

Eastern Illinois University

## The Keep

---

Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

4-3-2018

### April 3, 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, "April 3, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1091.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1091](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1091)

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  
3 April 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, K. Hung, N. Hugo, J. Oliver, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Williams, B. Young

Senators absent: S. Gosse, J. Robertson, R. Cash

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

---

Session called to order by Parliamentarian K. Hung at 2:02 p.m.

### **Approval of Minutes from March 20, 2018**

*Motion to approve by WILLIAMS, seconded by WHARRAM*

*Discussion: none*

*Vote: 10 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions – motion carried*

### **Executive Committee Report**

CORRIGAN: Sen. Stowell and I met with the President and the Provost yesterday along with Sen. Bruns (filling in for Sen. Robertson) – discussion of the Resolution on Administrative Performance Evaluation, passed November 17, 2015: President Glassman asked if/how Faculty Senate would like to participate in the three-year evaluations he is currently conducting; because Senate's role in the evaluation process hasn't been discussed, it was agreed to defer involvement for this cycle and to raise the topic for discussion in the Fall – Sen. Stowell discussed the Shared Governance Visioning Committee; President Glassman asked whether Faculty Senate had given thought to revising its composition (representation by college instead of 15 at-large members) – faculty elections, as well as the upcoming election for Faculty Senate executive committee positions, were briefly mentioned – President Glassman showed support for the proposed ongoing strategic visioning committee; the intended purpose of the committee, as distinct from faculty forums, was clarified

BRUNS: President Glassman's understanding of the strategic visioning committee is as a think tank; Provost Gatrell thought faculty forum might be an appropriate venue for communicating the issues

HUNG: Any discussion about how the outcomes of this committee will be communicated to the President, Provost, etc.?

GATRELL: I think one or both of us would be on it

HUNG: Any suggestions about committee composition, or will Senate take the lead on how to populate it?

BRUNS: I suggested that Senate and the President would each appoint 6-8 people

HUNG: Precise numbers are less important than having a fair sampling of people involved in problem solving; it requires interest, not subject expertise per se

BRUNS: I see it as looking at opportunities and threats on a macro level – President Glassman mentioned the eventual impact of DACA discontinuation

HUNG: Is there an implementation timeline?

GATRELL: We'll continue to flesh out the idea over the end of this Spring and convene in the Fall – link to books

ABEBE: The administrative evaluation resolution was passed three years ago – it's understandable that the university got caught up with other things, but the executive committee didn't follow up appropriately; when we make a resolution, it's important that it's followed through – the issue was brought to Senate because the feeling of the faculty was that the mechanism wasn't working, so the 360 evaluation model should be considered – it's frustrating to be delayed until Fall, not to make sure that resolutions are followed through; I don't want our resolutions not to have any meaning

BRUNS: No one in the meeting remembered – Sen. Corrigan wasn't on Senate yet, Sen. Stowell and I thought it was prior to President Glassman's arrival, actually I didn't remember it at all – President Glassman had questions about the context

GATRELL: We're committed to going through with the three-year review – how can we make sure that Faculty Senate has input in every evaluation: collaborative rubric, sample, etc.; the question is what mechanism makes most sense

ABEBE: That's beyond what we called for

GATRELL: Any ideas you have would be welcome

HUNG: I move to have an agenda item to talk about it at the next Faculty Senate meeting

WHARRAM: I see no reason to wait

OLIVER: A summer meeting could be called if needed

HUNG: If there isn't a quorum, the subset of members present could bang out the details

### Provost's Report

GATRELL: I thank those who showed up to yesterday's town hall; there's another scheduled for today – open it up to questions

ABEBE: The student paper [DEN] did a good job in summarizing – I'm conflicted on this: the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences could be too big an entity in relation to the other three colleges – Economics has less in common with History and English than with Business; I want to stay in Sciences but not necessarily Arts and Sciences – so I wonder about the size, economies of scale – if Economics were to stay in Arts and Sciences, would it be possible to create a School of Sciences; that might be a consideration to help identify, also symbiotic relationships would be compartmentalized

GATRELL: We have a consultation process (pursuant to policy, UPI agreement) – I anticipate that people will come over with proposals; faculty are great collaborators and innovators – next year will be transitional – Arts and Science is large, but philosophically what it means relative to the mission of the university, it's symbolic of the commitment to a holistic undergraduate experience – in terms of the specific case of Economics, I welcome a proposal – Associate Deans will not be functional but areal for Science and for Arts and Humanities – opportunities, such as medical humanities – way in which we can make a more forceful argument – consistent with resources, vision – new incubators for innovation – open to revisions; it has changed – transparency, engagement – it has legs, resonates with themes (Health and Human Services, sharpening college missions); it embodies prioritized themes within financial resources

HUNG: Timeline to get comments to you?

