

9-19-2017

September 19, 2017

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "September 19, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1103.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1103

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
19 September 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 meeting.

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

Senators absent: K. Hung

Guests in attendance: Jay Gatrell (VPAA), Kent Miller (UPD), Anthony Hoh (UPD), Chrissy Miller (DEN), Jarad Jarmon (JG-TC)

Session called to order at 2:01 p.m. by Chair J. Robertson, who welcomed new non-voting student member Rebecca Cash.

I. Approval of Minutes from September 5, 2017

Motion to approve by Williams, seconded by Stowell

Discussion: none

Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions [note: 12 senators present at time of vote] – motion carried

II. Executive Committee Report

ROBERTSON: President Glassman will be at our meeting on Oct. 3 – Josh Norman will be here mid-October; prioritize list of items to discuss with him at our next meeting – I've reached out to athletic director Tom Michael for our last meeting in October – President Glassman has the option of joining us again mid-November – first CUPB meeting of the academic year was held on Sept. 8 – CUPB Exec Cmte is Kathlene Shank as Chair (also representing Academic Affairs and Deans/Chairs), Tim Zimmer (Business Affairs), Eric Davidson (Student Affairs), Steve Rich (University Advancement), Luke Young (student rep), Gloria Leitschuh (full-time teaching faculty), Melody Wollan (at-large) – subcommittees for VP areas were also constituted – VP McCann's address to CUPB (similar budget update given to Staff Senate): general fund depleted from expenditures last 2 years; getting \$ from Education Assistance Fund; receive 5% of budget each month so far; plan is to replenish reserves, enough to last for a year without state funding – budgets were allocated this summer for FY17 and FY18 – \$0 received from general revenue fund yet, \$5.6 million from EAF – have received MAP for FY17 (\$6.3 million), additional \$300,000 received week before last – MAP funding for FY18 anticipated – in terms of FY18 budgetary funds, have received to date \$4.3 million (\$2.5 million from EAF)

GOSSE: *[asks for clarification on EAF]*

STERLING: EAF is part of the state budget but it's a fund exclusively for K-12 and higher education

ROBERTSON: revenue generated from lottery/gambling

tenth-day enrollment for Fall 2017 is 7,030 – lowest year to year decrease in last 6 years – positive indicators looking forward – transfers up 19% above last year – would have seen greater increase in graduate students if not for visa issues; some have applied for an extension, more time for visa approval, may join us in January – VPSA Lynette Drake undertook a study last year on a more consolidated way to share information, resulting in Panther Life app – there will be outreach on how to add events to calendar and send out to all students and campus community members – can customize app to interests, receive notifications –

President Glassman mentioned that advancement activities have been scaled back, now planning to ramp up again *[end of CUPB report]* –

Faculty Senate Exec Cmte met Friday with President Glassman and Provost Gatrell – will be rolling out new initiative related to retention, asked if Faculty Senate would be interested in being involved, we indicated yes – also talked about recruiting; I asked about recruiting funding because travel funding has been scaled back (I recruited while traveling), encouraged investment in that area

STOWELL: another topic was strategic investments in programs of strength/growth, especially online programs – talked briefly about continuing faculty-staff relationships

BRANTLEY: international student admissions, reasons for not coming here, influenced by animosity of national political leaders toward international community?

ROBERTSON: President Glassman didn't discuss; my impression is that students still want to come but are unable

GATRELL: data suggests that applications are a bit depressed, but for these students the issue really was obtaining the visa; most have delayed their admit term, good sign that they still want to be part of EIU community; part of the visa issue is that documenting intent to return is becoming more difficult

III. Guest Speaker: Kent Martin, Chief of EIU Police

ROBERTSON: pleased to have Chief Martin here to talk about ALICE training

MARTIN: we have a short PowerPoint – I've been here 20 years, been Chief for a little more than a year – with me is Ofc. Anthony Hoh, an ALICE instructor – ALICE is civilian response to active shooter or intruder, can be applied in a variety of settings, teaches options how to react in such a situation – we've put together a 2.5-hour program involving classroom time and practical exercises – we review the VA Tech case, good case study showing how ALICE principles can mitigate – IL School Security and Standards Task Force requires annual drills for K-12 schools – lockdown drills are good when threat is outside the building, but the threat has moved inside – ALICE steps are Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter, Evacuate – setting up meetings across campus to make this information available, would like the opportunity to meet with you as departments or colleges

HOH: have done "train the trainer" with FCS

HUGO: we had a large group split into 2 classrooms when we did our simulations – good to hold training in a classroom, covered things you don't typically think about, e.g., which way doors open/lock – I took that to my class, discussed our options and considered resources available to us – informative, interesting, great investment of our time

MARTIN: meeting with Dr. Cross on Thursday to discuss possible venues for training, tricky because program involves simulated gunfire

BRANTLEY: possible to break training into different days instead of 2.5-hour block?

MARTIN: looking into having CATS film one of these training sessions that people could watch at their leisure

BRUNS: you mentioned doing training for residence halls; have you contacted the RSOs?

MARTIN: we need to find a venue first; then the plan would be to have a session per month, first 50 who sign up

ROBERTSON: I teach a larger lecture class, 130+ people in Doudna Lecture Hall; training would be great but class meets for 1.5 hours twice a week, so we'd lose a week's worth of class time

MARTIN: will also be talking with Dr. Cross about offering training later at night or on weekends

HOH: don't want to bring down the level of training too much but maybe a classroom portion on day one, practical on the next day

BRUNS: thank you for bringing ALICE to campus – Vitalization Project Workgroup 9 discussed potentially changing the calendar, the class week to include an "EIU Day" (a Wednesday or Friday without classes); this would be perfect for an "EIU Day," or a faculty forum?

HOH: difficult to reach every student, but if we can reach every faculty member and get buy-in, dedicate 10 minutes of your class to talk about ALICE

BRUNS: most or all RSOs have faculty advisors

MARTIN: please call/send email with your suggestions – thanks for having us

IV. Committee Reports

1. Elections Committee

STOWELL: I distributed the election results that came in yesterday afternoon – after tallying, each position received sufficient votes to be filled – any questions? – motion to approve results by vote

STERLING: I second

Vote: 13 in favor; none opposed; no abstentions – motion carried

STOWELL: I will contact the elected candidates and committee chairs

2. Nominations Committee

OLIVER: since our last session I met with Amy Rosenstein (previous Nominations chair) about procedure for repopulating committees – wrong list was sent but I've cleaned it up to the point that it can be sent out for

distribution – I will cross-reference the list with the committee descriptions on the Faculty Senate website – any questions or comments on list of nominated committees?

ROBERTSON: I forwarded an email to you from Sarah Daugherty about IGP change

OLIVER: IGP changed to one faculty member; three candidates for one vacancy – used protocol for random selection; Andrew Cheetham to fill position, Brian Poulter as alternate

BRANTLEY: dates following names represent academic year in which term ends?

OLIVER: correct, Spring of [year] – accessed info on membership of IAB, sent emails to cmte members listed on Rosenstein's sheet; IAB is repopulated as well

ROBERTSON: thank you [to Sen. Oliver] for your work on this – how to fill vacancies?

OLIVER: call for nominations has followed elections in years past – motion to send out call this week

BRUNS: second

Discussion: none

Vote: 14 in favor; none opposed; no abstentions – motion carried

WHARRAM: Intercollegiate Athletics not on our IGP anymore – good that we know who they are, but add footnote as reminder that Faculty Senate is not responsible for populating

3. Faculty-Student Relations Committee

BRUNS: I attended recent Student Senate meeting; Luke [Young, student government president] introduced me – they are very serious, organized, impressive – I plan on going to a Student Senate meeting at least once a month – exchanging emails trying to get 3 members from Student Senate and 3 members from Faculty-Student Relations together, also 3 from staff/Faculty-Staff Relations

4. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee

ROBERTSON [*reporting for Hung*]: from Staff Senate meeting, student medical and counseling have been merged into one unit; suggestion to hold friendly-competitive games between faculty and staff teams during homecoming week – offered to have email with Faculty Senate agenda and minutes sent to Staff Senate Exec Board; [*to Corrigan*] add Jody Stone and Renee Kerz to email list, also provost's assistant (Karen Johnson) – proposed pan-Senate meeting with faculty, staff, and student representatives to meet twice per semester, support for idea from staff senate president Stone; [Hung] will coordinate with Sen. Bruns

5. Awards Committee

HUGO: sent out the call for nominations for Mendez award, due Oct. 13 – committee members will have two weeks to review nominations; their recommendations due to me by Oct. 27 – will report name of recommended award recipient to Faculty Senate for approval at Oct. 31 meeting

6. Faculty Forum Committee

ABEBE: no report

7. Budget Transparency Committee

STERLING: no report

8. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics

ECKERT: no report

ROBERTSON: I included the IAB report as an attachment to our previous communications, for your committee to work with

ECKERT: I saw that – [Tom Michael] has been invited but hasn't responded?

ROBERTSON: I sent an email invitation, subsequently ran into him and had a conversation – need to pitch a specific date to him

ROBERTSON: Ad hoc Committee for the Review of Workgroup 7 Recommendations is still on the agenda

STOWELL: I thought we did that in the spring

WHARRAM: we talked at the last meeting [of AY 2016-2017, on [May 22](#)] about whether we should disband it or not; I can't remember what the reason not to disband it would have been

ROBERTSON: I think it was to continue to follow up [on the vitalization project]

WHARRAM: I think we should disband it

ROBERTSON: motion to formally disband?

ABEBE: so moved

ECKERT: second

Discussion:

ROBERTSON: as a Senate we can continue to monitor and engage in dialogue; ad hoc committee has served its purpose

WHARRAM: we were tasked with writing report; that report is finished

ABEBE: transitioning to talking about retention anyway

Vote: 13 in favor; none opposed; 1 abstention – motion carried

STERLING: consider what we want to do about Workgroup 8 and 9 recommendations; some recommendations are far-reaching and controversial; at some point we're going to have to discuss it

ROBERTSON: create [committee] now, or wait until President Glassman's proposal re: retention
[deferred until another meeting]

V. Provost's Report

GATRELL: thanks again for inviting me to the table – update from Academic Affairs: will be undertaking an initiative to make meaning of [recommendations from] Workgroups 8 and 9; committed to work with chairpersons, deans, as well as Faculty Senate, to identify a group of appointees and a process so we can have discussion around development, concept of signature programs, items from WG9 being implemented such as differential tuition in CDS program beginning next year – that's on the horizon this semester –

we're recruiting already for Fall 2018 – day-to-day numbers positive across all groups; up double digits and triple digits in terms of initial indicators – I want to acknowledge the hard work of Josh Norman and his entire team – as the President announced in his state of the university address we will be undertaking a retention initiative; overall a decade of slow change in robustness of historical retention numbers; initiative will be campuswide, will engage faculty; more importantly it will be a collaborative effort to make sure all students succeed – recognize that we need multiple prongs to reach all student groups and subsets, so it's going to be a broad discussion about a wide array of strategies to make sure every learner can be successful

ABEBE: President touched on all the key points in his speech last week; he continues to be a good spokesperson for this institution; it was an upbeat report – second point: I have talked to a number of people and continue to raise the issue about this campus using the concept of a residential college as a way to recruit students, but it just seems to fall by the wayside; there are still families who wish to send their children to a residential school, if university is astute enough and strategic enough to tap that market and provide a niche, we could gain a significant number of students – perhaps it's too late in the marketing scheme of things but we shouldn't ignore that completely; I didn't hear that part in the President's speech, but of course he can't talk about everything on his mind, so I would like to put that to you as a suggestion

GATRELL: I couldn't agree more – what makes Eastern outstanding is the traditional residential experience; inherently embedded within marketing campaign; targeted toward first-time full-time students – pillars of marketing campaign speak to traditional values of residential undergrad experience

BRANTLEY: I spoke with representatives from District 214 when they were here for the dual credit program – anything in terms of recruitment from that program?

GATRELL: dual credit programming is new, still in pilot phase – those programs are designed to build affinity – [praises Rebecca Throneburg and Karla Sanders for going above and beyond] – leverage that connection, ramp up onsite admissions; bring down seniors and juniors to see campus – also shout-out to KSS for the international exchange they had; brought in 2 scholars and 9 students for two weeks; they were enthusiastic about things happening here at Eastern; a lot of departments could learn from it

OLIVER: I accepted offer from their study abroad director visiting our campus to guest speak in my class 10 years ago, so step by step

YOUNG: *[distributes handouts]* – opportunity on Thursday, apologies for short notice – visit from Shanghai dignitaries, invited by Rep. Phillips, stopping here on way to New York; Dr. Ping Chen (emeritus) has liaised; coming to campus for forum on Thursday morning – *[encourages attendance]*

[Robertson calls for five-minute recess]

VI. Proposal to Rename Douglas Hall (continuation of discussion from Aug. 22 and Sept. 5 sessions)

ROBERTSON: continue our dialogue about renaming proposal from former EIU professor Hanlon, response from History department, Hanlon's rebuttal – Sen. Williams has asked to speak

WILLIAMS: *[submitted transcript appears below]*

In 1908, the Rev. William Holland, Son of a Virginia slave, founded the Watchman Industrial School and Camp in Providence R.I. He intended to provide an opportunity for young male and female persons of color to gain technical skills, to get jobs, to provide for themselves and their families, to become better citizens. He modeled his school on the educational programs of Booker T. Washington. In 1923, being successful at this, he moved the school to a larger facility 10 miles west to North Scituate, R.I. The move was not without difficulty.

The following year, and again in 1926, suspicious fires were set at the school. And there is report that a cross was set on fire on the lawn of the school in the 1930's. While no one was ever arrested or charged, it was believed that the local chapter of the KKK, which was active in the region at that time, was likely responsible.

Rev. Holland was forced to close the main school in 1938 during the Great Depression as did other similar institutes, but kept the Camp going until his death in 1958. His Widow continued the Camp until 1974. It was typical that students attending the Camp would bring their families with them during their training, and the families lived in small cottages at the school.

In 1956, two years before Rev. Hollands death, a small white child was out at recess at the North Scituate Elementary School, about 200 yards down the street from the Camp. Finding no one to play with, the white child began playing with a boy and girl of color who had walked down from the grounds of the Camp. They were having a fun time of it and instantly became friends.

A third grade teacher approached them and told the little boy and girl of color to go back home, because they didn't "belong" there. The white child was confused and asked, "Why can't they play with me?" She replied "because they are negroes, and they are not like us." It was a terrible thing to say to a child. That child has carried the memory of that first occasion of prejudice to this very day. The world changed for that child on that day.

You see, I am that white child. I never again saw the two children of color that I played with that day. And I have only had 61 years to reflect on the events of that day. But I hold the memory of that day in my mind, seeing them walk away with heads down, and I am angry.

I like to believe that I can begin to understand how hurtful such language and actions can be, but I will never be able to come close to knowing, or understanding how persons of color can or will feel, or can live in a society that continues to marginalize, disenfranchise, and even dehumanize them. I try to understand their arguments, and I try to sympathize with their feelings, their frustrations, and their rage. I think that they are a much better and stronger people, than many of us can ever hope to be.

But now, I find myself being asked to consider the renaming of the Lincoln/Douglas residence halls. Statements have been made to simply strike the name "Douglas" from the building, on the basis that someone of color has been, or may be offended, to live in a dormitory named after a man who had pro-slavery views. Others state that we should just call the buildings the "Debate Hall." Or that we should change the name because change is good. And the resolution was put forth following prior name change discussions to place a plaque between the buildings commemorating the Lincoln/Douglas Debates of 1858, which we are told was the intent of the original naming committee.

Now I say to you that my involvement in these considerations is not equal to yours. That the depth to which I have read about the circumstances of these events is not equal to yours. That the level of my understanding of these things is not equal to yours.

But I believe that we must be cautious against making a decision too quickly, to change the names because we don't want to offend, to change the names because change is good, to change the names because it feels like a politically correct thing to do. To erase our history so that it reads easier. To storm the castle with torches and pitchforks raised,

....without considering the following:

The Lincoln/Douglas debates were held so the candidates running for the Illinois Senate could present their views to the public. Lincoln was a virtual unknown, while Douglas was the incumbent Senator seeking re-election. Only one of the seven debates was held in Charleston. Douglas was of course re-elected to the Senate.

Two years later however, in the race for President, Lincoln ran against Douglas and two other candidates. While there were no debates in the Presidential election itself, transcripts of the Illinois debates were circulated nation-wide influencing the voting populace, and Lincoln was elected President.

The Lincoln/Douglas Debate transcripts: Were critical to: Americans standing up and making a choice. Were critical to: Americans standing up and making the right choice. Were critical to: Americans making the statement that we would not live in a country that supported slavery. And so they elected Lincoln. A move that ultimately led to the Civil war. A move that ultimately led to Lincoln writing the Emancipation Proclamation. A move that ultimately led to Lincoln extending the right to vote to all men. Do you believe the Proclamation, or the right to vote would have occurred if Douglas had been elected. I don't.

One of the arguments for renaming was that living in the hall could be offensive to someone. I say to you that they should instead feel Honored: Honored to live in a Hall that commemorates the debates that led to the freedom for all men. Honored to live in a Hall that commemorates the debates which led to the right to vote for all men.

I say to you that we as Americans must stand up and make a choice.

I say to all of you, that as Faculty Senators we must stand up and make the right choice.

That choice must be to keep the title "Lincoln/Douglas Debate Hall" on the buildings.

I find therefore that I will be unable to vote for any proposition which seeks to remove the title "Lincoln/Douglas Debate Hall" from the buildings.

I will vote against any attempts to simply rename the buildings "Debate Hall(s)". I believe this erases our history, and even whitewashes the critical nature and significance of the debates into obscurity.

But, I could vote for removing both the individual names of Douglas and Lincoln from the two connected structures, and for keeping a plaque naming the buildings "The Lincoln/Douglas Debate Halls," of which there is an East wing and a West wing.

That is what I do now propose for consideration.

Thank you all for listening.

ROBERTSON: I propose we hold off on authoring resolution to recommend official renaming – though personally I am in favor of renaming, it's more important to get to the heart of the matter [i.e.] making sure that we have a diverse and welcoming campus – we're not accomplishing that by changing a name, could lead to entrenching various camps or antagonizing – reach out to constituency groups especially our current students, their feelings about campus climate – not an official proposal but that we engage through Faculty / Staff Senate in dialogue with staff, student body – given the current political and media climate, a declaration from Senate could be a hot button topic for media outlets – before we consider going in that direction we should have a broad sense of campus community – important to have a dialogue beyond building name

YOUNG: I agree with your suggestions, and I also want to thank Sen. Williams for his deeply-felt [speech] – since 2018 is 160th anniversary of debates, I suggest partnering with Student and Staff Senates and other groups representing community, to engage in planning public events with discussions to reflect on the names and commemorations that are part of our daily existence – reasonable to reflect on things and to change them when appropriate – don't have to keep the name – this event was important in the consequences it's had for American history – [suggestions for events/activities etc.]

STOWELL: [to Williams] I appreciate your remarks – one of the things I'm struggling with is that this was not an organic internally-driven proposal – before we invest, is this of sufficient interest in our community? – like wisdom teeth that don't cause problems until you try to remove them – evidence from Mark Hudson: this is not a concern, no complaints from students (they want to live there because of renovated bathrooms) – if there were a concern it would be remedied through existing policies – I have a hard time investing in this when it didn't originate from us – it's something we seem to be divided on – Sen. Williams has made a motion, not yet seconded – we need to come to a decision: is this something we want to pursue?

BRANTLEY: I know there have been class assignments; this is generating discussion – what I keep coming back to is that it has to be reiterated each time that it's about the debate not the individuals

BRUNS: I agree with Sen. Brantley – Sen. Williams has hit on an important point about the historical impact of the debate – he mentioned Lincoln-Douglas east and west; part of the problem is that people see the name "Douglas" when approaching the building, seeing the single name implies honoring the man and what he stood for; [the east-west suggestion] still says it's an important event but takes the onus off

STOWELL: we do have a motion from Sen. Williams, correct?

WILLIAMS: propose that we consider but didn't actually say motion

STOWELL: there is a campus climate survey that asks about students and their reactions to campus environment, so we do have information (Office of Civil Rights)

WHARRAM: I take your point, Sen. Stowell, that this is not organic – I like the idea of redirecting conversation to larger question of campus climate – do a listening tour; can be connected to retention – makes more sense than sitting around a room and making a decision without listening to constituents

CASH: this was brought up at the last student senate meeting – more than half of senators and other people I've talked to, didn't know why the buildings were named – they think it's something that doesn't need to be dealt with, something they learned about in school should be celebrated – they don't see name change as necessary

BRUNS: what did they learn? – I'm thinking of Texas history textbooks, ships brought over "workers" instead of slaves – when we're taught history, what are we being taught – we're told that an event is important but don't really know much about it, only know what we're told

CASH: it's an event that has shaped us

WHARRAM: everyone agrees on that basic point; consensus around importance of debate locally and nationally

ABEBE: I am a professor, I believe in education – ghastly spectacle of Douglas advocating for slavery is no more, but its consequences are all around here – I do not believe that smashing, tearing down, erasing a name changes anything or solves the associated problem – is this becoming political? Yes, resentment is political – is this about heritage, about history? – history is never neutral, in fact it can be toxic – what is bothersome is that intolerance and racism are rising again, education is the only way to fight it – intolerance and racism thrive on generational complacency – unless there is inner conviction that outweighs external pressure, shouldn't vote to erase name because that will only postpone debating this issue again

STERLING: I want to echo Sen. Stowell's concerns; ties in with what Rebecca had to say – most of my students don't have the faintest idea who the building is named after; if you tell them Stephen A. Douglas, they don't know who he is – in my experience this is not a student issue, not something they're worried about – to them "Douglas" means nothing at all

ROBERTSON: I would prefer to hold off on authoring resolution moving strongly forward in any direction until we feel it is organic from campus community – I would be in favor of moving forward but not erasing history – they may have intended to name the buildings after the debate but they actually named them after the individuals, [one of whom] espoused ideas held by present-day white supremacists

BRANTLEY: clarification: what would we be moving for, to have the name changed or to have the Naming Committee take up this issue?

