

5-3-2018

May 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, "May 3, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1106.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1106](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1106)

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 May 2018 ▪ 10:15 a.m.-12:15 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, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, K. Hung, N. Hugo, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Williams, B. Young

Senators absent: S. Brantley, J. Oliver

Guests in attendance: Jay Gatrell (Provost), Brooke Schwartz (DEN), Mark Johnson (CATS), Richard England (Honors College), Jon Blitz (UPI), Suzie Park (English), Jeannie Ludlow (English/UPI), Sace Elder (History), Nick Shaw (Theatre Arts)

---

Session called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 10:18 a.m.

[ROBERTSON opens with remarks on his experience at EIU and on Senate and his optimism about the university's future]

### **Approval of Minutes from April 17, 2018**

*Motion to approve by YOUNG, seconded by WILLIAMS*

*Discussion: none*

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

### **Executive Committee Report**

ROBERTSON: We met with the Provost and the President on Monday; Executive Committee will continue to meet monthly with Admin next year – Administrative review policies (re: resolution passed in 2015): President Glassman would appreciate more specific wording on the desired outcome or method of review we might want to implement; he is currently using the 360 model but would like more input from Senate regarding how to adopt a policy that works for all

STOWELL: It might simply be an open comment period from all faculty

ABEBE: What we have now is logrolling; we have to adjust it somehow

GATRELL: How would we make sure we get faculty participation – for this round of 360s for senior leadership undergoing review, there are members of Faculty Senate involved in those reviews, who received formal requests for feedback – President is open to a single common instrument for the Senate at large based on feedback or some other mechanism; just looking for clarity on how to receive the most robust feedback possible

STERLING: The biggest objection in the past is that when administrators were reviewed, the only people below them who were consulted were people they themselves had appointed

ROBERTSON: Proposed lecture series: President is supportive; broad support for beginning the annual series with a commemorative lecture recognizing the 160th anniversary of the debates; he specifically mentioned involving groups...

GATRELL: Diversity leadership team, which includes MEI, Office of Civil Rights and Diversity, student groups, Office of Minority Affairs

YOUNG: On the actual anniversary date? We need to get moving, that's in September – I've mentioned this to my Americanist colleague, Mark Hubbard; he indicated he'd be willing to work on helping to find a speaker – I'd like to reiterate how important I think it is that we follow up on this ... it's a strong opportunity to demonstrate that we understand the importance of this heritage and to connect with the community

ROBERTSON: I will follow up with the President about the date – we also discussed the activities of the Shared Governance Visioning Committee

STOWELL: Updated on what we discussed last time

ROBERTSON: Implementation: we discussed adjusting bylaws, etc. – Athletics overspending: President acknowledged it was a larger amount than he'd hoped; he hopes moving forward all parties would have a clearer, more specific picture of spending as it's happening

HUNG: In which area of Athletics was the overspending a problem?

GATRELL: Primarily scholarships

ROBERTSON: There were some reductions in scholarships this year (roughly 25); another problem is that in Division I, certain sports have a high number of scholarships – we also discussed Realignment

## **Committee Reports**

*Elections Committee: No report*

*Nominations Committee*

STOWELL: Sen. Oliver is unable to be here but asked that we ratify the appointment of Sheila Simons to the CEPS position on the Library Advisory Board

*BRUNS moves, WHARRAM seconds*

*Discussion: none*

*Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions – motion carried*

STOWELL: On CAA, Misty Rhoads will be on sabbatical in the Fall (one semester); also potentially another vacancy needing a one-year replacement due to medical leave; Stacey Ruholl volunteered to serve in either position

HUNG: Which college?

STOWELL: Both are at-large

*[WHARRAM, HUNG, and BRUNS suggest various coverage options, settling on appointing Ruholl to the one-semester vacancy with dibs on the one-year if needed]*

*BRUNS moves, STOWELL seconds*

*Discussion: none*

*Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions – motion carried*

STOWELL: Discussion about vacancies on Senate

STERLING: I move to appoint Nichole Hugo until positions can be filled in the Fall election

*ABEBE seconds*

*Discussion: [HUNG asks for and receives confirmation that Sen. Hugo has agreed to serve]*

WHARRAM: When will the election take place?

STOWELL: We have vacancies on other councils, so it needs to occur at the beginning of the semester

*[Further discussion on timing; WHARRAM consents to fill in]*

BRUNS: Friendly amendment to add Sen. Wharram to Sen. Sterling's motion

*ABEBE seconds*

*Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstention (WHARRAM, who expresses support for Hugo) – motion carried*

HUNG: So we still have one open seat? Can we look at the next highest vote-getter from the election?

*[STOWELL indicates that the rest were write-ins with insufficient votes, STERLING elaborates; eligibility requirement of four semesters also noted]*

*Faculty-Student Relations Committee: No report*

*Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: [HUNG states that Staff Senate meeting is next week]*

*Awards Committee: No report*

*ACA Recommendations*

ROBERTSON: We could approve the language to be added to the ACA application, revised at our last session:

“Please note incomplete applications will not be considered. Submitters should make sure that applications are complete using the checklist on the cover page (all checklist items are required). If relevant, the nominee should work with the nominator to make sure there are no omissions.”

GATRELL: On the cover page or on the form?

ECKERT: Cover page

BRUNS: What would be considered incomplete? *[gives example of Library Services faculty without course evaluations]*

ECKERT: We understand that; *[clarifies that confusion stemmed from inconsistency in course evaluation requirements among departments]*

HUNG: The checklist should make clear what “incomplete” means

*ECKERT moves to approve, HUNG seconds*

*Discussion: none*

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

#### *Faculty Forum Committee*

ABEBE: We have been working with the Provost, contacted the provost at Illinois State University – we’re going to schedule a forum for September 6; it would involve three or four individuals, we have contacted two faculty members already – I will communicate the specific topic by email

*Budget Transparency Committee: No report*

### **Provost’s Report**

ROBERTSON: *[thanks guests for attending]*

GATRELL: *[to ROBERTSON]* I want to begin by recognizing your service as the Chair of Faculty Senate – *[presents plaque; applause]* – you have demonstrated EIU’s commitment to the liberal arts and enthusiasm for students ...

GATRELL: I shared information preliminarily with the Board of Trustees, received feedback; the plan has been updated in modest ways since April 2, I’m committed to edits throughout; revised name to “School of the Arts” at the suggestion of the department chairs – I’ve been working with Newton Key and the team who will comprise the “Faculty Development Innovation Center”; strategic investment expanding from one half-time position to more FTEs in that unit (Lisa Dallas, Julie Lockett, additional graduate student support); we’ve been intentional in making sure that professional development is at the forefront, including support for research, statistics, hybrid learning, etc.; Newton is developing relationships with the deans and ISSs, coming up with a framework to meet monthly to expand programming in their areas and infuse skill sets across campus – I’m working on identifying additional budget resources to ensure a revised funding stream for operating costs of offices, FTE-based and base operating budget; net-net gain for liberal arts and sciences; expanded funding is a strategic reallocation – BoT has encouraged me to move forward with planning provisionally

ABEBE: Staffing has been increased for the new FDIC?

GATRELL: There will be four, possibly five graduate assistants; two will be 12-month appointments – *[further comments on Newton’s work with the Academic Success Center (formerly CASA), training for advisors and faculty, etc.]*

WHARRAM: You mentioned Lisa Dallas and Julie Lockett moving under that umbrella; where do others like Jay Grabiec fit into this?

GATRELL: Web Services will remain intact but report to Enrollment Management

ROBERTSON: We’ve had discussion within Senate regarding the proposed realignment; I would like to reach out to our guests, who perhaps have comments or questions

ELDER: You said that the Board has given provisional approval to begin planning

GATRELL: That was at our committee meeting, but there was no vote

ELDER: When will they vote?

GATRELL: That will be a June action

BLITZ: There’s been some concern about DACs with the new college structure; separate DACs within School of the Arts, but the School of Communication and Journalism will have one DAC – looking at the contract, Article 8: DACs are meant for departments, no mention of schools; that would suggest Communication Studies and Journalism should each have their own DACs – but in the definitions at the beginning of the contract: “Department shall mean the smallest administrative unit to which an employee is assigned, in which evaluation occurs, and where tenure is granted. In instances where this unit is called a school, for purposes of this contract, the word department applies.”

GATRELL: In the case of the School of the Arts, those will remain independent departments, though the structure will evolve over time; I’ve asked them to explore a shared governance model to facilitate the development of new programs as a school, but the departments remain intact – for Communication and Journalism the vision is to create a single collaborative unit, not two independent departments; over the next year the co-chairs will develop a pathway to identify a new chair and assistant chair for the following academic year; resources will be reassigned

to support additional faculty positions in future years – in terms of the consistency of DACs, all current faculty will in no way be disadvantaged by reorganization; this reorganization is intended to provide a framework for collaboration and new opportunities for interaction – for the people in the impacted units, it's important to honor their current DACs for a reasonable length of time; I defer to UPI on what a reasonable length of time is

LUDLOW: Did the difference in the two plans come from faculty in those units, or was it decided at an administrative level?

GATRELL: A school of Communication and Journalism is a direction this institution needs to move in; it's been an ongoing discussion, prior to my arrival ... – it's administrative on some level, but it's consistent with institutions our size, accreditation, and the sentiment of some faculty; I will own that decision, but it was based on data and my desire to preserve the integrity of both programs, as well as provide a framework to invest in not just broadcast news and media production but also rhetoric and comm theory – the School of the Arts came out of Workgroups 8 and 9 and the review team; it was something I had discussed with the chairs, something I believe resonated with the campus community

LUDLOW: In your presentation in April, conspicuous by its absence was the phrase “coming from the faculty”

ECKERT: We still have not had any get-together with you and the three departments to ask questions

GATRELL: I've met with multiple departments who have invited me to discuss the implications of reorganization with them; I've extended that offer to the deans; I would be happy to meet with Music, or Art ...

ECKERT: If we're supposed to go together, why hasn't there been any initiative to bring us together and talk about it

GATRELL: It's different from Communication and Journalism: the departments remain independent, the school is a framework to have interdisciplinary programs – at some point in the future we will have a coordinator to oversee interdisciplinary programs – if, five years from now, the chairs in consultation with their faculty determine that an alternate governance structure makes sense, by all means

STERLING: I'll summarize what I sent to the senators, copying the Provost: I'm uncomfortable with the size of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; it would be difficult for any dean to have familiarity with the curricular needs of numerous diverse programs; such familiarity is crucial for making staffing decisions and other decisions

ABEBE: My concerns about reorganization are not based on that this kind of thing doesn't exist anywhere else; it's not based on knowledge that it would not bring students here; I'm not quarreling that there is no vision here – instead, my argument is consistently that the new megacollege is going to be relatively too big for our size and for the other colleges in terms of balance; it would create a situation of haves and have-nots – we have unfinished business: we created a bin for old non-performing programs, now we're going to create a new bin with shiny objects; when something like that is created, resources will flow there – my concern is given that we have this old bin with old programs, many of them in the merging colleges, we're going to diminish those programs – given the stringent budget situation in our state, the disengagement of the public on higher education, I am not certain that we will get new resources for new programs, so the success of this new thing we're going to create will be at the expense of what we have now – until that is addressed somehow, clearing that bin, I will continue to state these views; the time for faculty to speak is now, not after implementation

GATRELL: I recognize the history there, I appreciate the analogy – the new larger college will have the same number of associate deans as the current two colleges; when you look at budget resources, by reallocating based on FTE at the operating level, the net-net is an increase per FTE; in practical terms, that means moving from two independent offices to just one, and I anticipate allocating \$150,000 to the new College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (the current base budget is \$75,000 for all colleges) – over the years what seemed like rational budgeting, equality, resulted in inequality – I am committed to creating a framework to celebrate those programs and resource them more effectively; maintaining current high-quality programs is what we need to do first – on the issue of the unwieldiness of a large college: the college of liberal arts and sciences existed on this campus historically; it's a structure that thrives at most campuses in the state of Illinois – I share Sen. Sterling's concerns about staffing, but as Provost I share those concerns no matter how large or small the college is – I've made mission and values and delivering the curriculum our number one priority, and I expect that of all deans – I was an associate dean in a unit with 22 academic departments and 7 centers; you take special care in making decisions – this year I've dealt with a number of challenges in one major from a staffing perspective: we launched mid-semester and late-semester Unit A and Unit B searches to support Music – can we deliver the curriculum, is the program consistent with our values, and are we meeting the mission and our commitment to students: if a staffing plan can't live up to that, then it's a spreadsheet, and spreadsheets are not leadership – I want to understand, when someone needs a position, that it's meaningful and we can justify it – we need reconfigurations for programs to thrive

ABEBE: Do you have a timetable for consultation? [*referring to the stratification of programs out of the Vitalization process*] When will the bin be cleared?

GATRELL: One of the first things I did was try to clear some of those issues; working on specific cases in those various strata; there is ongoing work by the departments to innovate and revitalize; we're going to return to discussions of curriculum, I'm going to advocate for a LA&S core – mission matters more than the starkness of a spreadsheet – if it's central to who we are, we will do it – I'm trying to create a culture of leadership that is mission and values-centered

WILLIAMS: I appreciate what you're saying and trying to achieve, but I agree with [the other senators] as to whether this is going to work – I'm from the College of Sciences, it feels like we're being swallowed up – I don't think either of the existing deans from CAH or COS should be in charge, spearheading this two-year approach, they don't have the ability to understand the needs of the other respective units – it's hard to retrain people [re: inclination to favor one's own disciplinary area], shortchanging other departments now in this conglomerate – whoever is chosen is going to set the culture of what will happen down the road

GATRELL: I see this initial two-year period as developing a collaborative framework for shared governance, to guide the next dean (whoever that is) – [looking back over decisions made in the past year] I'm confident every dean will look at it mindful of the individual integrity of every program

WILLIAMS: I hope you will oversee the process to guarantee fairness

GATRELL: Ultimately it's not about me, it's about structures that the faculty define, shape, and articulate – it'll take two years to get a mission statement and structure set up; we can't do three searches simultaneously

GOSSE: Very few people volunteer for radical change in the work environment – the plan seems rational, sensible; we're *doing* something – the last three years have damaged every department on this campus because of the shedding of resources – in my new department we are rebuilding; the future is brighter with this approach – I never want to hear again “budgets have been swept” – a dean told me ‘most majors don't make money’ – we have to right-size, advance the mission, ultimately for the good of EIU

STOWELL: Going back to Workgroup 8, for example, signature programs: we decided what we were trying to do helps everyone; when one boat rises, they all rise; we would strategically invest in programs that would float the other boats – I see the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as a home for general education and the core foundation for this university

HUNG: Do we stay the same or do we change: I vote we need to change something – if we want to make our school stronger and better, then we need a plan – there's not one plan that doesn't have considerations and worries – I have strong reservations about this combined college; I also feel that trading one set of worries for another is not a net gain – our concerns should be less about pitfalls, more about how do we best implement this plan – we've been in academia, we've seen how certain structures are prone to certain problems; these need to be heard, documented, and addressed in the planning phase – we need faculty feedback and input, but administrative decisions are administrators' privileges, they need to incorporate the input – the steps leading to this vision need to have ample, deliberate time for campus feedback; like Workgroups 8 and 9 set up town halls, sent out surveys, solicited feedback from key personnel; that's a good model to build on, it puts value behind the concept of shared governance and relieves some of the anxiety on campus – that process is critical in getting the outcome we all want; having the right people in place is critical

GATRELL: What we're seeing evolve with Communication and Journalism is an intentional transition and redesign – with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the two-year window is intended to do just that; no plan can become fully formed on day one – I recognize the timeline is accelerated, but it takes advantage of momentum – I'm open to whatever makes sense – the macro level is there, but how we negotiate that as a community is a dialogue

GOSSE: They don't have college meetings; my college has had one meeting in seven years – so how do you start that dialogue

GATRELL: All-college meetings should happen once a year, at a minimum: what are the priorities, how do they translate to the work people do – I would like to see a culture where we have regular collegewide meetings, robust administrative teams, a governance structure to address curriculum and leadership issues

ABEBE: I have a solution: we can leave College of Sciences as it is, merge the Honors College with the Graduate School – faculty can make it unsuccessful, if this merger takes place with resistance – merging can give more power

LUDLOW: The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is also home for quite a few majors – I don't want the administrative structure to look at us the way tour guides do, walking visitors past Coleman Hall they say ‘this is where your gen ed classes are going to be’ – I've been having conversations with people: their greatest fear is as

we move forward with realignment, they're going to lose the aspects of their knowledge production related to their PhDs, we're going to become the space for general education, they're going to lose the balance between teaching and scholarship

GATRELL: When we think about individual programs, we shouldn't fixate on the number of enrollments – if we're going to have an honest conversation about resources, mission and values: it's not just one metric – when you have a large LA&S framework, you're able to look across the array and see if it's balanced; are we hitting all priorities across all disciplines, that's not just about numbers – Geography doesn't have a lot of majors but we teach lots of courses, we're highly productive; that's part of our role in that configuration, [to support students in other majors] – a large unit that has a vast, diverse program array allows us to have intentional dialogues about the value of programs – I see LA&S as the heart of campus; liberal education is going to be the theme of our faculty forum this Fall; job one is to identify the learning values that we believe are important around liberal education, a College of Liberal Arts and Sciences provides the framework to do that

STERLING: We're constantly talking about "the new" moving forward (new programs, etc.); that makes some people afraid we're not interested in existing programs

GATRELL: New is great, but I've also been intentional in talking about our quality existing programs – applications and deposits are up 184% in English for new majors; that's the story of Eastern, not the programs we haven't created yet, it's the outstanding stuff we've been doing all along – the plan is mindful about the position of structures, structures that will be determined collaboratively by faculty, which is why there are windows for transition

STOWELL: We've put out 14 new programs in the last three years, many interdisciplinary, faculty-driven, built upon existing strengths

LUDLOW: Majors in traditional humanities disciplines are being erased from our discussions; this is a national trend

STOWELL: There is a culture of innovation on our campus, and it does involve cross-disciplinary interactions

BRUNS: The process of moving toward a College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is crucial to our ultimate success – when you talk about setting up the structure, the person leading that process really matters – [*refers to the merging of Botany and Zoology departments creating a toxic environment that lasted 20 years*]

GATRELL: I've had multiple meetings with stakeholders, I'm mindful of that history

BRUNS: When you hear multiple people concerned about pulling this college together, you're hearing a consistent message; integrate the concerns or address them, so people feel heard – my second point is, previously we've been doing a lot of 'deficit thinking', that's thinking in the short term; when we think about investing resources, we need to think about long term – Mark Cuban said major in philosophy, we need to teach people how to think

GATRELL: I agree 100%

WHARRAM: Senate is good at deliberating, but sometimes we're not as good at canvassing and being a conduit – we can help facilitate more commentary

GATRELL: Larger pieces did change (nomenclature, staffing arrangements); there has been constant revision – I'm open to revisiting the timeline of the dean searches – I want to make sure we're moving forward, it's about progress and having a goal out there, so we're poised to thrive when 2019 gets here – I don't want to start talking about new programs until we have structures and staffing in place; I want to have the permanent deans be part of that dialogue

ECKERT: Who will be the leadership in the combined college?

GATRELL: I will consult the current deans as well as the entire leadership of Academic Affairs

ECKERT: When will you announce the interim dean?

GATRELL: I hope to have something preliminary done in the next month or so

BRUNS: If the interim dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is going to lead creating that structure, would there be value in doing a search for the interim position?

HUNG: At least an internal search, if not national

GATRELL: I have no problem doing an internal search, that seems reasonable and fair

WILLIAMS: The difference is it's not an appointed position, there's a selection process

## **DAC Alignment**

STOWELL: I sent out a draft resolution after our last meeting [*reads*]

YOUNG: [*suggests language tweak*]

ABEBE: There are already 14 departments that prioritize university service – I think it's a good idea, I'm generally supportive of it, but we need to make sure departments don't feel we're telling them what to do

STOWELL: As this body we can only recommend

HUNG: Once we pass this resolution, we should actually go talk to these departments

ELDER: I'm not sure what this resolution is going to do – I come from a department in which the DAC privileges departmental service over university service, and we do a tremendous amount of college and university service; I think it has more to do with the cultures of various departments – generally at the university, there aren't as many of us as there used to be, and we're all tapped out; if we privilege university over department or make them equal, then who's doing the work?

STOWELL: Our department has departmental service at the top, and we're all doing more than before – at the university level we have so many vacancies – we need to recognize we're interdependent on every level – for example, in the curriculum process, people in the department might be doing the majority of the preparation, etc., but if there's nobody at the top to approve it, then where does it go – this is where it's coming from, can we at least balance it

ABEBE: Can we use “explore” rather than “recommend”?

