

1-17-2017

January 17, 2017

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 17, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1060.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1060

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.

EIU Faculty Senate Session Minutes
January 17th, 2017, 2:00 – 3:50 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 PM
- Welcome – Chair J. Robertson
 - Senators in Attendance = T. Abebe, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, A. Rosenstein, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, J. Waller, C.C. Wharram, B. Young, L. Young (SVPSA)
 - Guests in Attendance = G. Aylesworth (Phil), J. Blitz (UPI), J. Brown (DEN), J. Conwell (Physics), J. Cruikshank (PLS), D. Jackman (CEPS), J. Jarmon (JG-TC), B. Lord (AA), RK Marshall (Nurs), C. Miller (DEN), R. Peebles (Chem)
- II. Approval of Minutes from January 10th, 2017 2:00-2:05 PM
- Motion to Approve = Sterling (2nd - Stowell)
 - Discussion = no comments
 - Vote = unanimous – (Abstentions = Bruns, Rosenstein)
- III. Committee Reports
1. Executive Committee
 - Robertson – shared budget data from 09 Dec 2016 CUPB meeting. Definitely concerned about net deficit' data.
 - Sterling – is MAP money included in this data?
 - Lord – MAP money is reimbursement for a student for tuition that we have billed. MAP funding is assumed 'received' in this data. We have received all of last year's MAP funding, but none of this year's MAP funding.
 - Robertson – Regarding MAP \$ = the number of EIU students receiving MAP funding is ~2,200. John Henderson (CATS) also addressed the group at the CUPB meeting. CATS employees down to 13 from 28 – appropriated funding used to pay for 28 positions – now down to 10. Also – the D2L contract has been renegotiated – from \$300 down to \$100 K. Tech support was also renegotiated down to \$14 K for 24 hours per day/7 days per week tech. support services. Brian Murphy shared information on ITS staffing and network data capabilities – used to be 54 ITS employees prior to Fall 2015, now 27. Also upgrading of network discussed – potential for 10GB potential. One more comment on the U of I compact – all Illinois university presidents were aware of that proposal – they were waiting to see if the proposal gained traction – one potential positive of the topic was that it may have turned the discussion in Springfield back to the needs of higher education institutions in Illinois.
 - a. Provost's Report: Provost Blair M. Lord 2:05-2:15
 - Lord – not much new to report since last week. Next EIU BOT meeting – January 27th.
 - Oliver – requests for more details on the VP of Enrollment Management hiring process.
 - Lord – adds background details on the hiring process of associate vice president of enrollment management = Josh Norman. The one internal candidate. Interviewed by the search committee – one of 4 candidates. 3 of 4 candidates deemed acceptable by the search committee. President Glassman and I carefully deliberated. Josh was our final choice.
 2. Elections Committee 2:15-2:45
 - Stowell – I sent out a call for volunteers to LCBAS faculty for a UPC replacement. Deadline for applicants is next Friday at 4 pm. Available for all faculty in the college. Hopefully we will receive at least one candidate. If more than one candidate, an election will be administered.
 3. Nominations Committee
 - Rosenstein – updates on Apportionment Board situation – Board planned to meet every Thursday at 7 pm. It is a difficult time for faculty to meet. Need to find volunteers for the board. Emailed Derek about any flexibility of the meeting time. Did not hear back from the chair of the board (Derek?).
 - L. Young – I can talk to Derek – how many positions are needed?
 - Rosenstein – three as of today. I have heard back from at least one candidate that they cannot attend the meeting at that time. We still need to find 3 faculty to volunteer for the board. Will be difficult to find replacements if the board continues to meet every Thursday night for 2 hours.
 4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee
 - Waller – no report
 5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

- Corrigan – N. Hugo attended staff senate meeting last week. No staff layoffs expected this year. Staff reps will travel to Springfield with President Glassman to advocate for more higher ed. funding. Staff members have not received raise since 2013 even though with layoffs, individual workload has grown. J. Daugherty (Senate president) = Suggested that faculty and student senates meet together – starting to work on that process.

6. Awards Committee

- Hugo (via Robertson) – DFA award announcement has been circulated - deadline for apps in Feb.

