaws of the process – information needs to be shared first, maybe followed up by a forum (information session), then a referendum – but it may be too rushed
- Abebe – I second that –nominate Hung to author the communicate
- Robertson – unaware that the final recommendations have even been publicized
- Eckert – how soon can we start a vote? what about week-long voting? Enough time?
- Stowell – ITS won't be able to manage this in the next few days, but Qualtrics is available and fairly secure and prevents over-stuffing of ballots (multiple votes submitted by one person). Voting can start/stop according to our specifications. Very easy to set.
- Wharram – to be honest, the apparent disregard of workgroup #7 of departmental responses to their initial recommendations makes me feel like ignoring the process entirely. But that is not a solution – I think what is being suggested in terms of increasing awareness and information are the right steps to take.
- Hung – a possible forum should highlight concerns of the process adopted by workgroup #7 – what we have been discussing today – once informed a vote should occur shortly thereafter
- Stowell – I have not looked at the P/L data as closely as the workgroups – but when I looked at Philosophy department data they seem to generate revenue = a net profit for the university. If there is reference in this communication about data inaccuracies, we need to include specific examples that highlight 'misinterpreted' vs. 'overlooked' vs 'inaccurate'.
- Hung – there are examples of inaccurate raw data = ex - # of employees. In our department there was an error in # of student majors. There are errors – and some of the problematic interpretations/conclusions originate from the flawed data or misinterpreted data.
- Sterling – adds comments about averaging error in the data – student credit hour production within the college. The college calculation was based on 'averaging' the 'averages'? = fundamental error. We pointed it out but they did not correct it.
- Abebe – to help us re-focus = the motion on the table is about the 'process' that we are questioning and we don't want to attack our colleagues – they were asked to complete a difficult task.
- Hung – but if we are asking colleagues to vote on the process, we do need to highlight data flaws included in the process– that info will impact the voting.
- Wharram – this is difficult – we have spent significant time evaluating the data and reviewing the reports – we can see what has happened and what has not happened – this will be difficult to communicate in a very short time period.
- Waller – the short time table was by design – we could have received the report weeks ago.
- Eckert – asks about the APERC timetable
- Stowell – in the APERC time-track, the committee has until Mar 15<sup>th</sup> to make a recommendation to the President
- Sterling – Jan 20<sup>th</sup> is the key date – the decision will have been made to convene the committee – and probably decisions about what departments will be proposed for elimination.
- Hung – Jan 20<sup>th</sup> will be a difficult date to meet with a resolution with the 'weight' of the faculty senate behind it – we should probably still do it –we should still proceed through this with our eye on the APERC deadline – March 15<sup>th</sup>.
- Waller – in March any statement by the Faculty Senate would be irrelevant – decisions will have already been made
- Gosse – invite President Glassman to come next week
- Robertson – will we vote on the referendum today?
- Eckert – probably not based on the obvious constraints
- Wharram – President Glassman may not be available next Tuesday
- Oliver – add comments about possibility of the president not being available next week
- Abebe – in addition, we have already talked to him - he has already been here – what is the point to have him back?
- Abebe – one more thought on the support of the Provost through the process – much appreciated
- Hung – I support the idea of referendum, but I want to do it in a more timely manner – let's first send out an email making all faculty aware of the availability – and requesting 'concerns' be voiced and shared
- Abebe – please call the question regarding the referendum
- Robertson – roll call vote for a referendum regarding confidence in the 'process' used by workgroup #7- language to be finalize in the near future.
  
- Robertson – yes
- Stowell – yes
- Sterling – yes
- Waller – yes
- Eckert – yes

- Abebe – yes
- Corrigan – yes
- Gosse – yes
- Wharram - yes
- Hugo – yes
- Hung – yes
- Oliver – yes
- \* Result = ‘unanimous’

- \* Robertson – reviews steps that will be taken during the next few days/weeks – starting with email to faculty
- Abebe – can we ‘draft’ a senator to author a ‘communicae’ summarizing concerns about the process
- Robertson – and confirming that the timeframe for the approved action will be determined in the near future.
- Wharram – side comment – some reports contain interesting ideas with potential.
- Corrigan – marketing ideas proposed were very strong.
- Oliver – so forum has been tabled for the time being?
- Robertson – yes
- Hung – confirming that APERC is populated?
- Stowell – yes, populated
- Oliver – are all members of APERC still employed by EIU and on campus?
- Stowell – yes
- Robertson – mentions letter written by UPI President John Blitz – please review – will be discussed next week

VI. Other business, if time allows  
- none

IX. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

Spring 2017: Jan. 17<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup>, Feb. 7<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup>, Mar. 7<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup>, April 4<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup>