

Eastern Illinois University

## The Keep

---

Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

8-22-2017

### August 22, 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, "August 22, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1105.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1105](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1105)

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  
22 August 2017 ▪ 2:00-3:50 p.m.  
Witters Conference Room 4440, Booth Library

The 2017-2018 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available at <http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>.

*Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate session.*

Senators present: T. Abebe, S. Brantley, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, N. Hugo, K. Hung, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Williams, B. Young

Guests in attendance: J. Gatrell (VPAA)

Session officially called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 2:33 p.m., preceded by a reception to welcome Provost Jay Gatrell to EIU.

I. Approval of Minutes from May 22, 2017

Motion to approve by Sterling; seconded by Wharram

Discussion: none

Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, 3 abstentions (Williams, Hugo, Hung)

Motion carried; minutes approved without modification

II. Senate Address by Jay Gatrell, Provost and VPAA

Gatrell: getting acclimated – working with Deans on Vitalization Workgroup 7 – have identified 10 programs to be moved from 1.3 (enhance operational efficiency) to 1.2 (stable); 21 programs remaining – [refers to [update on Vitalization Project website](#)] – have also been advocating for academic programs, your Deans are your champions – recognize unique historical moment on college campuses – dialogue full, robust, contextualized – putting students first, and values of institution – where learners feel comfortable

Robertson: thank you for following up on Vitalization Project – which programs moved to stable?

Gatrell: B.A. in Chemistry, Clinical Lab Science, College Student Affairs, Counseling, Educational Leadership, Engineering Co-op, History B.A., Science with Teacher Certification, Social Science Teaching, Special Education – other programs are pending – focus on mission-centered programs, program array attractive to highest performing students, comparable to peers, etc.

Hung: considering recommendations from other workgroups?

Gatrell: my expectation is that Workgroup 8 dialogue will begin shortly with Deans, then with President's Council; then on to Workgroup 9

Gosse: money?

Gatrell: have received a number of electronic transfers, MAP money has arrived, but still a conservative environment – 90% of 2015, governor has right to claw back 5% – state legislature instituted new guidelines for SURS as part of budget deal (applies to new hires after July 1 & employees earning more than \$140K) – do our best to be effective stewards – I recognize holes in staffing, will fill where reasonably possible – decreased revenue due to enrollment decline

Gosse: will departments be able to see budgets?

Gatrell: expect budgets to be loaded in September

Hung: any news on physical structures? projects on hold because of crisis, is there an expected date to complete or still on hold? [gives examples]

Gatrell: monies for projects have been authorized and allocated but still need to be released – the expectation is that projects will begin in 2018 if monies are released

Bruns: have been pushing to get new Life Sciences building on as a capital project since 2010 – how do we get Springfield when capital projects are under discussion again?

Gatrell: Life Sciences is #1 project, #6 out of Springfield – I was a little bit shocked [at the condition of facilities] when we showed the space to the comptroller – I understand the physical plant challenges – can't create new

programs without facilities, going to have to invest (priority) – conversations with President Glassman & Paul McCann, also Rep. Phillips – agree #1 priority

Oliver: predicting enrollment growth in some areas?

Gatrell: grad students growth opportunities, it's a new environment due to access to F1 visas – going to hold our own – stable to slight increase in graduate student enrollment – overall headcount doing well compared to expectations – feel positive that we're moving in the right direction

Oliver: thank you re: eclipse event, positive vibes at back to school event

Gatrell: [praises Steve Daniels for organizing event]

Wharram: assistant dean in OISS?

