

3-7-2017

March 7, 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, "March 7, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1056.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1056](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1056)

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  
March 7th, 2017, 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, B. Hung, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. - Sterling, J. Stowell, CC. Wharram, B. Young, L. Young (VPAA)  
- Guests in Attendance – J. Blitz (UPI), J. Cross (AA), M. Izadi (LCBAS),
- II. Approval of Minutes from Feb. 21st, 2017 2:00-2:05 PM  
Motion = Bruns  
2<sup>nd</sup> = Young  
Discussion = none  
Vote = all except 1 abstention (Abebe)
- III. Committee Reports  
1. Executive Committee 2:05-2:20  
a. Update on Exec. Committee Meeting with President Glassman on March 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Robertson – Shared referendum results with President Glassman via email prior to the meeting. Initial response was not very positive. Some ‘spinning’ of results in his favor did occur (‘only 34% of faculty disapproved of the process’), possibly suggesting results were not strong enough to dissuade him from potentially recommending academic program cuts to the BOT. At the meeting this past week we discussed 1) campus morale, 2) possible ‘stressed’ relationship between staff and faculty – he is open to ideas regarding how to improve these two issues.  
Stowell – also open to ideas related to ‘morale’ on campus  
Robertson - We also discussed recommendation of work groups 1-6, including possible options for EIU athletics – including pros and cons of adding/dropping teams.  
Robertson - Current indicators suggest that enrollment will be down again for Fall 2017. Have invited Director of Admissions and VP of Enrollment Management for April 4<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate Session.  
Robertson – attended CUPB last Friday. Discussed items included Coles County Economic Impact Study, sent to you via email yesterday. Funded by non-EIU money. Will be published and shared soon.  
Bruns – who authored the study? It is not indicated on the document.  
Hung – a coalition group authored the report, which includes the Charleston Chamber of Commerce. It is a well written document about the importance of EIU’s economic role in the region. Probably was inspired by the information provided last year about this same time for the ‘Fund EIU’ rally. We assisted in converting the data into usable form and then it was integrated into the economic impact study. I am glad that this report will soon be public. However, we should be careful to not put ‘all of our eggs’ in this one report – we need to continue to stress the ‘value’ of higher education brought to this region of the state – whether or not EIU is actually ‘making money’ (profit). And don’t forget the multiplier effect that EIU promotes in the region...  
Robertson – a private donor funded the preparation of the report, no EIU money but some EIU ‘time’ was contributed to the report. A few highlights include impact of spending in this area, including a multiplier effect from the annual EIU budget. The state’s \$40 million dollar investment in EIU is estimated to have produced \$70 million of economic impact in return each year.  
Robertson - there is an effort to consolidate all events calendars (arts, athletics, library, etc) on campus into a ‘master’ events calendar – the goal is to be more effective and efficient at sharing the information to students and the community.  
Robertson – a VP search for Development will commence in the near future. No outside consulting firm will be used. State law actually prohibits use of funds for external agencies for searches beyond President or Provost.  
L. Young – what is the job description and duties for this position?  
Sterling – primarily fundraising for EIU – formerly held by Bob Martin.  
Robertson – distributes rough draft of proposal to reduce overall size of CUPB – will be discussed at next Faculty Senate meeting. Please send me feedback and ideas for this document. It represents a follow-up from last year’s resolution to CUPB to consider a size reduction.

- b. Update on Provost Search – two full days of airport interviews with candidates coming up, followed by on-campus interviews with finalists.
- c. Provost’s Report: Provost Blair M. Lord  
 B. Lord – (Jeff Cross substituting) – search for interim Dean of the Library and internal search for an interim Dean of CEPS are underway. D. Jackman announced her retirement at the end of this academic year. Also – over the years there have been plenty of studies that show/indicate that investment in higher education pays dividends in multiple times over. We often rely on the literature too little in the political process, whether or not they are actually listening to us.

2. Elections Committee

2:20-2:40

- a. Update on Spring Elections

Stowell – an extension announcement was sent out for more candidates. We have received a few more candidate applications. Quite a few uncontested positions still exist. Thursday at 4 pm is the deadline. I am preparing the election for ITS. Will be held during the week after Spring Break until the following Monday, March 27<sup>th</sup>

Gosse – where can I find qualifications for each position?

Hung – it was sent out with the call for candidates

Gosse – are there any committees that we cannot serve on simultaneously?

Stowell – yes, names a few – this stipulation is listed in our Faculty Senate bylaws, and Faculty Senate are all ‘at-large’ positions.

