

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1-31-2017

January 31, 2017

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 31, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1059.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1059

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 31st, 2017, 2:00 – 3:50 PM
Booth Library Conference Room

- I. Attendance and Welcome 2:00 PM
- Welcome – Chair Robertson
- Senators Attending – Abebe, Corrigan, Eckert, Gosse, Hugo, Hung, Oliver, Rosenstein, Robertson, Sterling, Stowell,
- Waller, Wharram, B. Young, L. Young (SV-PAA)
- Guests Attending = C. Buchman (DEN), J. Blitz (UPI), M. Izadi (LCBAS), B. Lord (VP-AA)
- II. Approval of Minutes from January 17th, 2017 2:00-2:05 PM
- Motion to Approve – B. Young
- Seconded – T. Abebe
- Discussion – none
- Vote = all except 3 abstentions – Gosse, Hugo, Hung
- III. Committee Reports
1. Executive Committee
a. B.O.T. Address, Jan. 27th, 2017
- Robertson – represented Faculty at the meeting. Brought up faculty and student concerns from campus. Thanks for the input. One of the Board members thanked me for my comments and assured me that I ‘had their ears’. Shared comment from Africana Studies student – majors and minors would be at risk if programs are removed - reminder about the impact on general education course offerings as well. Shared a few thoughts submitted by J. Oliver that I shared with the Board. I concluded with thoughts from the President of Ireland regarding his effort to make Philosophy more centralized to higher education.
- b. Provost’s Report: Provost Blair M. Lord 2:05-2:15
- Lord – EIU BOT did take an action at the meeting – Sociology/Anthropology created a Bachelor’s degree in Criminology/Criminal Justice. Lots of requests these past few years for this type of program. Was approved by EIU BOT – now will be forwarded to IBHE for approval. Could be available by next Fall. Purchase approvals were also discussed. Approval granted to initiate search process for interim leadership to replace Dean Lanham – leaving at the end of this academic year. I appreciate his multiple months of notice given. Had communication with Graduate School and Deans regarding the temporary ban on refugees – and any potential impact on EIU international students. It will have a minimal impact currently because of minimal # of students from the 7 countries identified in the travel/immigration ban. Adds additional comments about the situation. Can be complex depending on the student.
- Gosse – is there a central database for our international students?
- Lord – yes, there is a database and any effected international students have been contacted. Only one EIU student affected at this time.
- Gosse – offers aid/assistance for any student affected
- Lord – appreciation expressed – Office of International Programs has been proactive about this
- Wharram – offers formal statement about the current immigrant ban and President Glassman’s swift statement on this issue, as well as terrorist attack in Quebec:

We wish to thank President Glassman for his swift and unequivocal response to Friday’s executive order temporarily banning people from seven countries from entering the United States. As someone who came to this country on a student visa, who has resided in this country on a work visa, and who only recently and after much difficulty received a green card, I can assure you that the current situation for many students and faculty of our international community on campus is at best uncertain, and is for others quite possibly—and legitimately so—terrifying, and not just for those who come from the seven currently named countries.

As members of a larger academic community, we must all acknowledge that these are extraordinary circumstances. And it is not okay. I need to comment further that, as a Canadian, I also feel the tremendous national shame in the wake of Saturday’s brutal killing of six worshipping Muslims at a mosque in Quebec City. This was, as Prime Minister Trudeau rightly said, a “terrorist attack on Muslims” committed by someone known to be

enthralled by racist nationalisms. And I do not wish to insult the intelligence of my fellow senators or of the campus community, when I add that condemning Friday's Executive Order is not equivalent to condemning those who voted for President Trump. And while there can be no direct causal link between an executive order in D.C. and a terrorist attack in Quebec, there is little doubt that a radical fringe of extremists and racists may be galvanized and emboldened by an executive order that deliberately targets certain people because of their national origins.

We encourage all faculty to join President Glassman and the rest of the campus community in "monitor[ing] these developments, while also supporting the rights of all our international students, faculty and staff.

- Robertson – I motion to send your statement to all faculty.
- Hung – agreed, but let's re-work the document to re-inforce President Glassman's statement and your own personal sentiments on the terrorist attack in Canada. Refers to facebook page comments about President Glassman's statement – mostly positive but some negative pushback from some sectors. Facebook is not a great medium for in-depth dialogue. However, this is an issue that needs to be discussed further on this campus.
- Wharram – agreed, and I have already talked to other groups, including international students, who are interested in developing a greater dialogue in different forms on these issues.
- Hung – to Robertson – I second your motion.
- Stowell – by reading it into the minutes, would that not be distributed to all faculty?
- Robertson – yes, but only if faculty visit the faculty senate website to review the minutes. Emailing directly to students will cast the statement to a wider audience.
- Sterling – if we take the initiative to send it to all faculty, we accept ownership of the statement even though it is authored and attributed to Senator Wharram.
- Hung – another suggestion – we should consider including the staff and student senates in the distribution of the statement.
- Vote – all in favor except 1 abstention (Wharram – author)
- Gosse – this might be a great topic for a Student-Faculty Forum
- Robertson – open to that – I enjoy assigning Senator Bruns tasks when he is not here (smiles)

2. Elections Committee

2:15-2:50

- Stowell – sent a call to LBCAS for nominee/volunteer for UPC – no volunteers received – next step = will consult with Dean Izadi to attempt to secure a volunteer.
- Robertson – timeline for Faculty Senate elections this spring?
- Stowell – might need to have an electronic vote for UPC position. Our bylaws suggest that March is election month for Faculty Senate – time to develop a list of open positions for the upcoming election.

3. Nominations Committee

- Rosenstein – no report

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee

- Waller – student senate will begin discussion on EIU Vitalization this week – will keep you informed

5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

- Corrigan – no report

6. Awards Committee

- Hugo – waiting for nominations for Distinguished Faculty award – Deadline is Feb 24th

7. Faculty Forum Committee – no report

8. Budget Transparency Committee

- Sterling – no formal report, but EIU BOT did approve 2% increase in GIA fee that primarily benefits athletics. So academic programs are proposed to be cut but athletics receives more funding (?). Housing fee was increased as well, traditionally packaged together with the GIA fee.

9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

- Wharram – no report

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from January 17th, 2017
2. Faculty Concerns on the Vitalization Project
3. Senate Chair Address to Board of Trustees, January 27th, 2017

V. Vitalization Workgroup Responses, Ad-hoc Committee formation, Other Business

3:00-3:50 PM

- Robertson – it was a positive step that President Glassman finally did decide, even late in the process, to include Faculty Senate in the Vitalization process. At least we will have a voice. How should we formulate our response?

- Sterling – there are at least 3 separate issues. #1) the specific recommendations by the 7 workgroups, especially workgroup #7. President Glassman did solicit input from APERC, CAA, and Faculty Senate. I would suggest that Faculty Senate create an ad-hoc committee to evaluate, at the minimum, workgroup #7 recommendations – the 4 programs considered for elimination, and maybe the recommendations from the other 6 workgroups, #2) Vitalization process as a whole needs to be evaluated – both CAA bylaws and Faculty Senate constitution clearly requires these two bodies be involved at the beginning of the process, not closer to the end. Was this a reasonable process? Did it infringe upon shared governance? #3) Does Faculty Senate wish to express a vision for the university – in response to the proposed ‘vision’ of the workgroups. We should consider embracing #1, #2 or all 3 of these?

- Hung – from my recollection, Faculty Senate, at the minimum, wanted to respond to the process (#2) <the overall mechanism, time constraints on workgroups, P/L data, procedural concerns – how the process unfolded>.

- Abebe – with regard to the review itself, I’m not sure it serves any purpose or cures the already contaminated and faulty conclusions that have been made if we were to review the workgroup conclusions. It would be the ultimate waste of time. I don’t see any value to doing that. I am also not sure at this stage that I am prepared to dignify the process (#1). With item #2 – we have already spoken on this. We have decided to send it to the faculty – let them make a decision – our duty is to follow through with that. I do have sympathy for item #3 – it could be instructive to our administrators – not out of disrespect to our administrators – but they failed us when the process began - I did not hear vision from our current administrators at the start of this process.

- B. Young – I wonder if Senator Stowell would care to comment on the work of workgroup 8 – is a town hall meeting coming?

- J. Stowell – I serve on workgroup #8 – we continue to seek input on new or modify programs, signature programs, micro-degrees – the town hall meeting will be held this week – anyone can submit input via email, in person – we have received huge # of ideas – we may need help to process and prioritize those ideas – I do not want to duplicate workgroup 8 tasks with an ad-hoc initiative in Faculty Senate. Seems redundant.

Hung – point #3 – there is a value in Senate articulating what the core values and mission is for the university, but I feel we are prompted to do this because we disagree with the outcome of Vitalization by our current administration. It may not serve the purpose we want it to serve. A key question = what is the place of EIU, and what are we trying to achieve – very daunting process – difficult task to write a broad, meaningful, and useful mission statement – especially as a reaction to the process already underway. I am least supportive of task #3.

- Waller – the proposal is to eliminate 4 programs – I think we need to provide a response to that proposal – yes, somewhat self-interested – nevertheless, it would be useful for the administration to receive additional input

- Corrigan – respectfully disagree – I don’t feel like it is our place (Faculty Senate) to do that – I don’t want to step on ‘toes’ of elected bodies like CAA, COTE, and CGS to do so – we should focus on the concerns we have with the process rather than specific proposal cutting academic programs.

- Waller – the president requested our input at the last meeting.

- Corrigan – I think it is more our place to comment on the process

- Hugo – redundant to reply to the process again – we have already done so

- Corrigan > to Hugo > adds additional opinion on what our role should be at this point.

- Rosenstein – the APERC, elected by Faculty across campus, is, in essence, a subcommittee of Faculty Senate to review programs that are up for elimination. Not sure we need another Faculty Senate subcommittee to review the proposals as well. APERC is the active voice at this point regarding workgroup #7 recommendations.

- Robertson – President Glassman is requesting independent reviews from APERC, Faculty Senate, and CAA on the process and proposal by March 15th. I am in favor of a concise response for consideration by the administration and potentially the EIU BOT. We don't need to produce a large packet in response – 1 or 2 pages. It can include our opinion on the process and possibly our dissent regarding workgroup #7 recommendations.

- Gosse – where do we stand on the faculty referendum?

- Robertson – we need to discuss this today

- Gosse – you mentioned it on Friday

- Rosenstein – why are these 4 programs being targeted for elimination? What are the reasons? Workgroup #7 was asked to look at enrollment, quality, and centrality to the mission of programs – help me understand how these programs made it to 'elimination' list? Philosophy is what most universities are historically founded on. In terms of profit/loss, the department is not losing significant monies. It accommodates a significant # of general education students. How can we prepare a productive counter argument to what seems to be a poorly worded initial argument – what are the clear points of contention regarding the proposed elimination of these 4 programs?

Waller – I asked the President a similar question. Reviews the dialogue with the President from last meeting.

Rosenstein – just wondering if there were indicators that we haven't seen?

Robertson – probably – some indicators are in the handout I sent – but seem to lack justification points.

Sterling – there is no narrative supporting elimination for any of the 4 programs – there is no additional information that workgroup #7 provided.

Abebe – this is precisely why we can't effectively review these 4 programs – no standards for the evaluation process were provided – the philosophy of this 'process' was based on what 'can' be measured – adds more comments about the flawed process - I think we have a task/duty ahead of us to send a referendum to the faculty – let the faculty decide if the process was 'good' or 'bad' – not sure if we spent significant time on a program review that our review/recommendations would even be considered – we have to use our time wisely.

Hung > small quibble to Abebe > we should assess our education by quantitative markers and qualitative markers – no objection to having both – this process fell short because of time constraints – refers to reaccreditation of his own department – there is absence of qualitative considerations in the Vitalization process – if we do respond or pass a referendum to faculty to vote on 'confidence' or 'no-confidence' on Vitalization, we need to provide list of concerns as well. We need to spend the time to summarize some of the important issues/concerns of the process, relay that to the faculty, and let them vote on it. That will send as clear of a message as possible to President Glassman about the faculty sentiment on the process.

Oliver – another concern relates to the population of workgroup #7 – specifically the non-academic members – at least 3 of the 7 members of the workgroup have limited to no experience assessing the 'quality' and 'centrality' of academic programs to the university. President Glassman placed the future of these colleagues and programs in the hands of a fundraiser, a business office staff member, and a student affairs administrator. That would be comparable to me being asked to assess the quality of a fundraising initiative or student affairs program – I would have limited to no experience to accurately and effectively complete that task.

Sterling – in order for us to possibly respond to any of my previous recommendations – I will formally motion on all three for a vote.

Hung – I will second all 3 motions so we can discuss and vote on each one.

Robertson – I also motion that we finalize the faculty referendum so that it is prepared to send to all faculty

Abebe – I second that motion.