ROBERTSON: Offering a language adjustment as a friendly amendment: “at least equivalent to (or higher than)”

HUNG: I agree that most of us are doing above and beyond, but I support this resolution because recognizing that there's a departmental culture of service is also recognizing that it's not codified, that these cultures can shift – our department lost eight of 24 faculty in three years – these modifications can serve as a bulwark against the erosion

SHAW: The idea of outreach might go further than a resolution – certain departments may take this resolution from a defensive point of view – departments that agree with this resolution are already valuing it; for departments that don't value it, a resolution won't move the needle for them – there are other ways to do this, and I don't know that amending the DAC will make much difference

YOUNG: The resolution is an occasion to be able to do outreach – I hope when departments meet in the upcoming semester, somebody goes to launch the dialogue; if they don't want to change, at least we've had the conversation

LUDLOW: This resolution is like putting a bandaid on a broken bone – I'm in a department where university service is higher, but the draws on my time from department service are increasing, because we have lost not just faculty but also support staff; support staff tasks are being given to faculty across campus – it might be more helpful to have conversations about which committees are necessary, which committees can be reduced in size – it's hard to hear the resolution as a teamwork thing, it will sound like condemnation to some folks

STOWELL: How would change be implemented in a DAC unless self-driven; how would I have any influence on a department without the backing of a Senate resolution

LUDLOW: What if the resolution didn't suggest changes to DACs, didn't make DACs the seat of the problem – why not a general comment on the culture of the university, an acknowledgment that people are doing more, a genuine plea that we all think about university service when we think about how we're using our time

STOWELL: You've served on Senate and done elections; we started about that time to see less interest in running for university office – the deeper issue is how do you take an already-loaded faculty and get done the work we've historically expected to get done

ROBERTSON: We could simply reorder the statements, begin with the fourth “Whereas,” and add a short comment acknowledging that we understand the reasons; shuffle the order so it leads in a slightly more friendly way

STOWELL: I'm happy to rewrite it and bring it back

HUNG: One of the items for Faculty Senate in the Fall would be to bring this to the people we feel we should have a dialogue with on this topic – some of our colleagues do think about time commitment based on DAC rating

GOSSE: Will we address the reorganization of these committees, the ones that never meet, etc., to make it a reasonable load

BRUNS: I don't know that that's really the issue, and we've already done that with the Committee on Committees – the issue is we have two groups of faculty: one that's very engaged and involved in a lot of things, the other that shows up to teach their classes and then leaves – we've gone below a threshold where now we don't have enough engaged faculty to serve on committees

## **Other Business**

BRUNS: I think we should sponsor a resolution urging the provost to conduct an internal hire for the interim dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences



ABEBE: That would be good; the only problem is once we say that, we've approved the college

BRUNS: I don't know that we have a lot of sway in convincing [him of] a different plan

WILLIAMS: The resolution could say "If a combined unit is going to be created..."

ABEBE: It's implied consent

ROBERTSON: Do we have internal candidates who have the expertise to lead?

HUNG: That has to come up from the internal search process

BRUNS: At least the faculty of the two colleges would have an opportunity to weigh in

HUNG: The interim dean has to come from a collaborative process, not much different from a regular search – if the body doesn't feel it appropriate to have a Senate-endorsed resolution, we can write a letter with multiple co-signees

WHARRAM: If that is the general consensus of faculty, perhaps that would come through if we canvass – are we going to do that, by the way – that would be a means by which we could find out that faculty feel strongly about this

ABEBE: The hiring process requires the provost to do a search on a new organized college, even on the interim basis

BRUNS: He said 'I'm open to this,' he didn't say he would be required to do that – otherwise, just shuffling around current administrators will destabilize the entire thing – I move that Faculty Senate suggest that the provost conduct an internal search for the interim dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, with a statement saying that success is dependent on the engagement of the faculty serving in these colleges

HUNG: It's hard to vote on something without it written out; I will write it, then we can circulate it – is there a procedure for taking a vote electronically, because we're not going to convene again after this

STERLING: In the past we have been encouraged to do as little work electronically as possible – but we've already discussed the possible resolution out loud

WHARRAM: There is some time constraint

HUNG: I'll draft the language, then we can critique and edit, then vote in the next two weeks

BRUNS: Next week

HUNG: I'll write it by Friday, maybe we can vote on it Monday

ABEBE: Just be sure the language doesn't give consent to the proposal

WHARRAM: Do we want to send the Qualtrics form to the faculty, as an opportunity for them to give informed input to this process?

STOWELL: It's just the one question [*WHARRAM reads*]

WHARRAM: I move that we send out an email

*ROBERTSON seconds*

*Discussion: none*

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

ABEBE: I'd like to thank Sen. Corrigan for serving as Recorder

ROBERTSON: I'm sorry we didn't get to the discussion of evaluation of the Senate

Session adjourned at 12:24 p.m.