Gatrell: Matthew Walters from Columbia, New School, originally from Sullivan, Illinois – reflective, thoughtful individual who will focus on academic quality -- kudos to Austin [Cheney] for doing work in interim

### III. Discussion of 2017/2018 Faculty Senate Goals

Robertson: relate goals to upcoming guests – Newton Key re: Faculty Development; long overdue for direct conversation with Tom Michael (Athletic Director), dialogue could be more positive 1-on-1; President Glassman, hopefully in October

Robertson: last year there was rekindling of a positive vibe with staff, continue this as well as reach out/liase to students more, for a more unified front

Robertson: would also like to make a concerted effort toward faculty colleagues to become more active re: recruiting, do more to reach out, visit schools & help engage future incoming classes

Young: number of things planned for 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Doudna reopening, the building is wonderful for campus & community, can attract/recruit – Dean Shelton has interesting initiatives [suggests inviting her]

Bruns: establish a senior colleague program – work with new hires to do recruitment activities, create a culture of participation > recruitment becomes part of what it means to be faculty here

Young: have you discussed with Josh Norman? invite him to be present for conversation

Hung: we have set up biology recruitment effort within department, invited to talk during career days – encouraging but energy hasn't been channeled productively – need more structure, faculty willing to put in time but no infrastructure to do it – what can we borrow from that's already existing, e.g., contact lists

Hung: campus climate for faculty, especially those in minority groups – recent trend in higher education looking at [faculty] evaluations, especially faculty teaching social science (?) courses & female faculty tend to receive depressed scores compared to other measurables – moving forward in terms of workgroups 7, 8, 9, looking at reorganization and new programs, so we'll be thinking about assessment – important for Faculty Senate to have a voice in – what are reasonable objective standards beyond contractual obligations, how do we adjust for potential differences & how does that impact promotion

Young: History Department has been going out to certain high schools, dual credit program – we could ask the faculty members involved to come and talk to Senate

Abebe: some of these ideas could be organized/facilitated by Faculty Development Office [clarifies that he's talking about both recruitment & faculty evaluation]

Bruns: [points out that staffing in Faculty Development consists solely of Newton Key]

Wharram: drew up beginnings of memo to address this last year – we're here, ready but we don't have the structure – we don't want to step on toes but want to be part of admissions, etc. – communicate this desire to Admissions office, that we don't have expertise in recruiting but want to help, without coming across as if we're telling them how to do their job – [also agrees with Hung's second point]

Wharram: we've prided ourselves on retention numbers, quantitative data, but have suffered slightly – faculty can help with retention if educated on the issues

Stowell: retention was 78%, President Glassman says it has slipped into the lower 70s

Bruns: in the library kicking around the idea of a first year program and first year experience librarian to help students adjust & succeed – SelectedWorks can be used to promote faculty to prospective students, pages are Google optimized – new Expert Gallery is another way to promote faculty externally

Gatrell: retention will be one of our strategic initiatives this year – last year was marketing, town halls will be held on August 30<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup> – [agrees with inviting Josh Norman for recruitment discussion] – most valuable way

faculty can support efforts is to provide quality academic programs, also be available if prospective students want to meet – visiting early and meeting faculty yields higher enrollment and retention – [encourages being accessible and interactive]

Wharram: I had conversations with [prospective] students during Spring open house breakfast at Doudna – not enough faculty there, I just happened to hear about it – more faculty members would have been present if they'd known about it, so send us an email and tell us to come

Oliver: have we asked students who aren't returning their reasons for not coming back?

Stowell & Gatrell [simultaneously]: money

Stowell: they do ask, they survey – it's financial, the students don't have \$ to come back

Oliver: so it's not about quality or the uncertainties of the future, instability or negative media, it's about the price tag

Gatrell: academic indicator bands – highest performing students have been recruited out of state – every confidence that they will come back, rebound – retention issue is mix of family contribution & high performing versus murky middle – if they can find comparable elsewhere at lower cost, they will – first-generation students don't think about housing, tuition is qualifier

Robertson: will invite Josh Norman, thank you for ideas – I forwarded the monthly enrollment newsletter to you, encourage you to subscribe

#### IV. Committee Reports and Staffing for 2017-2018

Robertson: typically 3 to 4 members on each committee – need to fill Nominations, Elections – [proposes email thread nominating self or others rather than spending meeting time on sorting out committee membership]

Robertson: re: committee reports, any developments during summer?

##### Elections Committee

Stowell: Spring elections did not fully staff – 4 positions open – can't have 2 members from same department on CGS, need another member from CEPS; CAA has an open position; so does Academic Elimination & Review; UPC needs a member from CEPS (3-year term) – feelers out for ITS, get current list of faculty, put call for nominations out – nominations due by Friday, September 8, election to be held following week, positions filled by end of month

Sterling: since we've lost a large number of faculty, make sure people on committees are still here

Stowell: will reach out to elected committees re: vacancies

Robertson: Rosenstein chaired Nominations, reach out for continuity

Robertson: [reiterates email thread for Senate committees, rosters to be approved next meeting]

#### V. Discussion of Proposal to Rename Douglas Hall (agenda item IV.3)

Robertson: forwarded memo from History Department to you this morning – [describes context, i.e., Charlottesville, of receiving Hanlon's letter] – therefore I'm in favor but don't want to push my own view – I went to the Stevenson foyer with Wharram to look at the exhibit [on the naming of the dormitories] – members of the African American community were not consulted in 2010 – the proposal went through Senate to the Naming Committee and was voted down, but the Black Student Union was never approached – a very important voice to consult in dialogue moving forward

Young: Americanists with competence in 19<sup>th</sup> century, not whole History department, who signed memo [i.e., memo dated August 21, signed by Barnhart, Curry, Foy, Small, Wehrle, Hubbard] – didn't attend 2010 meeting where Hanlon proposed renaming but consulted colleagues including Mark Voss-Hubbard (principal author) – subsequent meeting between 2 History & 2 English faculty members spoke to two sides of the issue, one was Martin Hardeman (senior African American on faculty), he was against renaming – [distributes handout] – any decision to remember people historically, to dedicate buildings to them, rests upon judgments – 1) damnatio memoriae; good emperors were voted by the Roman senate to have joined the gods, bad emperors, e.g., Nero were voted to have their memory condemned > take the head off of monuments and replace with the head of a good emperor, chisel the name out from inscriptions – does white supremacist racism of Stephen Douglas rise to this level? – 2) research by [former President] Perry showed that Douglas & Lincoln halls were not named in

honor of Stephen & Abraham, intention found in notes was to commemorate L-D debates as moment crucial in history of Charleston – difference between monument to people & to event [cites French deportation memorial as example] – debate was seen in 1950s as an important event in Charleston history, I submit that it still is – 3) [refers to Faculty Laureate Abebe's remarks at convocation] search for harmony – not looking to make pretty but to incorporate memory into history unfolding now, recognizing different ways of seeing things – Douglas was an opportunist, but not on the same level as Goebbels or Nathan Bedford Forrest – opportunity vis-à-vis students & community to keep memory vivid, something that happened in 1858 is still relevant today – racism/racial violence remains fraught topic, part of our world, students have to come to grips – better to use memory creatively, by sponsoring contest for work of art expressing significance today

Abebe: I rise to respond to the argument made by my good friend Bailey Young not because he does not understand the issue, but because I wish to learn more.

As I listened to his presentation and read the document written by the history department in opposition to renaming Douglas Hall, I am more disturbed.

The history department says:

- 1) Lincoln was just as bad as Douglas. You can see the quote they site in their document. I say that we are now talking about Douglas and not Lincoln.
- 2) Douglas' actions were "complex" i.e. black people and those who suggest the renaming are incapable of understanding complexities.
- 3) Hanlon was inaccurate and omitted stuff, they say, but they don't cite what these omissions were.
- 4) They point to the 1951 committee decision and say: "it was to honor the debate". In that case: a) let us rename it the Debate Hall, or Debate Hall East and West or Lincoln Douglas Debate Hall. B) The history department ignores what happened in the 1890's and the 1950's. 1890's were Jim Crow being established, and the 1950's were a period of mass Southern resistance to the Civil Rights Movement. The actions of the committee (coincidentally) can rightly be construed as sending a message as to who was boss here.
- 5) That Douglas only employed "rhetoric"; and that the rhetoric was "nuanced". What is nuanced in saying that "the negro should never be a US citizen"?
- 6) That there were others who did the same thing too. I say that we are not talking about others, we are talking about Douglas. This is a feeble defense of a position—sort of a third grader's defense of an offense at best.
- 7) That there are other places and things named for Douglas. Again we are talking about Douglas hall at EIU in Charleston.
- 8) That the standard to condemn should be much higher. I ask, higher in whose view; how high; and what is that standard? They also say that it does not rise to "a level" that is offensive. Again, what is that level?
- 9) That he "was not a white supremacist". They say that because he was not a leader of supremacists, he should be above question. I say, but this man's position on the issue enabled white supremacists who brutalized a people.
- 10) That this is not Douglas' personality. I say, but this debate is not about a person's personality. It is about a man who was instrumental in organizing, sustaining, enabling a system of government to maintain a system of slavery along with its brutality (but not to destroy the Union). He was advocating a single, homogeneous people who can do no wrong and need only understanding to implement their will—a fantasy.

So, I say to the senate that in my view:

- 1) This issue has been debated here and was settled by a previous senate. They can't be wrong and we claim to be right. I say that we reaffirm the previous decision of the senate to rename the building.
- 2) Let me remind everyone here, that a European dictator (not equating here) once called America as the "one state" designed to exclude "undesirables" and progressing toward the creation of a healthy "race-based order", and doing so using democratic means!
- 3) That as a consequence, we should not be afraid, that in the USA, of one politician, one leader who would do damage to one group of people. Rather, we should worry that our institutions' potential would be used to facilitate evils. EIU, as an institution, should not facilitate this, even when it uses democratic means to do so!

Robertson: I reached out to Hanlon [author of renaming proposal, now at ASU] but he was unable to join session via Skype

Robertson: other comments?

Hung: I appreciate authors with historic knowledge putting information together – I'm not a historian, but my reaction as a person in the community & as faculty – [quotes from end of page 2 of Barnhart et al. memo, continued on page 3] – statement makes it clear where Douglas stood, slavery should be decided by popular vote, not a position I can agree with – always good and bad to every historical figure, not a reason to overlook prominent issue under consideration – what does renaming do to climate on campus & in community – not

merely accuracy of history but public perception, cultural impact – what does it mean to people living today, to new students & campus visitors – therefore I would support renaming – call it Debate Hall, but even slavery as a debate topic shouldn't be legitimized – [reiterates support for renaming]

Robertson: let's wrap up [in consideration of the clock]

Bruns: this is important, why are we wrapping up?

Robertson: I suggest that we continue to think about it – collaboration welcome from anyone who wants to draft language

Bruns: why not continue now?

Abebe: I move to extend session

Bruns: I second the motion

Gatrell: I urge looking at how others have handled such issues, such as University of Houston Calhoun Lofts – not about marshaling evidence, but about making a values statement – historical context should, must and does inform, as well as shape, shared values and the observed status quo – however important understanding historical context is, the decision really comes down to values that are shared – I appreciate the dialogue, recognize that it's personal – reflect not on data, but on human beings

Williams: not prepared to make judgment without further reflection – reminded of Pawtucket in 1970s > deemed 'manhole' covers inappropriate, voted to change to 'person holes' – take all views into consideration to make a worthy decision

Stowell: [speaking as the only current member who was on Senate in 2010] – I learned a lot – our contemporary view being imposed on people from 1850s, on historical record – looking at it differently than they did then – the discussion 7 years ago was: these men were products of their time, do we overturn & impose our own views to erase this record – whatever outcome is, I hope we don't disconnect & alienate from Charleston community – what makes Charleston known is Lincoln log cabin & debate museum – be careful of community's perception – we need time to think about this deeply

Abebe: that assumes we are changing history – we're not, we're trying to change the way we remember history

Robertson: comes down in favor of honoring the debate but not the man – in 1951, decision was made to name parallel buildings – students might not know the history – find a path forward without erasing memory of debate – renaming of residential college at Yale as example of being more sensitive to current students – colleague mentioned that when debate was brought up 7 years ago, changing the name was equated with whitewashing history – not intent to erase debate but to create welcoming environment for diverse students, to remember the debate without validating viewpoints of Lincoln or Douglas – intent not explicitly clear in name they chose

Hugo: can we request input from students?

Eckert: we should invite representatives from Douglas Hall to conversation – James Ochwa-Echel is the faculty fellows captain for Douglas

Further discussion tabled until next meeting on September 5. Session adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
E. Corrigan  
Recorder, Faculty Senate