

Eastern Illinois University

## The Keep

---

Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

3-20-2018

### March 20, 2018

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 20, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1092.

[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1092](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1092)

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  
20 March 2018 ▪ 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, K. Hung, N. Hugo, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Williams, B. Young

Senators absent: R. Cash

Guests in attendance: Jay Gatrell (Provost), Brooke Schwartz (DEN), Jonelle DePetro (Philosophy)

---

Session called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 2:02 p.m.

### **Approval of Minutes from March 6, 2018**

*Motion to approve by Wharram, seconded by Williams*

*Discussion: none*

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

ABEBE: A correction to the resolution: If the “Whereas” clauses were moved before “Therefore be it resolved,” it would look more orderly

ROBERTSON: The resolution has been forwarded to the Provost – How else should it be distributed? Send out to all faculty? It was in the Communications folder

CORRIGAN: There's a Reports and Resolutions page on the Faculty Senate website

*Motion by Robertson to post resolution on the Resolutions webpage, seconded by Bruns*

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

### **Executive Committee Report**

ROBERTSON: We have an Executive Committee meeting on April 2 with the President and the Provost – We attended the Provost's meeting yesterday where he rolled out a preliminary plan [based on the results of the Student Success Taskforce and WG8&9 Review Committee reports]

GATRELL: I invited various stakeholder and leadership groups to look at and provide feedback on the potential impact of reorganization if it were to occur; it's still in draft form

ROBERTSON: Do you have a timeline for publishing [the plan] to make it accessible to the rest of the faculty?

GATRELL: My hope is sooner rather than later; I'm still getting feedback – once it's worked through, then engage in dialogue with all the impacted parties people; I want to make sure that it reflects the full feedback of the people who have to implement it

ROBERTSON: I was impressed with the plan, it represents a lot of shared governance

### **Shared Governance Visioning Committee Update**

STOWELL: I haven't communicated with any other groups since our last Senate meeting because of Spring Break; I am planning to visit CGS, COTE, college curriculum committees – I'm hoping to have feedback from the other major campus committees by the second week in April, then the committee chairs will meet again to discuss the feedback and determine how to move forward with a recommendation – there are sideline discussions in CAA's agenda this week, they're continuing to discuss the proposal as well as looking at the curricular approval process at peer institutions and potentially streamlining how we do it here

### **Committee Reports**

*Elections Committee*

STOWELL: I anticipate that ITS will have electronic voting in production by tomorrow; when it's available, we'll make that announcement; voting will run for a week, with at least one reminder – we'll have a summary of results to discuss at our next Senate meeting

*Nominations Committee - Discussion of Nominations Committee Motion to Adjust Appointed Committees*

OLIVER: There was an attachment sent by email, following up on recommendations attempting to streamline some of the appointed committees; in summary, responses were collected regarding six or seven committees; Campus Recreation Board: maintain one faculty member; Committee of Brand Champions: eliminate; Environmental Health and Safety Committee: has not recently met but Paul McCann indicated meetings in the near future; Office of the Registrar Advisory Committee: Amy Lynch suggested faculty involvement on the Student Process Team, so also change the name of the committee; Parking Advisory Committee and Parking Appeals Committee: meet as needed, haven't needed to meet yet this academic year, there was a suggestion of merging the two, might require a name change; Student Government External Relations Committee: Student Life liaison to that committee doesn't remember faculty involvement in more than 20 years

STERLING: In regard to the last committee, the city of Charleston has an External Relations Committee: *[reading from city website]* "consists of members of the Eastern Illinois University Student Senate, Administration and Faculty, and members of the Charleston City Council," but as members it only lists three city council members and one student government representative, nobody from the administration or the faculty, so I wonder if we're supposed to be appointing a member to that committee but it got mixed up at some point

OLIVER: I remember you bringing this up previously; I emailed the mayor then, I've given him a month but he has not responded – I believe there was an adjustment made on that page, faculty remains in the description but has been removed from the population of the committee – I'm going to interpret that as a dead end, although it makes sense from a relationship perspective, to be building relationships with faculty as well as students

BRUNS: It's valid to ask the mayor what the position on that board is intended to do, because if that position is supposed to represent EIU to the city it should be someone from Admin

OLIVER: We're talking about two different committees – for the student government committee, the proposal to eliminate is still valid – we can continue to try to follow up with the mayor, and maybe that's a future committee that we populate with a faculty member

WHARRAM: I volunteer to talk to the mayor during his Friday office hours

STOWELL: Are we planning to combine the Parking Advisory and Parking Appeals committees? If that's the case, then members would serve a dual function

OLIVER: That's the proposal, it could save two or three colleagues from serving on two separate committees (right now there are three on Parking Advisory, two on Parking Appeals), it seems like common sense to consolidate – would you suggest a name change, or a change in the language of the bylaws?

STOWELL: It wouldn't be in the Senate bylaws – is there an IGP?

OLIVER: Yes

ABEBE: The issue of parking is sensitive for the union, there was some discussion about making sure that there is a faculty member; it's not in the contract

BRUNS: On which committee?

ABEBE: Advisory, not Appeals – last time they met, we got a few parking spots at Coleman; it didn't work out the way it was supposed to, they went to handicapped parking instead of regular parking as requested

BRUNS: I'm not sure of the mechanism, but the obvious thing would be to combine the names and call it the Parking Advisory and Appeals Committee

STERLING: IGP 159 is the Parking Advisory Committee; I don't think there's an IGP for the appeals committee

BRUNS: This looks like progress, eliminating three committees, moving in the right direction

OLIVER: Pare down, become more efficient – some of us have concerns about faculty stating that they serve on committees, that don't actually meet, and earning promotions and PAIs; it's not their fault that the committees aren't meeting, but take it in the right direction of being rewarded for work that's actually happened

ROBERTSON: Would we like to separate out item 6 until Sen. Wharram has a chance to speak with the mayor, and vote on items 1-5?

OLIVER: Item 6 represents the discussion we've had with Ceci Brinker about the on-campus committee, not the city of Charleston committee

ROBERTSON: So leave item 6 in there

BRUNS: The issue with the Student Government External Relations Committee is that there's never been a faculty member, that's what Ceci is saying

OLIVER: Her recommendation is we don't need to populate that committee because it's student government, it doesn't need to involve faculty

*[clarification that the vote is on eliminating nominations to the student committee]*

ROBERTSON: So we've had a motion from Sen. Oliver

OLIVER: Does that include the friendly amendment about the title [i.e., committee name]?

HUNG [*as Parliamentarian*]: Motion, then second, then friendly amendment; if the author of the motion accepts it, so amended; then discuss the amended resolution

BRUNS: Second

ROBERTSON: Then we have a friendly amendment, and we've had discussion [*calls for vote*]

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

BRANTLEY: How will Sen. Wharram's discussion with the mayor about this other committee be brought back to us?

ROBERTSON: I will make an agenda item for April 3

OLIVER: IGP 159 maintains two faculty members and one additional alternate faculty member to serve on the Parking Advisory Committee – I will contact our colleagues who have been serving on these committees, let them know that their positions will be eliminated at the end of this academic term but encourage them [toward other university service]

ROBERTSON: For IGP 159, do we need to contact President Glassman to ask the President's Council to adjust the title?

GATRELL: Correct

OLIVER: Do we have the authority to change the title?

STERLING: We can recommend

ROBERTSON: We need to nominate someone to the VPAA scholarship committee

[*Eckert volunteers – approved by acclamation*]

*Faculty-Student Relations Committee: No report*

*Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report*

*Awards Committee*

HUGO: The Distinguished Faculty Award recipient is Dr. Gary Aylesworth from Philosophy [*reads bio*]

*Motion by Abebe to approve the recipient, seconded by Eckert*

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

*Faculty Forum Committee: No report*

*Budget Transparency Committee*

STERLING: We're looking into the history of tuition and fees over the last 10 years or so, but nothing to report at this time

*Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics: No report*

ROBERTSON: We've talked about dissolving the ad hoc committee, perhaps we can bring that to a final resolution

*Motion by Eckert to dissolve, seconded by Stowell*

ROBERTSON: We'd discussed repurposing the service to that committee on a broader visioning group

ECKERT: I have a request: I served on the ACA committee last fall, and I'm going to be Chair this fall; there's a lack of guidelines for comparing and contrasting, so it's hard to make decisions, for example nonteaching CUs – I talked with Jon Blitz because we thought it was a contractual issue, he said Faculty Senate could take that up and make recommendations – there's also the question of incomplete applications, someone else might submit the application – if the repurposed ad hoc committee could look into that and come up with suggestions; [incomplete applications and nonteaching CUs] impact how things are looked at, how should we weigh that

BRUNS: I have not served on ACA, has this been a continuing issue?

STERLING: Yes

ECKERT: You can serve two years at most; we asked Scott [Ronspies], the Chair who served the year before; it seems to be [handled by] practices that the Chairs try to put forward

BRANTLEY: How would an incomplete application be considered?

ECKERT: The question is what degree of incompleteness – for Teaching and Balanced, you need to submit a student support letter and course evaluations: how many course evaluations?

HUNG [*as Parliamentarian*]: Procedurally the ad hoc committee should be dissolved before drafting a new committee, so let's resolve that

*Vote: 13 in favor, 1 opposed (Sterling), no abstentions – motion carried*

ECKERT: I move that we create an ad hoc committee to look into developing ACA award guidelines beyond what's currently in the contract

HUNG: The contractual language just says that there will be an ACA award, in these categories ...

ECKERT: It says it needs to be exceptional, and what needs to be submitted – other awards specify that incomplete applications will not be considered, but often the ACA nominees do not submit the applications themselves

GATRELL: I'm cautious about creating recipes because the DACs vary greatly – practices develop to reflect shared values, prescribing could become problematic

ECKERT: People do not submit it in the form of a DAC

GATRELL: I mean that practices vary among departments

ECKERT: We could encourage faculty members to address [the issues in question]

GATRELL: I suggest that the ACA committee come up with a statement about expectations and post it on the website; informative but not prescriptive

STOWELL: Not everybody has been on an ACA committee, so I like the idea of a functioning ACA group to provide recommendations

BRUNS: That's technically more than what ACA service is supposed to be – going back to Sen. Brantley's question about when incomplete is okay ... Library Services faculty up for Balanced or Primary Duties don't have course evaluations

ECKERT: We understand that – I could contact the ACA members from last fall; if we come up with suggestions, will you consider them

HUNG: That's probably the best way forward

ROBERTSON: Are you withdrawing the motion?

ECKERT: Yes – I will come back with something by April 3

ROBERTSON: I will add it as an agenda item

HUNG: It's not unique to ACA; I served on the COS undergraduate award committee, we have the same issue that from year to year certain things are weighed differently depending on the composition of the committee

BRUNS: CFR to a degree, too

OLIVER: For Service or Balanced, require applicants to provide evidence of contributions to the committees listed in their CVs?

ECKERT: I wouldn't ask for that; it's more like, if there could be an explanation of nonteaching CUs – if applicants have done service, they will have a letter from a committee chair

ABEBE: Quite a few faculty members make ACAs their focus – because it's a sensitive issue, I don't think we should deal with it

### **Provost's Report**

GATRELL: I want to thank everybody for the feedback – thinking about who we are, what is our signature experience ... – I've shared some thoughts, broad strokes with [various groups] – my hope is we'll have something we can rally around as a community – the themes that are distilled ... will allow us to chart a path forward, not only for new programs but also reinvigorate existing high-quality programs – I've asked deans and select chairs to confer with their faculty – faculty innovate best when they have an opportunity to discuss and explore things that work for them – we have to have something that resonates with our identity and our structures – change has to have a purpose

HUNG: What we're experiencing as a result of the budget crisis is not unique to us [EIU] or to Illinois, events like this are happening across the nation without a budget crisis – [citing *Edinboro University case study in the Chronicle of Higher Education*] there's a similarity in rallying points like efficiency and marketing, but what they've done is different (top down, oppositional), they have a different outcome – we have a functional relationship with our admin, we are pulling together as a team despite our differences and contradictions, we are working together to make our institution stronger ...

ABEBE: Sen. Bruns had mentioned the issue of a strategic committee, ongoing, to continue to look at things as they emerge – I think that's a viable idea, I would hope that it would not be forgotten in the process

GATRELL: I believe that we'll be undertaking a strategic planning process, laying the foundation for that launch over the next academic year

BRUNS: I brought this book, *Demographics and the Demand for Higher Education*; it's an intensive statistical study of demographic trends, broken down by region and type of institution; they're forecasting a drop-off in enrollments starting ten years from now, particularly in certain areas of the country including our region) – ongoing SWOT committee tasked with looking at macro issues and how our institution responds – if we come on board to get EIU out there in the next ten years, we might be well-positioned to handle any demographic drop-off – what if we had a service category in our DACs

for promotion of the institution ... – I'm hoping that this committee gets formed and that they consider outside-the-box ideas to push us

HUNG: I suggest you bring that [book] to Newton [Key], book club every semester

GATRELL: The faculty forum this semester brought together administrators and faculty from a variety of areas; using the faculty forum to launch those discussions two or three times a year is important ... having one on demography and shifting markets, the role of the regional university in 2030 ... dialogue as a regional comprehensive in an environment that is very different from what it was 10-15 years ago – I would be willing to invite someone from [?] to come to campus

ROBERTSON: [*to Abebe*] Further considering the strategic committee, is this something you'd like us to consider forming within the Senate?

ABEBE: From around campus ... not too large, just a kernel group that continues to talk and to think about issues that are emerging on a continuous basis – we did things here admirably; the President deserves credit for how he guided us through ... – the last two administrations slept while things came to pass; those kind of things could have been questioned, brought to the forefront; we also need to take blame for what happened on campus, not just the administrators

HUNG: I agree for the most part, the processes we've engaged in the last year have been overall positive, but there have been a few missteps (WG7); beyond that, the direction is good – that's something we should foster as a body, more examples of better collaborations moving forward

BRUNS: I'd like to propose a resolution forming this SWOT committee, or whatever we want to call it – the original thought was that it would be a group of six or eight people, half appointed by Faculty Senate, half by the President ...

BRANTLEY: Part of our most recent resolution addressed and supported this

BRUNS: That resolution was about the report, 'we think this one idea from the review committee is a really good idea,' but I'm talking about a resolution where we actually propose creating this committee, here's how we think it should be populated, here's what we think the focus should be

ABEBE: You don't think the wording addresses that?

BRANTLEY: Perhaps it would be a new and more elaborated resolution, but there has been affirmation of the idea officially

BRUNS: Then maybe we just wait and see how that develops

HUNG: Do we really need a formal resolution to start a committee? Can't we just get together?

BRUNS: If the President appoints half the people to it, then we need something a little more formal

BRANTLEY: It's also an announcement to the larger community that this is something we value and want to do

ABEBE: It's also part of the DAC, faculty use these kinds of things to include [in their portfolios] – we can tackle it next fall if we need to

### **Discussion of Proposed Changes to Processes for Elected Committees**

STOWELL: I have a proposal that was communicated to everyone; I may have minimized potential changes – Enrollment Management Advisory Committee: somehow in the past we've both elected and nominated people to this committee, so we have four faculty members right now; this committee is EWORX now; Josh Norman has been using [the faculty members] on subcommittees – when you look at the listed committees that involve primarily curriculum, promotion and tenure decisions, university budget and planning, research grants...I don't see EMAC as at the same level, as needing to have elected people on this committee – Sen. Oliver and I have communicated about shifting that over to the Nominations Committee, letting current terms run out... [*motion by Stowell to shift EMAC population from elected to nominated*]

ECKERT: If you categorize the committees by what kind of impact they have, it doesn't really have the same impact ...

STERLING: I'll formally second the motion to make that change – there will have to be a bylaw change, and so on

OLIVER: Did Josh Norman recommend how many faculty members moving forward?

STOWELL: The number of elected positions is two, so it seems like we should keep it at that

OLIVER: We're filling four positions right now, he indicated the need for two – is that strong enough faculty influence; if enrollment is the bottom line that's going to keep our jobs, then is two enough?

STOWELL: In the nominations process, the committee could ask if he can accept additional volunteers

HUNG: We need to get dialogue going with Josh before we change the number of slots ...

ABEBE: I always think that administrators would like to see as few faculty members on a committee

STOWELL: We'll stick with what we have now

OLIVER: It'll gradually wind down to two during the next few years

BRUNS: Sen. Oliver raises a good point that faculty voice on that committee is important; we'd be going from four positions to two

STOWELL: It's four because we erroneously duplicated, it's supposed to be two

OLIVER: I found that email; there are five faculty right now (Steve Scher, Andy Cheetham, Melody Wollan, Don Holly, Catherine Polydore) integrated into EWORX subcommittees – Josh's recommendation is two

ROBERTSON: In our bylaws we don't spell out nominations, we do spell out elections; it might be more streamlined if we no longer nominated – would we have time in this election cycle to propose rewording of the bylaws?

STOWELL: Do it in the fall

*Vote: 14 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstention (Bruns) – motion carried*

STOWELL: Two other minimal changes, the Sanctions and Terminations Hearing Committee and APERC; I'm not opposed to keeping them as elected committees, but I suggest that we elect on demand when these committees are called to meet instead of every year; it would mean changing terms to one year; as to how quickly could this happen if the committees were called, we could have an election with results within ten days

BRUNS: Either way we have to have an election; why wouldn't we just do a normal election and have somebody in place?

STOWELL: Because we keep having elections for committees that don't meet

HUNG: APERC met once in the last 20 years

ECKERT: It becomes politicized if they come together for specific cases – could administrators push people into these committees?

STOWELL: That's why I've shied away from nominating

ABEBE: As it is now, no one gets on these committees with a specific purpose or agenda; if it changed, it would be like Workgroup 7 – you did an excellent job summarizing the issue for us, but I think these two committees should stay as they are – let the onus of justifying their work be on the committee themselves

STOWELL: These positions are still elected by the whole college, it's not like somebody can say 'pick me' – on the other hand, don't we want people to be invested in their committee service, because right now we're not filling committees

HUNG: Maybe a compromise ... would it be possible to have a shared standing reserve pool, whichever committee calls you serve on; if both committees call, then we have an extra election – it would reduce the number of people who have to be actively serving, and it would maintain impartiality

BRUNS: It could be an on-call section in the elections ...

ABEBE: Both of these committees are also contractual

HUNG: I won't support a change to nominating, being elected in these positions is critical; but we are running out of people to fill committees, and it would reduce the workload

BRUNS: But we are making progress on that ...

ECKERT: How many are on each committee?

STERLING: Five on Sanctions and Terminations, no more than seven on APERC

ECKERT: And they have two-year terms [on Sanctions] and three-year terms [on APERC]

STOWELL: If we don't elect them, then it gives Administration the right to appoint people

STERLING: These two committees are contractual, so all Senate can do is make a recommendation to the administration and UPI to revise the contract; outside of contract negotiations it could be a memorandum of understanding

BRUNS: Should these two committees come out of consideration, to be revisited later if needed?

HUNG: There are two topics: one is combining the two committees, which will require a change in the contractual language; the other is the Senate has been tasked to fill these committees and it's up to us to decide how

STERLING: Even there the contract specifies [details of the election and positions, e.g., term length]

STOWELL: The only language change—if we want the option of on-demand election, because it doesn't say it has to be Spring—is to change the length of term to one year

HUNG: The language about two- and three-year staggered terms is already in the contract – regardless of whatever change we propose, we have to go through the contract, so why not change it to something we really want

ABEBE: They're still elected, it's just the timing and the frequency

STOWELL: I move that we recommend to the administration and the union changing the language on the length of terms, to be one-year terms; that would keep people from carrying over from one year to the next and would give us the option to decide how we elect

BRANTLEY: Second

BRUNS: How does that solve the election problem, because we'd be electing people every year

STOWELL: It doesn't say that they have to be elected every year, it means that they would serve a one-year term when elected

BRUNS: This is back to the on-call issue, I think there's a problem with that

HUNG: Reading the language of 16.1 [*quotes from contract*], how can we change that to a one-year non-staggered term?

STOWELL: That's the motion

WHARRAM: It says "If a college fails to elect a member, the Dean of that college will name a member from among the tenured faculty of that college," so we would basically be giving the right to appoint over to the dean

STOWELL: We'll still elect the people to these committees

HUNG: But if we fail to elect them, then admin will get to appoint

WHARRAM: So we're going to have an annual election?

STOWELL: No, we could, but the language change gives Senate the option of when we want to elect people

WHARRAM: But if the President calls the committee, the Dean could say 'there hasn't been an election, I'm going to appoint'

ECKERT: If we could get 'these committees draw from a pool of candidates that are elected annually' into the contract...

ABEBE: The reasons for debating this issue are 1) because people claim to have served when they have not, 2) because we're running so many elections, we're running people down; I sympathize with the second point, running elections when there is no need, but it benefits faculty so leave it alone; let them claim whatever they wish to claim, and if the departmental personnel committee doesn't look at whether they have served on that committee or not, let it be

BRUNS: It's not like we're underworked right now

ECKERT: I don't think that's such a huge issue, claiming credit for something they haven't done; the greater issue is the problem of finding enough people to elect

HUNG: If we keep the language as it is and fail to fill 12 spots, we end up in the same situation and forfeit that seat; we're in a bind in what we can do reduce the demand while still meeting obligations in a meaningful way – I'm not seeing a great compromise, moving forward on what you're currently proposing; reducing it to one year with the option to elect only when there's a need, it's not an overall gain for us

STOWELL: I don't know how often the Sanctions and Terminations committee has met; I was called to be on it for a specific case a number of years ago, but I wasn't elected...

HUNG: I was on the Sanctions and Terminations committee...

ABEBE: Three years ago; you and I were on the same committee...

HUNG: That's right, we were called

ABEBE: We set up to start work but the issue was resolved

WHARRAM: I like the idea of bringing them together as one elected committee – with all respect to the work you've done, I am uncomfortable with not having the committees populated – just because it happened once in 20 years, but when it happened, wasn't it valuable that there was a committee there ready to do it ... – the only disadvantage is as a junior faculty member, signing up for an election thinking you're going to be doing something for the university and finding out you're not

OLIVER: Do academic program elimination situations ever spill into a second year? We would have to call a whole new committee

STOWELL: There's a specified date in the contract by which they have to provide recommendations – the other option is to leave it as it is and [elect] on demand, and then when they're elected, they're on for three years

BRUNS: [*seeks clarification from parliamentarian as to when another motion can be introduced*]

HUNG: We have to resolve this one first; someone can call the question any time

ABEBE: Or you can amend it

STOWELL: Or I can withdraw the motion ... I withdraw the motion; it's not going anywhere, but I appreciate your support on the other recommendation

HUNG: We see where you're going with this, but I'm not sure this is a comfortable solution yet

BRUNS: Are there other elected positions that we could nominate?

STOWELL: The complete list is on the second page ...

WHARRAM: I was going to move to attempt to find language to conflate those two committees into one, because if they're only going to meet once in a blue moon, the odds are very small of them having to deal with a lot of sanctions and terminations the same year they're dealing with program elimination and reorganization

ABEBE: They're different committees [one is related to discipline, the other is program review]



BRUNS: Would it work to have a pool of faculty that could be called to serve on either, if those committees are called?  
Not a resolution to combine committees but to propose staffing from a pool of seven elected people

HUNG: That way we still save five slots ... you staff the pool to the maximum needed ... if it's the five-member committee that's needed, they draw lots

BRUNS: These are elected, so it could be the top five

ECKERT: What if both committees are called?

HUNG: Then we have a provisional election

BRUNS: They're called so infrequently, we're assuming they won't be called at the same time

HUNG: But it's not impossible, so we need to have language for that eventuality

ABEBE: Are there IGPs on either? [*general consensus is no*]

HUNG: Sen. Bruns, are you going to make a motion?

BRUNS: It's Sen. Wharram's motion, we were just clarifying

HUNG: So the motion is to find language where there could be a pool of elected faculty members to serve on either of these two committees when they're called

BRUNS: Seven positions

HUGO: Do we have a timetable for how long they're serving?

STOWELL: Three years, staggered

HUNG: I would like the resolution to be to find the correct language ...

WHARRAM: Or for UPI and the administration to find the correct language

ABEBE: If that were to pass, people could claim service on two committees

HUNG: Faculty on the review committees for awards could be aware of this situation and address it accordingly in their deliberations – the question's been called

*Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, 3 abstentions (Young, Sterling, Abebe) – motion carried*

#### **Discussion of Draft Resolution Supporting Commemoration of 160th Anniversary of Lincoln-Douglas Debates**

ROBERTSON: Sen. Young has drafted some language for us

YOUNG: [*reads draft resolution*]

ECKERT: I would be in support, except one lecture, not a series every year

YOUNG: The importance of this event is such that one lecture won't do it – it could become established as a tradition, early in the fall semester ...

ROBERTSON: A single annual lecture, not multiple each year

YOUNG: A series of annual lectures [*reads again*]

ABEBE: Why did you include the Naming Committee?

YOUNG: They made this recommendation ... we could change it to "Senate endorses the principle," I would accept that as a friendly amendment

GOSSE: Who would be in charge of it?

ROBERTSON: I believe President Glassman is creating a fund to sustain it

GOSSE: So we could bring in a lecturer

YOUNG: ... maybe a committee could come out of it, I think it should; faculty should have ownership

OLIVER: Is September 18th the date you propose for the lecture?

YOUNG: The resolution doesn't say that – I hope we would do something on the 18th in 2018, but 2019 could be a different date – the resolution would not have the force of binding anything, it's just advisory – this year is the 160th anniversary, so much attention has been drawn to the debates already, we should strike while the iron is hot

ROBERTSON: Last fall our resolution stated in the last paragraph [*reads sentence pertaining to establishment of a lecture series*] – the President has pledged to support it by creating that fund; the Naming Committee also supported the idea; so we're endorsing the print of our own resolution – maybe for today we shelve the idea and revise the language just slightly

[*Proposal is tabled*]

ROBERTSON: I will send out a preliminary version of the agenda for our April 3rd session

Session adjourned at 3:55 p.m.