

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

9-4-2018

September 4, 2018

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "September 4, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1108.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1108

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.

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting on Sep 4, 2018
Room 4440, Booth Library

Note: This minutes is a summary of the proceeding, not a verbatim transcript.

Attendance: Abebe, Brantley, Bruns, Chahyadi, Corrigan, Eckert, Gosse, Hugo, Hung, Oliver, Stowell, Wharram
Student Senate Representative: Gordon
Guest: Provost Gatrell, Ms. McLaughlin

Stowell called meeting to order at 2 pm.

Motion to approve minutes of Aug 29, 2018 by Corrigan, Stowell second. All in favor, with Chahyadi abstain.

Bruns: Executive committee will meet with Dr. Glassman next week. Senator Wharram and I met with Provost and President about Presidential Lecture. Last Spring the Senate passed a resolution to request a lecture series on the event of the anniversary celebration of the Lincoln/Douglas Debate. Ms. Mona Davenport, Dr. Sace Elder, and Dr. Mark Hubbard were also present at the meeting. President Glassman will put in a couple thousand dollars to support the event. The organizing effort has been handed off to the Committee on Inclusion and Diversity. The specific topic for the lecture remains to be determined. Possibly – History and Commemoration. Could be speech or lecture about the Lincoln-Douglas Debate.

Wharram: Seems too ambitious to organize it for this September. Especially if we want it to be the start of a series. The scope is for topics of relevance to the campus, per resolution. Another topic discussed was that Fac Sen might come up with idea for the lecture series for following year.

Bruns: President Glassman was insistent that the FacSen to be involved in the process. President asked about the experience with the exhibit at Booth. Corrigan and Brantley can chime in, but the success depends on the topic of the exhibit. So as the first topic of the series, should we follow the resolution or pick a new topic.

Corrigan: Yes the success is dependent on the topic. Also the timing of the exhibit. Kind of hard to round up speakers with reduced staff level.

Brantley: Internally we need time to prepare the exhibit. If it is a small exhibit for one talk, then it might not be too demanding on faculty time. But the library staff involved will need time to gather info and develop the material. The success also depends on whether the exhibit is a traveling one, which we receive grants for, with all the pieces already in place, or if it all has to be made in house.

Bruns: Given this, is it okay to deviate from the topic on resolution?

Wharram: One thing Sace suggested was to get a speaker on the politics of commemoration. That is clearly tied to the topic to last year. She said that would be best way to honor the resolution. This will likely take place in Spring. That idea seems to be one that we all thought was best. Other comments?

Corrigan: Far as lecture series goes, this is a once a year?

Wharram: Yes.

Corrigan: So if we do it in Spring, then will we do it every Spring? It's good to have some consistency.

Bruns: The details are still being worked out, but the intent is to have it once a year.

Wharram: This was in the Spring resolution that we recommended President to set up a series on topics of significance to campus and community. Fall date is impossible this year due to lack of time. So this year will be Spring, but not sure if it will have to be Spring every year.

Brantley: Since this is a special year commemorating the debate it is a good thing to do it now. But it's not odd to do the next one in Fall. In the beginning of the semester there are a lot of activities oriented to the students organized by the Office of Student Affairs, so it will be good for the Office of Academic Affairs activity be present. The Fall semester also catches students coming back.

Abebe: Our intent is for the Pres office to do this lecture series. We didn't suggest specific time. Only that it is yearly. It is great that the President has followed through with the suggestion. What is interesting to me is to have the Inclusivity committee to organize.

Gatrell: He will consult the inclusive committee. Depends on the theme there will be specific committee to organize. But it will come out of the President's and Provost's office.

Wharram: Given this particular topic it makes sense to have participants from the History Department.

Abebe: My concern is that if it comes out of Inclusivity office. It might lose some of the gravitas as if coming from Presidents Office. It will be a different series than other. It will miss some of the meaning. It's up to him to do what he would.

Gatrell: I think that's where we are. Going forward, we will solicit ideas for themes from FacSen for the following year. Once theme is found, then reach out to appropriate stakeholders and then to establish committee moving forward. It's more a consultation.

Eckert: Thought we asked Bailey to take charge on this since he felt strongly about it. Did we?