ROBERTSON: we would be making a motion to the administration to enact the Naming Committee to tackle this issue, who would make a recommendation to the President, who would take it to the Board for consideration – we are only an advisory body – our larger purpose should be to foster positive dialogue on campus – [to Stowell] I appreciate your reaching out to Mark Hudson; my hesitation with his response is that just because students haven't identified it as an issue doesn't mean that there is no issue – building is conveniently located near athletic facilities; up to 50% of legally allowed number of student athletes who can live in that building choose to do so – profess my own ignorance as to why it was named Douglas Hall, had to read informational placard in museum exhibit to learn more about it – it concerns me that members of the campus community were not consulted by the Naming Committee when this issue was last taken up in 2010 – before we proceed, we should reach out to diverse number of student constituency groups and others on campus to ensure that there is enough organic support to move forward

ABEBE: Mark Hudson's position as presented here is a misrepresentation of what he said in writing

STOWELL: I said that there were no student complaints living in Douglas Hall

ABEBE: he didn't state that

STOWELL: I will consult the original response

BRUNS: as a society we generally whitewash history, we are not good at addressing and facing our own history – someone might think that changing the names is erasing history; another might argue that having buildings named Lincoln and Douglas commemorating the debate is softening history, not really addressing what the speech was about; what views did Douglas hold, why are we commemorating a building to this man who argued that human beings should be slaves – we paper over history, say it was a disagreement between states; we don't want to face up to the brutality of slavery, that we had ancestors who argued that they should be able to own other people – I took an entire undergrad class about civil rights movements in the U.S., that professor never once talked about gay rights movements – this was a history professor, but this is what we do as human beings: interpret history in our own way, minimize what we're uncomfortable with – when I look at Lincoln and

Douglas's buildings, I see this as minimizing history that we're uncomfortable with; we're saying it was about the debate and that's all we're focusing on, not what Douglas was arguing for

OLIVER: I can't add much more to the commentary; I want to thank all who have helped my perspective grow – current students' lack of awareness about the debates creates an educational concern – I like the idea of getting more stakeholders involved in an educational opportunity – I recall when the athletics logo was changed a few years ago it was a group of individuals in a room, key stakeholders were not involved in the process

GOSSE: I agree 100% with Sen. Young re: educational thrust – I'm concerned about the 800,000 people estimated in this country to be involved in human trafficking – it's a current issue, things we need to teach our student now – it would be a great project for a faculty forum – in the context of these discussions that have been uncomfortable; discomfort is a learning opportunity – forward and backward thinking; many oppressed groups in 2017 – did the President have anything to say [on this subject during meeting with Exec Cmte]?

ROBERTSON: yes, my take is that the President's main reservation is that the conversation did not begin on campus, that it began externally – we should move toward wrapping up – we have a few different ideas about how to proceed – not to diminish the importance of this conversation, but we have other issues to look at within our scope of view; I would hate for us to get sidetracked and address only one issue

BRUNS: I move that we vote about sending this issue to the Naming Committee at our next meeting; we can continue the discussion about campus climate and diversity issues

ABEBE: second

Discussion:

ROBERTSON: my concern is that we won't be consulted if we move forward that quickly, that we wouldn't be consulting some of these constituency groups

BRUNS: doesn't the Naming Committee consult?

WHARRAM: in theory, but in practice that might not end up happening

ROBERTSON: that's what happened in 2010, Naming Committee's call to do that but they did not consult all constituencies

BRUNS: good idea to have stakeholder groups weigh in, but I'm also baffled that we're talking about what should be changed and what it should be changed to, but we don't have any ultimate say in this; all we can really do is say should it go to the Naming Committee; we can add the recommendation that they talk to these groups, right?

ROBERTSON: vote should be structured to reflect that Faculty Senate wants to stay involved as the conversation goes forward, instead of just handing off problem to be solved

ABEBE: three sessions we have devoted to this; enough is enough

ROBERTSON: we have to have something specific to vote on; I will author and present draft version at our next meeting but I'll put out a call if anyone wants to help

Vote: 11 in favor; 2 opposed (Young, Sterling); no abstentions – motion carried

Session adjourned at 4:02 p.m.