Oliver – list of qualifications for each position are also listed on the Faculty Senate website

3. Nominations Committee – no report

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee – no report

L. Young – hoping to hear from Senator Waller in the near future on this.

5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

Corrigan – will attend next Staff Senate meeting tomorrow. Will more actively liaise with Staff Senate.

Hung – what would that look like? (more actively liaising)?

Corrigan – possibly a meeting with representatives from all involved committees (3 senates).

Hung – what would a more active relationship look like between the 3 senates? More meetings not wanted, but maybe needed – Student Senate, Staff Senate, and Faculty Senate liaising together.

L. Young – what is Staff senate?

Corrigan – governing body for different types of staff on campus – different groups of workers across campus

Bruns – is there a liaison from staff senate to student senate?

Corrigan – no, but there is an effort to reciprocate but this year there seems to be a lack of interest or time or schedule flexibility.

Wharram – do we have a diagnostic on why there is a ‘stress’ (problem) between staff and faculty?

Robertson – most likely originating from the CUPB proposal that I authored? Mentions previous strategic planning a few years ago when CUPB was unable to clarify the mission of EIU = somewhat dysfunctional. And my CUPB proposal to reduce size may have re-ignited negative feelings. Add in the disinvestment in higher education in the state resulting in significant lay-offs of EIU staff. But faculty have also suffered during this situation.

Stowell – also add in the faculty raise while staff did not receive a raise.

Abebe – maybe this ‘stress’ is also a consequence of administrator turnover? In addition, the former president undervalued contributions of the faculty in a comment made at a CUPB meeting, while at the same time, maybe inaccurately overvaluing the contributions of everyone else – possibly igniting the issue.

Hung – in the spirit of coalition building, it pays no dividend to have negative feelings between governing bodies of faculty, staff, and students. Maybe we should formulate a more concrete initiative that can be discussed at our next meeting? The Faculty-Staff Relations subcommittee should probably meet to discuss options.

Corrigan – were their specific ideas mentioned during your meeting with the President?

Robertson – a picnic to say ‘thank you’ or removal/withdrawal of my CUPB proposal

Corrigan – recounts a previous unifying event hosted by the Staff Senate

Sterling – in the past Staff senate has invited Faculty Senate to match funds to pay for a shared picnic event. As former chair of the Faculty Senate, I always had to decline because we have no budget-no money.

Corrigan – it really does come down to the money. Staff are traditionally underpaid on campus.

Hung – this kind of tension will always exist on this campus – we need to effectively act on it proactively and implement ideas that will help manage and reduce the tension and host sessions that promote dialogue between the groups. Let's not wait – let's approach the Staff Senate proactively to attempt to lessen the tension. Let's try to help our staff colleagues.

Young – what if we recommend to the administration that the Chair of the staff senate attend our meetings? We could also host a social event with Staff senate – funded by Deans of the colleges. Deans have the money.

Abebe – that's a good idea

6. Awards Committee

a. Distinguished Faculty Award Update

Robertson – reads statement from Hugo regarding proposed recipient of 2017 DFA. – Linda Ghent.

Motion – Abebe, seconded = Eckert, Vote = unanimous

7. Faculty Forum Committee

Bruns – no report – no contact with Mark Cuban

8. Budget Transparency Committee

Sterling – no report

9. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

Wharram – no report

10. Ad hoc Committee for the Review Workgroup 7 Recommendations

2:40-3:20

a. Discussion of Forthcoming Response to President Glassman

Robertson – I emailed you the document from the subcommittee. Feedback from you on the message? Tone? Arch of the document?

Stowell – under section on Career and Technological Education (CTE) – a little bit confused - isn't this an education program that preps students for education positions in HS? Is that where the data comes from to support this program? Not clear on this.

Wharram – this was Senator Hugo's section (not in attendance). This is information that CTE staff provided us for this response.

Eckert – the data may not be directly linked but was probably included to point to the types of jobs gained that the skill set can help a candidate acquire.

Wharram – I will follow up with Senator Hugo on this question in case edits/changes are needed.

Hung – comment on Africana Studies section – there was an earlier reference to possible restricting and/or consolidation of the program into a 'Minority Studies' program?

Wharram – true – internal initiative – being discussed right now.

Hung – initiated by program itself? Or imposed by administration? what is the dynamic of that process?

Wharram – faculty and CAH – internal faculty are attempting to work out some details to this. The Vitalization task force prompted the faculty to re-think some of these possible transformations. From what I understand, this is a 'work in progress' that should be resolved this semester by African-Studies.

Hung – In the document I like how you discussing budgetary considerations but separately from discussing the 'value' of the programs. Within the body of that section, are there any accounting inconsistencies, similar to Philosophy, on the P&L sheets for Africana-Studies and CTE programs?

Sterling – harder to determine for a program like CTE because it is not a stand-alone academic program.

Wharram – true, there is not a separate data sheet for CTE – not a separate P&L sheet. They had a high graduation rate, but then experienced a 'dip' due to a few external issues that they are trying to sort out. The conclusion is that it would be premature to drop this program until they sort out the external issues.

Hung – should we add language in the document that points out how CTE is not a stand-alone program and therefore dropping it won't necessarily save \$?

Abebe – I commend the subcommittee's work – they evaluated programs as they were but also as they 'should be', whereas work group #7 evaluated programs as they were. A robust and useful analysis, but maybe 'too careful' in wording. I disagree with paragraph #1 – we don't need to be apologetic in this document. The institution works when everybody does their job. Let's not avoid stating the obvious. The faculty has told us that the process was wrong and we have communicated that to the president, several times. Suggesting anything different would be inaccurate and a disservice to the faculty. The endeavor of vitalization was ok, but not the process. That is why the subcommittee was initiated. We need to avoid

being apologetic. We need to state things the way they are. Therefore, I have proposed edits to the author – mentions a few suggested edits.

Gosse – with respect, my concern is placing moral judgments on someone else's process. I don't like to tag 'good' or 'bad' on a process that we did not initiate. So now we are condemning the process? We don't like the report of work group #7, but it was never our process. I hesitate to do this – it may create additional barriers on campus.

Hung – We already have laid out the concerns about the process with the referendum vote and companion document. With this subcommittee's report, maybe we can reference the earlier statement and voting result in the document in order to avoid being too antagonistic.

Wharram – I am considering editorial suggestions from senators, but I am hoping that this document does not restate what has already been stated, as well as contradict what we have already stated.

Hung – maybe a slight reference to previous faculty comments and referendum vote about the process, and then move on to specific points desired to be made in the document.

Robertson – I think Pres. Glassman is well aware of our position on Vitalization, it does not need to be repeated in this document.

Abebe – so what is it that we get in return? this document will be filed, and future presidents and provosts will refer to for future initiatives that they implement. From a strategic point of view, we need to author documents that are official statements that uphold the values of the institution, but not documents that are not absolutely true, or we may lose credibility. This is a critically important document.

Young – reads the first sentence of the conclusion paragraph – I did not write this sentence but I wish I had – this is the right tone and right attitude.

Abebe – refers to the same paragraph...what are the reasons? What did we learn? Be specific? We need to uphold the value of the Senate through the statements that we author.

Young – I think the reasons are well represented in the document, the real values of a liberal arts education at this institution.

Stowell – I think we have an obligation to submit a document that reflects the majority opinion of our group. There were divergent opinions. This is a well written document. But there are larger questions – why are we in this mess to begin with? Not our fault. With funding = everyone happy. No funding has forced us to reflect on what we have to offer students? Preparing them towards viable careers? To be informed citizens from a quality liberal arts education? There was going to be predictable push-back from any process of this kind initiated on campus. This is reactionary, it is normal. But within the constraints given, maybe we should be thinking of reallocation of limited resources, like a faculty line, into a high-demand, growing field. Maybe we should be thinking about reallocation, preferably without elimination. Let's think with a larger perspective – two workgroups focused on our future that are still working on solutions – mentioned engineering program at SIUE (significant # of students that do not attend U of I) – what if EIU provided a comparable program?

Hung – a few responses – I agree that the lead-in paragraph needs some editing – needs to more accurately reflect what the Senate feels and faculty feels. In response to Senator Stowell – there are effective ways to eliminate or re-allocate than what has occurred here with this process. The result may still affect colleague livelihoods. But I still believe that our focus should be on the flaws in the process – lacked openness, consistent evaluation system, transparency, etc – specifically with program evaluation.

Bruns – I thought our task here was to provide our analysis of work group 7 recommendations? If we came to a different conclusion than WG 7, we have to discuss concern about the process

Wharram – yes, and that is why I cited the literature. Cites researcher. P/Ls don't account for everything that an academic department provides. AT THE END OF THE DAY! – ha. Dropping these programs will not free up significant revenue to spend elsewhere. And we lose 'return on investment'.

Abebe – the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph does not line up with the rest of this document, or previous statements that we have authored, etc. Don't talk to me about worrying about hurting other people's feelings (administrators) knowing what our faculty colleagues have experienced this year.