GATRELL: Informational session at April Board meeting – the UPI window is 60 days – I take feedback seriously; I expect the plan to change; I want it to reflect our conversation, as the university reinvents itself and embraces what it does well

STERLING: The Faculty Senate Constitution suggests ... [*quotes from Article II*] ... "Section 3. Except in emergency situations, at least a 90-day consultation period shall be allowed ..." – this isn't the first time the provision has been violated

GATRELL: I have no concern with a 90-day window

STERLING: But the plan is to be implemented starting July 1

YOUNG: Implementation will be an ongoing process; I don't see the provision as drawing a line in the sand; 60 days seems reasonable

STERLING: Faculty Senate will have no opportunity to discuss the plan; it bothers me that a major reorganization is proposed when we have no time to discuss it

ECKERT: We're no longer under contract in a month – the 60 or 90 days should be when we are in contract

GATRELL: I was operating from contract language

STERLING: You presented it to the Executive Committee with 90 days, though they didn't share it with us

GATRELL: I try to be aboveboard – I think of this as a dialogue – from January 15 on, we've had dialogue, feedback, etc. – the process has been transparent and collaborative – the PowerPoint presentation is a date on the calendar – I want to be an honest broker, I want a plan to move forward ... reinvent ourselves as a community – we have four interim deans right now – there is no perfect plan, but I'm confident that this institution will be stronger, have a pathway to collaborate – there will be a College of Education for the first time in a long time – CAEP (accreditors) is coming to campus next week – I was not aware about the 90 days

HUNG: I agree that process has had elements involving campus – 1) I concur with Sen. Sterling’s point, the feedback period overlaps with when school is not in session, so how do we bring comments to your attention – 2) regarding July 1 as the implementation start date: we heard about the proposed July date a few days ago, so given that the adopted model is not what the review committee picked, there should be time to talk about it

GATRELL: I envision 2018-19 as being a transitional year – feedback I received about STEM college was thoughtful and direct – pieces to that plan are embedded in what was presented yesterday – the other piece is that the line for a Continuing Ed dean was swept, it would have been cleaner if there were a fifth dean position – what we have is a best effort to capture the essence of Vitalization

OLIVER: Thank you for moving forward [*refers to historical nonstarters*] – you unveiled the plan on April 2, that’s roughly 90 days to June 30

ABEBE: Earlier I addressed a parochial issue, the issue of size – I look at the proposed reorganization: departments that need to be exposed to liberal arts are in the School of Business; Psychology belongs perhaps in Health and Human Services, if trying to match

GATRELL: I posed that question ...

STOWELL: One program might be amenable to that, but the body of Psychology is not clinical in its approach

WILLIAMS: I don’t like the idea of going into Health and Human Services

GATRELL: The Liberal Arts and Sciences is also home to 85% of the conveyance of the general education program – I’m excited about the “realignment,” I’m committed to creating a gen ed coordinator from that college – [?] has been rightsized, functionality moved to other offices; it belongs in the faculty realm – thread through our professional programs – LA&S is large and potentially unwieldy but coherent; it’s a familiar structure, exists at other universities

YOUNG: There’s a momentum that’s been gathering force, it’s important to stay with the momentum – often what happens when institutional change is considered is the instinct to slow things down, bad decisions are made by moving fast; I don’t have that sense in this case – if we didn’t start July 1, we’d have to push off another year; it’s a direction most of us support, so go ahead at this point

HUGO: From my department’s standpoint, we’ve been trying to figure out which direction to head in – the plan is well-thought out, there have been multiple opportunities for feedback – we need a direction

GATRELL: Being consultative is critical – a lot of discussion informally, what makes sense for you – I want everyone to thrive; continue to focus on students – aggressive benchmarks are good, striving to meet goals is critical

STOWELL: Having been on WG8 (dream big with no constraints), now these are the constraints – the model was discussed previously; it’s a reasonable model, let’s move forward and tweak it

GATRELL: I expect the university to look different, new programs and departments

HUNG: Overall I’m optimistic but to bring our memory back a year, the difficulty with the profit-loss sheet underscored a fundamental divergence in values – how do we view role of, how do we value faculty on this campus – it does our body a disservice to be swept up and ignore this difference that’s not yet resolved – urge colleagues to be thoughtful and engaged during the transitional period – we need to evaluate and assess, so what standard of performance, where does profit-loss fit into the bigger picture of this new landscape – this is a chance to address some of these differences and come to an understanding with Administration

GATRELL: One of my first priorities is to revisit that, to take away uncertainty; I’m cognizant of the concern re: metrics; the faculty themselves to need define those parameters and values, and make the case – I really am a liberal arts person, I believe in it; that’s the reason for focusing on program quality and the mission of the institution

HUNG: During realignment, can we revisit the issue of Philosophy being under reform guidelines; that seems to be at odds with the general principle

ABEBE: We shouldn’t be overly sensitive to making comments to administrators, we are elected by faculty to advise and consent when necessary – When are we going to talk about the mission? Why would we create a college (Health and Human Services) before addressing the mission?

GATRELL: That will be discussed with the Board of Trustees in June – there will be a formal review process – we can’t have a coherent program array if we don’t have that discussion, that’s part of the transition year – the mission is going to be a dialogue, too – full two years ... to become the institution we aspire to be

WHARRAM: WG7 should never be forgotten, it was too traumatic – regarding the transition, Senate will have its work cut out in terms of reorganizing committees; changing college structures will affect [committee composition]

BRUNS: The big issue with WG7 was lack of transparency; all these discussions have been the opposite of that – regarding concerns about the 90-day window, most of us are gone in May until August, but things are happening in the meantime – I’m guessing that the concern is we don’t want to come back to “Whoa!”

GATRELL: There will be no “whoa” – I’m hopeful that what I present to the Board of Trustees will be the final nomenclature and framework; for operational details, we have to trust the deans – I have to go prep, but I appreciate the feedback and the discussion, it improves the product; process matters

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

STOWELL: There will be disruptions in the councils with the potential realignments – I have been to all the major curriculum committees, also the college committees – Sen. Robertson and I will meet with the council chairs on Thursday; I hope to have a recommendation at our next Senate meeting – there’s support for Senators attending other meetings (question of voting or ex-officio)

HUNG: Any thoughts on how senators are chosen to be on Senate?

STOWELL: There hasn’t been a lot of comment on that specific component

BRUNS: Looking at this issue came from the HLC visit, so it’s coming from an external source – the only internal thing is that we can’t fill committees

HUNG: We don’t know what committees are doing and we should, but you’re right, I don’t get the sense that the structure needs updating

ABEBE: Is it still the position of the chairs that they do not want to join Senate?

STOWELL: We haven’t met but will address that on Thursday

BRUNS: I’m concerned that a 50-person Senate doesn’t seem effective [*met with general agreement*]

HUNG: How do we deal with one college being so much larger?

ECKERT: The Provost answered that by emphasizing that each will have an associate dean (a quasi-dean)

ABEBE: That’s meaningless

STOWELL: Area representation, we do that now

ABEBE: Wait until college structure takes place

STOWELL: That will play out next year – just consensus, then prepare for implementation

HUNG: A lot of bylaws, etc., to be looked at

### **Committee Reports**

#### *Elections Committee – Ratification of Election Results*

STOWELL: I distributed the results – 30% of faculty voted – motion to ratify  
[*YOUNG moves, STERLING seconds*]

BRUNS: On CUPB & CFR, one position is Library/Counseling; no longer any Unit A in Counseling

BRANTLEY: No nominations or write-ins

BRUNS: We are down to 11 faculty, so we need address changing that

STERLING: You don’t have to have 10 votes if on the ballot, only for write-ins

HUNG: Can we change the bylaws to a percentage instead of a fixed number?

STOWELL: Maybe 1%

HUNG: Overall faculty number, or relevant division?

STERLING: We have often voted to appoint whoever got highest number of write-in votes – the 10 votes rule is because we wanted the candidate to have some body of support

HUNG: We should talk about the ambiguous results

[*to be continued*]

#### *Nominations Committee – Vacancies for Faculty Senate Appointed Committees*

OLIVER: I submitted a list of vacancies on appointed committees for the upcoming year – Eckert will be Chair of the ACA Committee; 31 positions to go – we need to encourage colleagues not only to vote, but also encourage them to serve – losing colleagues we were not expecting to lose, on the current list of the appointed committee population: Andy Cheetham is leaving EIU, that’s factored into the list; if there are other colleagues you know of, let me know – I move that we accept this list and circulate it to our colleagues [*ECKERT seconds*]

STERLING: Allow Oliver to add other vacant positions due to faculty leaving

OLIVER: I will finalize the initial list by our last Senate meeting two weeks from now – send out second call next week

ECKERT: Jonathan Bowman is also leaving [*OLIVER has already accounted for this on the list*]

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

*Elections Committee (continued)*

STOWELL: For CFR, Courtney Scott was a candidate; she received 9 votes [*i.e., has the most votes, therefore wins*]

HUNG: What do we do [when no candidates has the most votes]?

STOWELL: Typically a fall election

STERLING: Let's ratify the results we have now, then we can discuss appointing or not

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

BRUNS: Moving on to appointments, Kirstin Duffin got 6 votes [for CUPB]; I move that she be appointed

YOUNG: Second

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

ECKERT: Lee Patterson got 8 votes for CGS; we have to find out if he consents

YOUNG: He does

[*ECKERT moves to appoint, BRUNS seconds*]

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

HUNG: Rank voting?

WHARRAM: Wouldn't help for write-ins

STOWELL: [I've talked to some people about] why they're not interested in serving on Faculty Senate; they don't want to answer the questions or get three signatures

ECKERT: I saw several questions unanswered, so that does not appear to be enforced

STOWELL: Some positions for which there are no questions

BRUNS: This came up at the Executive Committee meeting: serving on Faculty Senate is prestigious at other institutions – one issue here is that there's a core group of faculty who do service; the second problem is that we are all overloaded because we've lost colleagues

STERLING: A third thing is [resolutions are passed but nothing happens] – I suspect that if you look at resolutions for things not under our control, almost all have been ignored, so why should it be a position of prestige

HUNG: I'm sympathetic to Sen. Sterling's point; when not on Senate, as faculty, I don't hear what goes on, no vested interest to follow minutes, not clear how my daily life is impacted – hard to make that argument when [lacking] evidence

ABEBE: Number four, we are apologetic – we cannot be apologetic, we undermine ourselves

HUNG: We have brought attention to issues, but there are structural problems – we relinquish our authority if we don't stay engaged with what they're doing

YOUNG: What we say and do in here has reverberation on campus – the DEN publishes it, it's important that students are aware

BRUNS: I have heard students talk about issues brought up here [for example, the mascot change]

*Faculty-Student Relations Committee: No report*

*Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report*

*Awards Committee: No report*

*Faculty Forum Committee: Will report next time*

*Budget Transparency Committee: Will report next time*

[*WHARRAM and HUNG are drafting a resolution on a combined pool for APERC and Sanctions & Terminations members; will send out to be voted on at next Senate meeting*]

### **Draft Resolution Supporting Commemoration of 160<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Lincoln-Douglas Debates**

[BRANTLEY moves to adopt, OLIVER seconds]

ABEBE: I would feel better if the Naming Committee were struck out

YOUNG: That was accepted as a friendly amendment last time, was supposed to be fixed

STERLING: For clarification, is the series supposed to focus exclusively on the Charleston debate or the debates as a whole?

YOUNG: The latter, their ongoing importance

[Rewording]

YOUNG: Accepted as a friendly amendment

STOWELL: What we sent to the President about establishing a lecture series [in the renaming resolution]

ABEBE: That was general, this is different

YOUNG: This is an example of something we proposed that is moving along

*Vote: 12 in favor, 1 opposed (Corrigan), no abstentions – motion carried*

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

STOWELL: We dealt with this at our last meeting; we need to change the bylaws, remove EMAC from the list of elected committees

### **Final Resolution Language Concerning the “EIU Signature Experience” Document ...**

HUNG: We had postponed this – President Glassman had asked for a response, we were in the process of writing one; now that they’re rolling out a plan, do we still need to comment – I propose that we bury it, it’s done

### **Other Business**

ECKERT: I will send in the suggestion for the ACA award application [*referring to a statement on expectations, as discussed at the last meeting*]

BRUNS: President Glassman mentioned that he wants to continue meeting with the Executive Committee on a regular basis

HUNG: Executive Committee election will be on the next meeting’s agenda – the date for Danelle Larson is still listed as TBA

ECKERT: Should we meet on May 1?

[*pointed out that it’s finals week*]

STOWELL: Come to the next meeting with exam schedules

Session adjourned at 3:51 p.m.