7. Faculty Forum Committee

- Bruns – no report

- Robertson – we proposed hosting a faculty forum in the near future regarding Vitalize EIU process

8. Budget Transparency Committee

- Sterling – no report

9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

- Wharram – no report

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from January 10th, 2017

2. Communication from UPI President, Jonathan Blitz

3. Communication from Gary Aylesworth regarding CAA Bylaws

4. Faculty Concerns on the Vitalization Project

V. Vitalization Project Discussion

2:45-3:00 PM

- Robertson – let's review concerns about the EIU Vitalization process submitted this past week by our colleagues, and try to identify some topics that we would like to bring to the attention of President Glassman during his visit

- Young – suggests that we keep the long-term goal of EIU in mind as we consider what attitude to adopt regarding the EIU vitalization process as we move forward. Refers back to President Glassman's visit to Senate in Oct 2016.

- Waller – faculty concerns submitted this week > they were consistent regarding 'bad data', 'no consideration of dept responses', etc. Also surprised and concerned about the comment that one of the members of committee #7 was recruited even though they did not volunteer, while at least 1 that did volunteer was not selected. Surprising and concerning.

- Robertson – discusses G. Aylesworth's email about Article VII of CAA's bylaws – further discusses

- Aylesworth – it is not just articulated in the CAA bylaws, but also in COTE and CGS bylaws

- Robertson – one concern is that the process clearly has bypassed the existing shared governance structures and mechanisms on campus = it creates conflicts with many existing constitutions and bylaws of existing committees

- Oliver – another concern is no CAA or Faculty Senate member serves on workgroup #7 – the committee that is charged with being the judge of 'quality' and 'centrality' of academic programs is not represented by either of these committees.

- Young – given the methodology of workgroup #7, they would be incapable of assessing the quality of academic programs – while they would be equipped to make P/L recommendations (budget-based)

- Eckert – no firm 'quality-based' decisions are made in workgroup #7's report – he refers back to minutes from Oct 2016 visit from President Glassman – he re-assured us that the members of work group #7 could fulfill this responsibility of assessing 'quality' among other key decisions

- Sterling – comparing workgroup #7's report to workgroup #6's recommendations (workgroup 6 = very clear, justified, coherent) – work group 7 did not provide any such recommendations in a comparable form.

- Eckert - adds additional concerns about workgroup #7 report related to their conclusions and recommendations

- Abebe – to Senator Young – the point that other groups on campus are also looking at other issues relevant to EIU vitalization – a valid point but it does not cure the problems associated with the process applied by workgroup #7.

- Abebe – a point about program review = if done properly, it can be very informative and helpful for us – it is important but it has to be done thoughtfully and carefully. If not, it could result in negative consequences. There is much more at risk in this vitalization process than P/Ls - I value the time that workgroup 7 invested, but I don't think they were able to be thorough enough with their evaluation – maybe for lack of time and most likely because of faulty data. But not because of their intention(s).

- Robertson – regarding first comment on the feedback document from faculty – do any of you have any evidence to support this? (that recommendations target current UPI union leadership?) – also – the question of 'why an unbiased, outside group was not employed in this process?' = President addressed this at the beginning of the process – he thought we had the necessary human resources on campus to successfully complete this process.

- Wharram – part of the concern/outrage with regard to the workgroup #7 report = we were all under the impression that when departments and programs provided a response to the initial report, they would be thoughtfully considered.

Noting the sizeable challenge of workgroup #7, only 13 groups had any changes in their initial report, most with minor changes. Only 4 programs received substantial changes to their final report = this created confusion and frustration. President Glassman reassured departments that if needed, they would have an opportunity to respond to initial recommendations, and that the response would be taken seriously. Maybe workgroup #7 reached a threshold of too much work and not enough time to thoughtfully review all the department responses?

- Wharram – some ‘good news’ = we now have some valuable data within the departmental responses – we need to use this information for a PR advantage. But right now, most departments who responded to the initial reports are asking – ‘Why did we go through this?’.
- Wharram – also confused that these responses are not included in the final report. Also – where are the department responses posted? I would think those are the docs that the public needs to see.
- Rosenstein – Workgroup 8 decided that it would be a good idea to look at some of the dept. responses provided to workgroup 7. But as we were discussing this, a DEN reporter in attendance was told that these responses were going to be included in the final report, but the decision was then made not to include the reports (?) We need to ask why that information was not included/shared (?)
- Eckert – I re-evaluated summary of workgroup #7’s final report. No mention of the huge task that they were asked to complete (noted). I believe their decisions were based by faulty data/evidence during a too narrow window of time.
- Sterling – I know colleagues that attended workgroup 7 meetings – they observed that there was no substantive decisions made in any of the public meetings. All decisions must have been made behind the scenes.
- Eckert – referred to work group 7 minutes – very brief – not detailed – notecards used – not very transparent
- Abebe – possible question for President – why have the department responses to initial recommendations not made public? They could have facilitated more dialogue with this process. That is one of the reasons why we are having this meeting with the President – to promote more dialogue about the concerns faculty have with the process.
- Rosenstein – and it is a repeated concern from faculty submitted this past week, even in the presence of the obvious P/L concerns.
- Stowell – it is also important to emphasize who the decision makers are (or who could be) moving forward, and how we can help them be best informed, and to encourage the president to make department responses available to the public, and to make sure the APERC committee is also informed moving forward – they are picking up the process where workgroup #7 ended.
- Corrigan – we need clarification on what is going to happen at this point moving forward – we need to know the proposed sequence of future events – also concerned about CAA and Faculty Senate being bypassed in this process
- Robertson – referring to page 4 on faculty concerns – point #1, page 4 – there is a mention of the concern that EIU Vitalization is happening outside of the established shared governance structures and processes.
- Sterling – my concern is that President Glassman seems to want decisions made by Jan 20th – so the APERC may need to be activated later this week. So taking the recommendations to CAA would be almost impossible based on time constraints- my fear is that he will put forward a recommendation to eliminate first, and then ask CAA, COTE, CGS to review recommendations later.
- Eckert – have any programs been informed if they will or will not be eliminated?
- Peebles – last Friday the President visited the Dean of COS to confirm that the MS Chemistry would not be eliminated.
- Abebe – mostly because Chemistry never had the opportunity to respond to the final recommendations – which included a recommendation to delete the MS Chemistry program, where the initial report did not.
- Wharram – one completely unrelated item related to students – discusses a possible accounting issue involving many students due to unpaid bills and other funding issues or administrative error (?) – hopefully we can be patient and try to help students solve these problems as we can.
- Lord – I have not heard anything about this. I will approach the Bursar about this possible issue in a meeting tomorrow and report back if I find out anything.

VI. Break (10 minutes) 3:00-3:10 PM

VII. Conversation with President Glassman 3:10-3:50 PM

- Robertson > to President Glassman – thank you for taking the time to visit with us this afternoon.
- Abebe > to President Glassman – referring to concerns submitted by faculty regarding EIU Vitalization this week – why haven’t the departmental responses to the initial workgroup reviews been posted? I think it could be instructive and useful. They should be publicized. What is your view on this?
- President Glassman – I read the Senate minutes from last week – I realize this was one of your concerns – I don’t think this would be unreasonable – In addition, I have decided to provide all relevant data to the APERC, if the

process moves to that point, as well as to CAA and Faculty Senate for your own review of the workgroup recommendations – your voice will be heard in this process – you will have the opportunity to review.

- Glassman – I am being mindful of the UPI agreement – trying not to avoid existing contractual agreements - Jan 20th is a firm date for any recommendation involving the APERC – simultaneous reviews by CAA and Faculty Senate will occur if any program is recommended to the APERC.
- Eckert – have you made a decision on workgroup recommendations? – possible program deletions?
- Glassman – 7 programs were to be considered by the administration (VPs and the Pres) – we read the comments of workgroups, Deans, departments, etc – two of those programs are no longer being considered for future action (Chemistry MS and Pre-Eng) - the administration is considering action on the other 5 programs during the remainder of this week – if any are moved to the APERC committee it is still only a ‘consideration’, not a ‘done deal’ – the BOT has the authority to make a change of program status – by March 15th the EIU admin would receive 3 recommendations – 1 from Faculty Senate, 1 from CAA, & 1 from APERC. The APERC and the admin reports will be submitted to the EIU BOT for final decision.
- Eckert – beyond March 15th, when would recommendations move to the EIU BOT?
- President Glassman – after March 15th, the 3 independent reviews would be received and then reviewed by EIU Admin. If decision is made to move recommendation for elimination forward, we would submit recommendation to the EIU BOT – they would need appropriate and sufficient time to review the recommendation. Each program is independently reviewed. EIU BOT meeting in April would most likely be the meeting used to discuss/act if needed.
- Corrigan – sounds like CAA and Faculty Senate will be looped back in to the evaluation process? In addition, at the graduate level, per committee bylaws, CGS should also be involved in the process of evaluating graduate programs, as well as COTE with education-based program.
- Glassman – sounds reasonable if they have a stake in the programs being reviewed.
- Glassman – historically, the APERC has never been used in the past – the data that goes to this committee is typically quantitative – we will provide these committees with additional data as needed, beyond what is required by the contractual agreement between admin and UPI – the question that this process is addressing is more about ‘do we need this major?’ rather than ‘do we need to teach this discipline content into the future. So we are not necessarily focused on a major (Exception may be a masters’ degree program). Referring to UPI contract – only need to initiate APERC committee if a UPI employee might be terminated. Uses Anthropology as an example – important discipline to offer courses in but if no faculty are being laid off, contract does not require use of APERC.
- Glassman > referring to J. Blitz (UPI Pres) – do you agree with this statement and language I used?
- Blitz – I agree with the interpretation of that language.
- Eckert – how specific will the charge be to APERC, as well as CAA and Faculty Senate?
- Glassman – the charge would be ‘review and assess’ the potential elimination of the ‘major’, not the ‘discipline’. I will not be proposing any recommendations to the BOT this Friday that would include an elimination of a specific ‘major’ with a reduction in faculty.
- Eckert – has the overall process been focused on financial viability/efficient?
- Glassman – not necessarily - referring back to Oct 2016 visit – you asked me to ensure you that I won’t only look at P/Ls – but now your concern seems to be about why programs might be deleted even if it is making-money – P/L was one aspect, marketability is another, # of majors is another, effective use of faculty is another, etc
- Eckert – what have your conversations been like with the departments? – how have they defended their programs?
- Glassman – that is one piece of it – maybe like defending a program with low enrollment – we are trying to develop new programs to attract students. Maybe some faculty can teach a broader range of general education courses to reach students, but not necessarily via an academic major. Challenging times right now - (enrollment, Springfield, etc). We need to offer an array of new programs – we can’t continue to support a 14 to 1 student/teacher ratio. The average of our peers is 18 to 1. Some are at 20 to 1. How do you address that without cutting faculty? Increase enrollments. Increase Marketing. Increase attractive programs.
- Glassman – I am committed to a broad/strong base of liberal arts and sciences, but that does not necessarily mean we will have a ‘major’ in every discipline. We can have a strong discipline base without having a major.
- Abebe – the Faculty Senate and the faculty on this campus are not against program review. We expressed this during your last visit in Oct 2016. However, we are concerned about having workgroup# 7 provide recommendations that suggest that some programs are ‘top-heavy’ and ‘expensive’ because of tenured faculty. That has caused stress.
- Abebe – we don’t know what the Dean recommendations are in this process (not publicized). We trust you, and you have been a great spokesperson for the university, but when your promises and communications aren’t followed through by the deans and chairs, it causes concerns and confusion.
- Glassman – apologizes - discusses role of Deans and how he announced when the recommendations were available to the deans last week, but they were not forwarded to the faculty within each college. And also hopes that relevant discussions are taking place between deans and chairs. But I have to rely on the leadership of the provost, deans, and

chairs. If we have a communication problem with the levels of management, we need to analyze that carefully to improve channels up and down the levels of management.

- Wharram – with regard to dept. responses – depts thought that their responses to the initial drafts would be revised before the final report from workgroup #7 was released – however, only 13 dept reports were changed, and only 4 were significantly changed - that caused a feeling of ‘why did we go through this process’ if the reports would not be read/considered? When you visited in Oct 2016 – you encouraged the departments to make a case for ‘quality’ that they provide students – but it does not appear that this happened or maybe workgroup 7 had too much info to consume and process within too short of a time period(?) – so what do we do with departmental responses? – there is significant ‘good news’ in the responses but it was minimally used.

- Glassman – I am aware of many great things that are happening on this campus when I hear about them. Through reviews and newsletters I hear about these positive things. Department reviews should probably be completed on an annual basis. In terms of if the dept responses were read, I assume the workgroups did read them. But I don’t know for sure if they did and if they were considered in the final reports.

- Wharram – only 5 percent of the academic program reviews were edited between initial draft reports and the final recommendations released by workgroup 7.

- Glassman – the reports are valuable and we need to use this info to market our programs

- Waller – hypothetically, if you were going to eliminate a program, would the primary reason to eliminate be \$-based?

- Glassman – not necessarily, maybe to save \$, maybe to use faculty more efficiently, but not just \$ alone.

- Waller – the whole reason is to save \$, correct?

- Glassman – the whole reason is to vitalize this university, this is just one piece of it – adds comments about possible results from this example – the process is not all about the money – Vitalize EIU is more about repositioning and long-term viability and sustainability. We cannot continue to ‘cut’ our way out of this budget mess. Discusses other on-campus facility issues (Coleman Hall) that relate to the larger goals of Vitalize EIU.

- Waller – if on Friday you make a recommendation to eliminate a program... what would it be worded like?

- Glassman – it will be worded more like ‘the university is considering the elimination of _____ program... we are seeking your feedback and consult in this process’. Sorry to have interrupted but the rhetoric used will be very important – especially to the press (some who are present here today).

- Waller – then your recommendation might include laying off faculty?

- Glassman – at this time that is not necessarily a consideration – laying off faculty is not necessarily a ‘done deal’ – even if a major is being considered for elimination, but the discipline area may be maintained.

- Rosenstein – where do you see EIU in 5 years? What is your vision? Campus atmosphere? What programs look like?

- Glassman – I hate to pre-empt workgroups 1 & 2, and 8 & 9 – I want to see enrollment around 9,000 – Springfield is holding us back – we won’t be able to reach that without more assistance from Springfield – prospective students are leaving the state in record numbers – numbers of IL high school graduates is reducing – families don’t have trust in the State of Illinois enough to make a 4-year commitment to IL higher education – unknown how long the budget impasse will continue – I am confident that funding will always come, in various forms, and sometimes at sporadic times = creates budgetary challenges, 9,000 students is a reasonable number – but big picture vision in 9,000 – I see more adult learners with more online programming at Master’s level, another ‘gateway-type’ program, more 2+2 partnerships from junior colleges, more collaboration with Charleston to improve relationship with community – enhanced honors programs – accessible campus – strong liberal arts and undergraduate research, enhanced honors programs, enhancing EIU brand – something to rally around, experiential learning opportunities for diverse student body – we are already best among our peers at graduating underrepresenting groups of students – the data supports it. We have to first get students to attend – I want to be the ‘First Choice’ regional university in this area – through the right programs, price-point, and experiences. We need to tell our story to HS students and get them here to visit.

- Abebe – you discussed efficiency – when considering efficiency - let me alert you to the DACs – faculty behavior is guided by DACs – promotion, tenure, and retention are based on the DACs – incentives are an important factor to drive faculty performance and productivity. I think efficiency criteria with DACs need to be considered – especially as they apply here – any inconsistent application of this may create serious problems for you in the future with this process.

- Eckert – refers to question on workgroup 8 & 9 recommendations versus workgroup 7 and the timeframe for both.

- Glassman – defines workgroup 8 charge vs workgroup 9 charge? – those charges don’t really fit with workgroup #7’s charge. This year the EIU BOT may only be asked to consider recommendations from workgroup #7. A few terms in the Vitalization process that generated negative attention – ‘outsourcing’ was one – we were never suggesting outsourcing ‘instruction’, but possibly some ‘student services’. ‘consolidation’ was another troubling term – putting two programs together. However, it already exists on this campus. It may be an efficiency ‘option’ to consider.

- Glassman – when we receive recommendations from workgroup 8 & 9, we will have to connect/re-connect with constituencies and stakeholders in order to make long-term recommendations by next year.

VIII. Other business, if time allows

IX. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

Spring 2017: Jan. 31st, Feb. 7th & 21st, Mar. 7th & 21st, April 4th & 18th