Robertson – motion #1 – Faculty Senate should review workgroup #7 recommendations

Wharram – asks for point of clarification – have we received a specific request/charge from President Glassman about what we are supposed to do? I know he asked us at the last Senate meeting to review.

Robertson – provides some background info – President asked us to review workgroup #7 recommendations – same request sent to CAA – materials sent to you via email – 3 docs total - one doc is 50-pages in length – that is the extent of the request and materials received.

Wharram – info sent to CAA? Is there a particular template that the APERC is using that we should also use?

Hung – no, this is the first time the APERC has ever been called to act

Sterling – the UPI contract contains very limited info on the task (1 paragraph) – items for the APERC to consider - but APERC can request additional info if needed.

Corrigan – regarding 4 programs under consideration – any explanation/details provided on why one program is suggested for deletion versus the other 3 not being deleted?

Sterling – Africana Studies has no Unit A faculty, so program deletion would not result in Unit A layoffs.

Stowell – Jerry Cloward is director of the Career and Technical Education program, but he also has other assignments
Corrigan – it is a very new program, maybe they fell short on faculty resources to be successful?

Rosenstein – provides more background info on creation of adult/community education program – offers comments on the rationale to develop the program - fell short on faculty and student interest.

Hung – I am in favor of stating that the Faculty Senate is not in a position to conduct program reviews, and to defer to CAA and APERC. Or we must create a sub-committee and invest the necessary time in the process. We may want to focus on the flawed process rather than the flawed workgroup #7 recommendations?

Wharram – there may be senators who are willing to ‘roll up their sleeves’ and carefully examine WG #7. recommendations. If we don’t take the opportunity, we may be renegeing on our responsibility as faculty senators.

Hung – modified statement – if some senators want to do this, I will support the initiative.

Wharram – thankful that APERC was created, but we also have the opportunity to have our voice heard on this.

Stowell – by invoking the process, that may create a justification to request more info on criteria used to create the recommendations.

Gosse – the underlying issue is the lack of funding from Springfield, but was this a charge from the EIU BOT to President Glassman to find operational efficiencies can cut budget? I have survived restructuring twice – was charged with ‘You write the report and you show them the door’? But is it possible that if funding comes through from Springfield, no changes needed, and Vitalization report placed on the shelf?

Hung – personally, not optimistic about that possibility. Dr. Glassman plans on acting on these recommendations, regardless of what happens in Springfield. He is going to follow through.

L. Young – I don’t think this process is strongly connected to Springfield, the process is going to happen regardless.

Sterling – let’s avoid taking any action based on the assumption that Springfield will get its act together.

Wharram – glad there is APERC, but they have not been as intimately involved in this process as we have – we have been keeping an eye on the process since the beginning – insights into the P/Ls, workgroup involvement, etc. and we have a little bit of a ‘jump’ on those serving on APERC.

Robertson – suggestion - perhaps our first order of business is to send out the faculty referendum to all colleagues to find out where they stand on the process (‘confidence’ or ‘no confidence’), - valuable info to send to President and EIU BOT.

Oliver – there is the humanistic aspect of this as well – we have two faculty senators whose job is threatened and I am not aware of any colleagues of APERC members whose job is threatened.

Abebe – the purpose of a review is to provide a ‘why will we do that?’ = to change someone’s mind. Our review is not going to change someone’s mind. In addition, the moment you have to begin to think about ‘how you will save your job’?, you have probably already lost it...I call the question.

Rosenstein – no one of APERC is/has served on any of the Vitalization workgroups

Robertson – reviews population of APERC

Sterling - Richard Jones has been selected as the chair of APERC

Robertson – **Motion - formation of subcommittee to write a review of workgroup #7 recommendations**

Yes – Robertson, Stowell, Sterling, Waller, Eckert, Rosenstein, Wharram, Hugo, Oliver

No – Abebe, Corrigan, Gosse, Hung

***Motion passes** – will populate ASAP

Robertson – recommend that we follow through with a Faculty referendum, with a preamble?

Hung – adds comments in support of following through with the Faculty referendum concerning the Vitalization process

Stowell – did we vote on including a preamble?

Hung – we did not call it a preamble, but sending it out a summary of concerns before a vote in the confidence in the process – we should follow through on the previous resolution

Stowell – reviews the language of the motion voted and approved at the previous meeting

Hung – reviews agreed upon steps and who will author the referendum – but solicits help with the process

Robertson – would vote for yes = form committee, would vote for no = subcommittee of 1 (referendum author)?