Robertson – reiterates that there may be other terms that can be used that can express the Senate's sentiments without being openly confrontational.

Hung – compliments subcommittee on their finished product. I appreciate the labor and time that it required.

Wharram – when looking at the research related to this process, a major barrier across the country is a lack of P&L transparency in processes like these – Candice Flatt provided us with valuable data

Robertson – let's move towards a vote

Hung – 2<sup>nd</sup> with proposed amendments – I would like the suggestions to be implemented

**Vote – unanimous**

IV. Communications

1. Faculty Senate Minutes from February 21st, 2017
2. CAA Minutes from February 16<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2017

V. Proposal for Membership Reduction in Faculty Senate

3:20-3:50 PM

1. Proposal – was submitted via email to senators

Robertson – documents were forwarded to you regarding proposed changes. Fewer faculty at EIU than in the past. Proposal requires bylaws revisions as well.

Hung – I agree with the idea to explore, with the ideal language included to allow us to grow in the future as the campus grows. Possibly with the ratio attached to a specific number of faculty (percentage)

Eckert – I completely disagree. We don't have a similar problem as CUPB.

Bruns – recounts experiences at the University of Wisconsin. We may lose divergent voices if we shrink membership. We have colleagues who don't serve on committees – we need their voices. Another side of this relates to work group 9 proposals, it may impact membership on committees.

Stowell – I provided data on faculty attrition. We have 74 elected positions – It is getting harder and harder to fill these positions. However, senates at other campuses are much larger and have specific representation – other important considerations in this process.

Corrigan – we are already the smallest senate in the state – if the concern is the 'toll' it takes on faculty, is senate where we want to reduce or should it be with other committees. If the proposal was implemented, what happens if there is attrition? How do we fill a vacancy?

Stowell – depends on how long the vacancy will be – if over 1 year we usually try to fill in a future election

Abebe – I like the proposal. The only way I would support it is if CUPB agrees to comparable reduction (ha). I think the plan that you forward the proposal to CUPB is excellent and I support it.

Hung – are we voting today?

Robertson – if we move forward, we would need to hold an open meeting with faculty, then a vote from the entire faculty, then submit proposal to the President for approval or disapproval – same process last year for revised Faculty Senate constitution. I also proposed a revision to our bylaws to consolidate subcommittees to match a reduction in # of serving senators.

Gosse – can we table until Fall 2017? I don't think the timing is right. Is there some reason why it has to be now?

Bruns – we should only reduce size if it would help us to be more efficient but still remain productive. This is also about rights and responsibilities of faculty.

Eckert – so a vote right now would mean immediate change during this election season? What is the urgency?

Robertson – not sure if it is urgent

Eckert – maybe there are other options to explore first

Oliver – it's an issue that was brought up 1 year ago, but placed lower on the 'to-do' list due to more important issues – a lack of candidates is still an issue.

Stowell – maybe number of candidates next year will be more promising

Sterling – problem - some committees are contractual

Stowell – a few each year, but 74 positions to fill each election is the larger challenge

Bruns – when we eliminate positions, we reduce faculty input on key shared governance issues. Maybe we need to do more politicking?

Abebe – it's a good plan, but it feels like there are concerns about the timing.

Hung – motion to table this for the fall agenda

Abebe – second

**Vote – unanimous**

Robertson – perhaps in the Fall when we re-visit this, maybe we need to identify seats by college (or department?) on Senate?

Hung – maybe not by department – some departments of 2-3 faculty.

Hung – I would like to propose (motion) Faculty Senate endorsement of a satellite march in Charleston for the 'March for Science' on April 22<sup>nd</sup>. There will be a march in Washington D.C., and this will be a local compliment event. The goal is a march on every continent in support of science, in reaction to recent federal government decisions. Supported by Coles for Science. Would include a 'march' at Lake Charleston in support for science, along with an afternoon of hands on activities related to science. Will be advertised across the county. Also falls on Earth Day. Programming and scheduling is being finalized. I ask for Faculty Senate to endorse this event.

Abebe and Bruns – provides supportive comments

Corrigan – seconded the motion

Vote – unanimous

Robertson – IGP #82 was changed. Moving forward, only 1 faculty will be needed on the Apportionment Board

2. Proposed Constitution Revisions
3. Proposed Bylaws Revisions
4. Open Faculty Meeting to Discuss Proposed Changes (If Adopted)

VI. Other Business

VII. Adjournment no later than 3:50 PM

Upcoming Dates for Spring 2017 Faculty Senate Sessions: Mar. 21<sup>st</sup>, April 4<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup>