

4-17-2018

April 17, 2018

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "April 17, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1090.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1090

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
17 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, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, K. Hung, N. Hugo, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Williams, B. Young, R. Cash

Senators absent: T. Bruns

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

Session called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 2:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from April 3, 2018

Motion to approve by Wharram, seconded by Abebe

Discussion: none

Vote: 10 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstention (Gosse) – motion carried

Executive Committee Report

ROBERTSON: CUPB met on April 6, Athletics director Tom Michael gave a report: he came on board three years ago, inheriting a deficit of almost \$1 million; he's made a commitment to try to bring expenses in line with revenue; Athletics department is as thin as it can be, and be sustainable in terms of current staffing; his focus is on the student experience and maintaining competitiveness; \$5.6 million in direct institutional support for athletics: \$1.3 million of that is appropriated money used for salaries, also includes GIA, TSA, work study; NCAA revenue down a bit for FY17; 12-14 fewer scholarships due to reduction in revenue (note: one scholarship may be divided among several players on a team); Athletics has engaged a consulting firm (Peak Sports MGMT) to help with corporate sponsorships, two full-time employees on campus, contractual guarantee to meet at least revenue generated by current sponsorships, outlined goals for increasing – President Glassman forecasted numbers: a healthy freshman class is anticipated, but Fall head count will be down slightly due to this year's large graduating class; enrollment should stabilize the following year – the university hopes to do well with international student enrollment for Fall – verification process affecting 1,500-1,600 admitted students: students are placed in the process by FAFSA, making public institutions unable to administer their aid packages until they've successfully negotiated the process; inordinately affects first-time, full-time students; Administration is taking proactive measures: evening call-out program to walk students through the process so aid can be awarded – Board may vote on a 1% increase in tuition for Fall, which would raise the cost from \$292 to \$295 per credit hour; the tuition increase would apply only to new incoming students

OLIVER: Guaranteed for four years?

GATRELL: Eight semesters – it's a range between 1 and 1.5 percent

ROBERTSON: The Business Affairs subcommittee suggested a 1.9% tuition increase – no intent to lower tuition for marketing purposes, although other universities have

STERLING: What is the verification process verifying?

GATRELL: For first-time full-time students who participate in the FAFSA program, they're randomly selected for verification through a tax transcript from the prior year, so they have to request that from the IRS and submit it along with other documentation

STERLING: The Athletics report doesn't include student fees (\$1.8 million); indirect support is another category on top of that (roughly \$80,000) – the report also does not include Athletics' \$750,000 deficit that the institution covered; in fact, what the institution gave Athletics is \$8 million last year – [Tom Michael] can say he inherited a deficit, but he's failed to bring expenses in line, the deficit is almost back up to the figure he started with

ROBERTSON: It's unclear how widely distributed the Athletics report is intended to be

GATRELL: It was presented at CUPB, an open meeting, so it's public knowledge

ROBERTSON: I will share that entire document with all of you

ECKERT: Three years ago Athletics gained additional money through student fees; that hasn't helped?

STERLING: Enrollment has dropped

HUNG: On the academic side we've had loss (faculty lines both Unit A and Unit B, office support staff); how does the personnel adjustment on the Athletics side compare?

STERLING: It's difficult to compare because they've kept student athlete numbers roughly stable, so they can't cut personnel to the same degree

Shared Governance Visioning Committee Update

STOWELL: This proposal comes from bodies visited across campus – there would be two major changes to Senate bylaws: 1) elected senators would serve on four or five committees as a voting member, which would allow Senate to have input and would help committees struggling to retain members (next year CGS has three unfilled positions, COTE has three, CAA has none); 2) Senate body would assume new curricular responsibility, at an executive action level of approving new programs (typical of other faculty senates)

HUNG: Someone runs for election as a senator tied to a specific committee, so they're expected to attend those meetings, and also attend all Faculty Senate meetings

OLIVER: Most of us know our teaching schedules from semester to semester – is it more likely to be able to align assignments once elected?

BRANTLEY: What's the rationale behind aligning the positions beforehand?

STOWELL: It would already be planned in the faculty member's schedule; it also indicates preference, interest, commitment to serving on those other committees coming in – this way we know who's going to do what because they ran for it

STERLING: Senators are on three-year terms – so if someone's interested in CAA, but the CAA senator is in the middle of a term, then the other person can't run that year because the position is not available

HUNG: If we implement the plan all at once, the terms would be lined up and the committee-tied seats would come open in the same cycle

ROBERTSON: If we adopt this, it would take revision of the constitution and bylaws – we could choose to stagger, or we could adjust the terms; turnover of these positions all in one year might not be best for continuity

STOWELL: There will be a lot of adjustment next year anyway with college realignments

HUNG: I can see the advantage of this model: it guarantees that a senator is tied to an important committee, and guarantees an open channel of communication (don't have to rely on committee chairs to come to Senate to give reports) – I worry about the workload involved: CAA is a lot of work, I imagine the other committees are as well; that piece of the plan taxes the service capacity of our faculty

STOWELL: I would argue that it more evenly balances the service workload – these committees are the workhorses of the university; if they are our committees, we need to invest something in them ourselves – I recognize that it's more work for the Senate – we can't do the reverse, add more to the committee chairs

YOUNG: To pursue the alternate model, CAA could designate a member (non-chair) to be liaison to Senate, not every week; that would be less of an extra workload

ABEBE: We can argue this many different ways, but we have difficulty filling Faculty Senate positions; this will make it even more difficult to find people to run

STOWELL: The same argument can be made for any configuration

HUNG: Looking at the bullet point about Senate composition: one senator tied to each committee, then several functional committees are listed within the Senate; that's nine plus five or six, so 14 or 15 individuals

STOWELL: Fifteen members, we didn't change the current total number – what balance of workload among the Senate makes sense, what if we had just really essential committees: move Elections to a member who isn't vice-chair, combined with Nominations that would be a significant responsibility; External Relations would include both staff and student senate liaisons; the remaining duties would be lumped together (forum and awards)

OLIVER: We've had limited interaction, collaboration, accountability; the proposal here makes a significant jump to dual service – is there a halfway point; could we propose that a senator liaises with one of these committees but only once a month, as a compromise of sorts

ECKERT: You would be a voting member on the committee, so you would have impact but won't serve in an official capacity (not chair) – it makes sense to forge a bond

HUNG: If the purpose is to strengthen ties, then the person should attend all meetings at a minimum – maybe stagger committee reports, overall four meetings a month

STOWELL: CAA is the only one that meets weekly; CGS meets twice a month
ECKERT: CGS meets at the same time we meet?
STERLING: All committees will have to change bylaws to accommodate a voting member from Senate
STOWELL: CGS could meet on the weeks Senate does not
HUNG: The defined-responsibility assignment will improve accountability – some senators will have more time commitment to their roles – in a way it's not terribly different from now, because currently we have senators who serve on other campus committees, so we are wearing multiple hats already
ROBERTSON: We could look at the CUs assigned to the Executive Committee and redistribute them in a more equitable way
HUNG: That's a nice gesture, but the amount of CUs would not be terribly impactful in terms of teaching load
ROBERTSON: It might depend on the discipline
ECKERT: How would we actually phase this in?
STOWELL: Over the course of the next year we would hold an election – we'd have to develop a transition plan
HUNG: We need time to talk about the implementation and to coordinate with the other committees
GOSSE: This has been communicated?
STOWELL: The original model was considerably different – after meeting with the college curriculum committees, CAA, CGS, COTE, CASL chair, this was an agreement with the chairs of those committees; there seems to be general support for this model
GATRELL: CASL is sort of ad hoc – if we move to a general education model (under CAA), then do we need CASL – I would prefer to have a gen ed committee comprised of representatives from the disciplines by the recognized areas, chaired by the gen ed coordinator
ECKERT: What is CASL's role?
GATRELL: Assessment of learning outcomes
HUNG: CASL also handles department assessment reviews
GATRELL: Yes, maybe that's a role for CAA or CGS
WHARRAM: It might make more sense for the Honors College to have a faculty senator representative
STOWELL: There are a lot of committees that have representatives and should be reporting to us – these would be elected positions, other than CASL – are you suggesting an elected senator who attends the Honors Council?
ECKERT: Honors Council is appointed right now
ROBERTSON: To move things forward, perhaps we need either preliminary approval to explore further, or tabling
HUNG: We need to work on an implementation plan, knowing details will shift; for example, when will CGS be able to finish modifying bylaws – I will make a motion to talk to stakeholders and come up with an implementation plan for the general concept
ABEBE: Along with an implementation plan, instead of just Sen. Stowell we need to add one or two individuals to help support and generate ideas
OLIVER: An ad hoc implementation committee
HUNG: We should do two motions; let's do the committee first
Motion by HUNG, seconded by BRANTLEY
Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, 2 abstentions (Abebe, Young) – motion carried
ABEBE: Because we haven't approved the proposal, so we can't have an implementation committee
HUNG: Other motion: statement of intent to explore implementation
STERLING: We're not committed to saying yes
ROBERTSON: It would take revising our constitution and bylaws, asking the stakeholders to revise theirs, taking this to a faculty vote, then to the Board of Trustees – this is just one small step
WHARRAM seconds
Vote: 13 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstention (Young) – motion carried
STOWELL: For our next meeting I would like to put on the agenda that we discuss the priority of service in DACs – I'll send a resolution by email

Committee Reports

Elections Committee: No report

Nominations Committee

OLIVER: I'm pleased to report a strong response from faculty colleagues across campus: 28 of 30 appointed positions have been filled; the only two vacancies remaining are the CEPS three-year term on the Library Advisory Board and a one-year replacement term on the Student Publications Board – positions with multiple candidates were decided by random number generator – I move to approve this list of appointments

STERLING seconds

GOSSE: This does not include the Charleston committee

HUNG: That will have to be added for Fall

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

External Relations Committee update

WHARRAM: Mayor Combs does want to get the committee going – there was a lot of frustration because of no-shows; he didn't mention who came other than the two police chiefs and Dan Nadler

YOUNG: How many faculty would he like to have on it?

OLIVER: This would be a City of Charleston committee

WHARRAM: There had been a student, according to their bylaws, but they didn't have faculty – the city website showed Mayor Combs, a city councilor (Jeff Lahr) ...

HUNG: To Sen. Young's question, as the mayor decides how many, then we'll do our best to fill the positions

WHARRAM: They will be meeting at 7:00 or 7:30 p.m.

OLIVER: Are you planning to follow up?

WHARRAM: He [the mayor] recommended that I contact President Glassman, and he would like to see it going again, too

OLIVER: Would you also recommend, once that's approved, should it appear on the list of appointments?

WHARRAM: That would be a good way to ensure that the position gets filled

OLIVER: Would you suggest that it be a faculty senator, or someone from the general faculty population?

WHARRAM: Same as the most of the committees we fill

OLIVER: Add it to the call

Faculty-Student Relations Committee

CASH: Student government executive board positions for next year have been filled: Carson Gordon will be taking my spot as VPAA, [names others elected to positions], I will be Student Body President

HUNG: What was the student government response to the proposed tuition increase?

CASH: We did talk about it, we had a pretty lengthy discussion – no complaints, everyone was on board

STERLING: We have a student fee review committee; fee increases are routinely brought to student government for a vote – why doesn't that happen with tuition?

ROBERTSON: You're correct, it's not directly brought for discussion to us by the administration

GATRELL: Those projections are determined in the Business Office; the discussion then goes to CUPB, Student Government, and the President's Council – statutes limit it to a timely review; you have to set tuition as close to May 1 as you can because that's the commit date – it should be on the agenda, at the very least of the Executive Committee, as a standing item for Spring

Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report

Awards Committee: No report

ACA Recommendations

ECKERT: The ACA committee was frustrated about the lack of strong guidelines, about submissions in incomplete stages; we would like to have some language printed on the cover page (award nomination form), underneath the checklist – Newton Key came up with the language, "Please note incomplete applications cannot be accepted ..."

GATRELL: Forward the text to Billie Rawlings, cc to Jeff Cross and me

ECKERT: Sace Elder was concerned that no one get penalized – I suggested adding language about the number of student course evaluations to go along with the assignment of duties, but we acknowledge that sometimes happens

[STOWELL questions some of the wording; ECKERT responds; clarification of the statement to be worked on later]

Faculty Forum Committee

ABEBE: We have been preparing for next Fall – I have been communicating with the Provost; he's going to help us invite a speaker from outside the institution – I will update you by email as things develop

HUNG: Lincoln-Douglas celebration?

ABEBE: No, this is different, that will be separate

GATRELL: The theme will probably be liberal arts in higher education

Budget Transparency Committee

STERLING: In the interest of time, my earlier comments about the Athletics budget will suffice

2018-2019 Executive Committee Elections

ROBERTSON: We had some email conversation about an evaluation of Senate and the Executive Committee performance; I think we should have that discussion, but would it be appropriate before we elect new members?

YOUNG: I suggest that we proceed with the order [of items on the agenda]

OLIVER: I want to thank the Executive Committee for their dedicated service – I nominate Sen. Corrigan to continue as Recorder

CORRIGAN: I respectfully decline

HUNG: Sen. Bruns is scheduled to be on sabbatical next Spring

[*Senators with expiring terms—Hugo, Wharram, Young—are thanked for their service*]

ROBERTSON: Let's identify nominees for the Chair position

ABEBE: I nominate Sen. Sterling for Chair

STERLING: If the Senate wants me to

STOWELL: [*in response to the question of his possible candidacy for Chair*] The number of associated CUs would exceed the contract

BRANTLEY: I nominate Sen. Hung

HUNG: I respectfully decline

Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, 2 abstentions (Sterling, Wharram) – Sterling approved as Chair for AY18-19

ECKERT: I nominate Sen. Stowell as Vice-Chair

Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, 2 abstentions (Stowell, Wharram) – Stowell approved as Vice-Chair for AY18-19

HUNG: I volunteer to serve as Recorder

Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, 2 abstentions (Hung, Wharram) – Hung approved as Recorder for AY18-19

Provost's Report

GATRELL: I don't really have a report; we're excited about Commencement, encourage you to participate in the events – I just want to open up the floor to questions

ECKERT: I'm a member of the Library Advisory Board; we were informed last Wednesday morning that there were candidates for the Dean [of Library Services] position that afternoon and on the following day – it was disappointing that a search as important as the library dean was held without ever involving the LAB; we were not given time to make arrangements to attend the open sessions – this speaks to concerns I had when we talked about the big searches ...

GATRELL: The search was run by Interim Dean Shelton, it included six or seven members of the library community – that information was disseminated – that concern has been brought to me, I have shared those concerns with Shelton – that search is ongoing – extenuating circumstance: the administrative support for that search had a medical emergency; phone interviews happened in February, candidates were invited to campus before spring break, so that last piece didn't happen – the process was thoughtful, over a ten-week period

BRANTLEY: [The search committee] had representation from the library faculty but not the larger university community; that concerns me because the library serves the whole university – the announcement to library faculty and staff about finalist interviews occurred Monday morning; had I known there would be no broader announcement, I would have done it myself sooner; even within the library it was relatively short notice

GATRELL: Because of that oversight, we had the candidates skype in with the deans and another group who had the same concerns – I apologize, the [missteps] are not acceptable and will not be repeated going forward

Advancing the Signature Experience Realignment

BRANTLEY: Question about ITS and CATS being realigned: I manage the library's media collection for the university, I'm involved with helping faculty to get DVDs digitized for secure streaming through the Kaltura server to D2L – if CATS is dissolving to different places, I want to be sure that the service is maintained in some area of ITS

GATRELL: Streaming and captioning will continue

BRANTLEY: Not just the streaming, but the actual processes

GATRELL: That's done through the online piece or web services; those services remain unchanged, the personnel isn't changing – that's important for ADA compliance as well as distance learners – [instructional support specialists] will be maintaining their relationship with the deans, they need to support the mission of the faculty; some of that will be in the faculty development innovation center

ABEBE: I think I'm the only one on campus who has some issues with the proposal, everyone I talk to seems to think it's fine – I have no objection from a philosophical point of view – I'd like to remind you to think about a few things: 1) the College of Arts and Sciences is too big – 2) when I look at the program evaluation the President started a few months ago, those programs that have been identified for action are now populating that huge college; when is the promise of changing the status of those programs going to happen? – 3) I feel like we are creating a loss-leader college when I look at the programs under that college; the language used in your presentation worries me because there seems to be a change in the mission of the institution; on page 4 of the presentation there is a statement about celebrating strength and opportunities, under which are performing and fine arts, education, business and technology; that is the beginning of a vision of the mission of this institution where we have not had discussion – on the point of the huge college being created, I don't want to get into the budget, but I am certain that the cost to run the new structure will be higher than projected; I don't think the figures include fringe benefits, for example

GATRELL: CMS costs are done elsewhere

ABEBE: But somebody has to pay for them here

GATRELL: Those resource calculations are based on a current college with one associate dean; the net in terms of positions remains unchanged

ABEBE: We are going to have programs losing money simply because of what the experience has been here, just a year or two ago, in terms of profit and loss; all of those programs are concentrated in this College of Arts and Sciences; I don't want to this to be viewed as some parts of the university being favored and others not – I want your assurance that programs that have been promised to be enhanced are going to be enhanced, those programs that need to be adjusted are going to be adjusted, and no new review will take place to eliminate some of these programs that have been identified as not having performed very well, after the creation of this new structure

GATRELL: On the question of themes and strengths, that language came out of Workgroups 8 and 9 and the review team; if I selected the wrong ones, I was trying to reflect the priorities and the themes in those prior planning documents – I can assure you the mission of the institution has not changed – from a resourcing perspective, the net change in terms of budget resources, if we base them upon a recalculation of FTE faculty full-time equivalents: there will be no net change in operating costs; the new college will have more net than the combined Arts & Humanities and Sciences based upon the size of that unit, in terms of operating costs in the dean's budget; there will be no decrease in the operating budgets of individual units per se – I see the creation of a liberal arts and sciences college as an opportunity to celebrate new intersections, also to create a unit that is robust and has a complex mix of programs; it also avoids the creation of a very small unit with lots of small programs that might be on that list – what I want to do, to avoid the very thing you're talking about, is create a dynamic college environment that is mutually supportive; a large unit that is collaborative and integrated is a win; it reflects the language we've had around branding this year – in terms of 'will it cost more,' obviously there will be incremental increases over time; planning is based on current dollars only, no increase in administration or salaries – over time some administrative costs will decrease; those decreased costs will be reinvested into faculty – in terms of the program evaluation, I came to this body committed to moving people off those lists; it's important for the liberal arts and sciences to be taken off those lists, symbolically as well as practically; the number of credit hours in those programs made it a no-brainer to do so; we need to be practical in the assessment and appraisal process – some of the programs proposed to be eliminated are in the other colleges, some in the new CLAS, but I don't see that as problematic; the new configuration allows for economies of scale and allows us to look at the productivity of the entire unit

ABEBE: When will we see a change in the status of these programs?

GATRELL: Eleven programs have already been moved

ABEBE: That was as soon as you got here, nothing has happened since

GATRELL: Once we have additional revisions to programs, as those revisions move forward

ABEBE: I want to get your commitment, because this process was exacting for a lot of us, and it was very contentious on campus ...

GATRELL: We're in a different space than we were two years ago

ABEBE: Not with regard to the status of these programs; the status has not changed

GATRELL: Some have been updated, others were moved from 1.4 to 1.3, so there have been some adjustments – I would anticipate this summer in discussion with deans there will be additional moved, but I can't guarantee it because that's a dialogue – what I can commit to, going forward, is that the process will be collaborative and informed by outcomes

HUNG: I concur that we need that new college to have a new focus – rearranging departments and establishing new colleges is a starting step; the key part is that it fosters new opportunities that are then supported – I would like to see those mentioned as we get the details about how we're implementing realignment – what I fear most is we have this realignment, but then we don't have institutional-level support to actually development new programs, like getting new faculty lines with expertise in the areas we need to develop – if you're maintaining a revenue neutral level, then a new faculty line to develop a new program necessarily means a cut has to happen somewhere else

GATRELL: There are opportunities for strategic reinvestment and prioritization of salary pools; the challenge is, until we increase revenue, the salary pool remains limited – the resourcing of Unit A positions authorized this year shows evidence of prioritization across all disciplines – that list informs how we invest; we've approved Unit B requests for overlapping sabbaticals, we need to do that in order to deliver the curriculum – next year will be a year of transition; then once we move to searches for permanent deans, we'll get to the issue of laying the foundation for new programs – we need to build community, create energy and excitement about this institution; I think this plan does that because it resonates with the themes and priorities this campus articulated in multiple venues – every effort is being made to take care so that those concerns don't come to pass

ABEBE: I'm not in quarrel with your vision; I'm not convinced that there will be sufficient resources to create new programs, attract new faculty, without harming the programs we have right now

GATRELL: In the case of Criminology we've hired a Unit A faculty member, we anticipate hiring again to support that new program because that was a commitment made by this institution; that will generate additional students and revenues, will yield larger salary pools which can be deployed strategically for new program development – history is prologue; it is a challenging environment – we've done our best to staff and resource high-priority areas, areas that have acute instructional needs, those that might be emerging or those identified as growth areas – we're still two to three years out before we start staffing for new programs

HUNG: Steering back to the FAFSA issue of verification, do you and President Glassman and the university counsel have some ideas about students who couldn't navigate the process and the aid package could not be dispensed in time?

GATRELL: We're not only doing phone calls, we've also invested in converting what was a paper process to electronic; we're doing text follow-up as well as email ...

HUNG: Will the realignment plans make it into our promotional materials?

GATRELL: Our enrollment cycle is 18 months, and the branding book is put to bed 20 months before – by September or October the architecture on the website will be in place for a lot of those pieces, 100% by July 1

Other Items

STOWELL: Can I get volunteers for the new implementation committee that was established? [*Brantley and Eckert volunteer*]

ROBERTSON: Do we want to proceed with our Thursday, May 3, 10:15 a.m.-12:15 p.m. proposed meeting? [*side discussions, consulting of calendars*] – we haven't discussed how we want to proceed with reviewing the realignment proposal; we've had a lot of shared governance in the process, a lot of our colleagues on campus are anxious to know how we are going to proceed; if we implement a review that could slow the process down, and there are justifiable reasons to do that, many of our colleagues are looking for a direction to move forward and this plan seems to lay out some assured direction; much of the feedback that has come to me has been positive,

though there are some questions about details – are we going to reach out to the entire faculty community by a poll or survey, would we take items back to the faculty for a vote over the summer?

HUNG: We need to begin the process; this is going to be controlled by the college admins and the realignments, and they may or may not invite us to give feedback, so we should just offer it – one of the important things about this realignment is the details; the most impacted faculty and programs need to have a voice, it is our role as their representative to provide a mechanism for that voice to be heard – we need to reach out to faculty members, gather and distill information and relay it to those in charge of realignment

WHARRAM: I agree that canvassing faculty and getting feedback would be good

ABEBE: I've said my piece, I'm worried about programs being eaten up to support the new programs – although there has been tremendous analysis and input from campus, program development should be left to the departments – we need to ask the question as to what is going to happen to the programs we already have – with regard to Article II of the Senate Constitution, we're not even supposed to approve this, just simply assess – I'm not sure going back to the faculty would do any good at this point

STERLING: We can't do it in the summer anyway

HUNG: It would have to be Fall – what good it would do is to advise and provide feedback; providing the mechanism for any faculty members who wish to provide feedback is an important role that we should carry out; whether anyone will speak up I don't know, but I'd feel better if we at least tried

OLIVER: At this point in the academic year, would an electronic platform not be sufficient? – is Fall too late, because it's already in motion

YOUNG: Since we are going to meet in two weeks, if Sen. Robertson sent a memo to all faculty inviting them to send feedback for us to consider at that meeting ...

STERLING: And invite them to attend

BRANTLEY: We should send it to all faculty, but shouldn't we also identify and send a special invitation to those who are going to be impacted greatly

HUGO: The Provost came and talked to us [FCS faculty] last week, so faculty members were able to speak to him directly

BRANTLEY: I'm glad he did that, but I think the opportunity to speak to their fellows as opposed to speaking to their boss, people may feel a little more open

HUNG: If we want to try to get something done for the next meeting, it feels a little rushed

ROBERTSON: I like the idea of sending an invitation to all faculty to provide feedback, and also an open invitation to attend and provide comments on May 3

ABEBE: We're not going to get to an assessment today ...

ROBERTSON: On May 3 we can assess the Executive Committee and Senate performance

STOWELL: In the meantime, if there's email communication, that might give us a little more structure: how do we evaluate, by what standards

HUNG: We haven't really decided whether we're meeting on May 3; can we have a clear consensus that we are meeting? [*murmurs of agreement*]

ROBERTSON: I'll book a room

Session adjourned at 3:58 p.m.