Sterling – I withdrawal motion #2 if the Senate agrees on Hung authoring the resolution

Robertson – can you finalize it by next week?

Hung – accepted - goal = will have a draft of the resolution completed by Monday evening (2/6) and then accept feedback and edit before next Tuesday’s meeting.

Robertson - #3 recommendation – ‘visioning’ – formation of a visioning ad-hoc subcommittee

Stowell – I think the existing committees are covering this – it would be redundant

Rosenstein – agreed – also - I would suggest sending out an email for the town-hall meeting this Thursday. Suggests methods for collecting feedback for those who can’t stay for the entire meeting.

Sterling – my concern with the two existing workgroups is based on their ‘charges’ – ‘academic visioning’ and ‘areas within academic visioning’ – an ad-hoc subcommittee could look at a broader structuring/resources/shared governance vision – parts of the university beyond workgroups 8 & 9.

Stowell – I think the current workgroup effort may evolve into a mission/visioning committee for the university. Notes that the Higher Learning commission is interested in having a regular committee look at university mission/vision.

Rosenstein – we have been highly engaged in mission and academics/student services, etc, but not so much on campus climate – what is our vision in terms of ‘campus climate’? When you think about EIU, what does one think about? Not sure EIU has thought much about ‘image’ and ‘climate’. Refers to Facebook post regarding international students – it made we wonder about what people think about in terms of ‘image’ of EIU campus

Hung – I feel that Faculty Senate has a responsibility to investigate issues relevant to faculty, topics such as integrative learning, role of university investing in that, philosophy of our school as a regional, master’s level institution and what is our place in this picture. Not just about academic programming but shared governance, UG and Grad needs, integration of separate campus parts into a cohesive campus whole.

Wharram – an unfortunate consequence of WG #7 is the creation of ‘siloes’. Interesting work can occur if we step outside of those siloes. Our vision goes beyond the siloes – lack of specific boundaries – integration inside and outside boundaries of our campus. Part of the process that was problematic was the artificial separation = limits the vision of EIU.

Hung – workgroup #7 recommendation targets humanities – unfortunate, especially at a liberal arts universities – their work goes beyond ‘quantitative’ – more than just a ‘degree granting’ university that results in jobs - a faculty senate vision group can take us beyond the typical ‘quantitative’ examination.

Corrigan – what purpose would a faculty senate vision ad-hoc committee serve, beyond Faculty Senate?

Stowell – I would echo that sentiment – to do this right a vision committee needs to involve the entire campus – not just a few faculty members on a senate ad-hoc vision committee.

Rosenstein – provides encouragement to review workgroup #8 recommendations – let’s use the mechanisms that are in place as much as possible...as well as encourage other faculty to get involved

Hung > to Corrigan > I am having these ideas and sharing these thoughts because higher ed has been under assault across the country. Someone needs to take a stand and clearly define what we represent and ‘why’. It’s getting lost in the shuffle under financial crises. Higher Education quality, benefits, and values need to be reaffirmed and articulated.

Corrigan – I agree with that in principle-but the task should go beyond the Faculty Senate – we can’t represent the entire campus.

Wharram – adds additional comments about the value of an ad-hoc senate ‘vision’ committee, and the rationale for other campus groups for having their own vision groups as well. It may help us to clarify, to ourselves, what exactly we are doing here at EIU. It is not a harmful process, but a helpful one.

Hung – agree with Senator Stowell’s statement about campus-wide faculty involvement needed.

Corrigan – what happens if vision statements conflict across campus?

Wharram – dialogue...

Robertson – **Motion = forming an ad-hoc faculty senate vision statement committee.**

Yes – Hung, Sterling

No – Hugo, Wharram, Gosse, Corrigan, Rosenstein, Abebe, Eckert, Waller, Stowell, Robertson, Oliver

*** Motion does not pass.**

Robertson – we will defer forming membership on ad-hoc subcommittee for workgroup #7 until next week

Hung – I request at least a half hour to finalize the language of the referendum

Abebe – we need to set a date for the referendum – it’s important and we need to follow-through.

Stowell – the Qualtrics survey is ready to go

Robertson – **Motion = hold the faculty referendum by Feb 15th?**

Abebe – second the motion

Vote - unanimous

VI. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Faculty Senate Sessions:

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