Bruns: I did attempt to ask him. As a Presidential series, it has now become a bigger thing. Also Bailey couldn't attend so he recommended Hubbard. Commend Glassman on committing to doing the series and to allocate money for the series. It's great that he's happy to follow the theme recommended from FacSen. I don't have a clear idea yet what you all's opinion is on the topic. Does the topic that is broader than the resolution make sense?

Abebe: I think that should be left to the Pres office to decide. I don't think we need to have it defined right now. I'd like to see it left as wide as possible, as broad as possible.

Hung: I think the theme was the one we offered last year about the historic impact and significance of specific commemorative naming events. It doesn't have to be specifically about the LD debate itself. If it's about the naming and commemoration I think it fits the Senate's intent. Our intent was to have a forum, a place for dialogue on the issue; to have speakers to come in with a view and to engage the campus community. Whether it's specifically about the debate or the commemorating aspect of it I personally prefer the latter, because I think that's what we're struggling with, not the historical detail of the debate. The debate itself is worthy of celebrating because of the anniversary. Whether these two things need to be the same? I don't know. Whether we have the human resources and energy to do two lecture series? I don't know. But as an inaugural Presidential Series, I think the topic of Commemorating our Past, within the context of a more evolved understanding of social Justice, I think that's a pertinent topic.

Brantley: I think that's a national topic. It's still going on. It is an issue that came to local interest with last year's renaming effort. I think the politics of commemoration is a good idea. Many of our exhibits at Booth are commemorative in nature. This Fall we're doing an exhibit on the 1918 flu pandemic. In spring we will do 50th anniversary of moon landing. It will be out of this world. It is not very controversial and has wide appeal. But currently the topic of historical commemoration about civil war era can be controversial nationally. So I think the topic can be pretty broad and general.

Hugo: Let's say we pick a different topic in Spring. Then will we still talk about Lincoln-Douglas debate? I thought the intent was to address the perceived lack of awareness of the LD Debate amongst students. I thought the intent was to reach out and bring more awareness to the campus. So will it be a second thing then that we need to do?

Bruns: No there won't be a second thing.

Brantley: I think the topic of commemoration encompasses both the debate itself as well as the local relevance.

Hugo: Yeah, I think we do need to hit on the historic even itself because that's what we talked about originally. We can keep it more open but that's what we decided on.

Hung: I actually agree with Senator Hugo too. Part of the genesis of the resolution was to address the issue to the campus about the place and event of the LD debate so that the campus as a whole can become better aware of these issues. Would it be okay to suggest that the inaugural series may be not a single lecture but one-and-a-half? So have one speaker on the history, and then one on the commemoration. So we can have our own historian about the time and place of the debate. Because that is different from the second topic, which is how do we commemorate historical events that in modern time, can be problematic. Let's not choose, let's do both. Because it will be from two speakers.

Bruns: Well that's not going to happen unless you volunteer to be on the second committee.

Hung: Okay, I will.

Bruns: As Abebe was saying, our role is not to run it. Just make suggestions.

Brantley: What is the relationship of meeting with Dr. Hubbard and Dr. Elder and MS. Davenport in the planning meeting

Gatrell – Baily specifically asked for Elder and Hubbard. Dr. Glassman invited Senator Bruns as the representative from the Senate. And he thought it touches many campus organizations, so he pulled in Davenport. This fall is too rushed to do it justice. So each year we will consult Senate and formulate new topics. I expect it to change every year.

Hung: So would it be okay to reflect the current discussion to the planning committee? Would it be enough to get the issue to move ahead or do you want something more specific?

Gatrell: We just don't want to speak on behalf of Senate. So we want to make sure of the event reflects Senate's intent.

Bruns: So reflect to the planning committee is that it should address specially in part the debate the historic event of the debate. Other committee reports.

Stowell: Election committee – the call for volunteer to run closes on Friday. If we don't have enough. I might need to extend deadline. Need to do more recruiting. After it ends, a week after that will hold elections.

Hung: Did we get the 1-year CAA replacement volunteer?

Stowell: Yes, we have one volunteer.

Oliver in absentia via Stowell: Thank Chahyadi on joining the nominations committee. Finalized a list of the positions. Sent out to faculty serving on that committee. Requested to be uploaded to Website.

Students/Faculty Relation Report

Gordon: Up to 13 senators. One interview tomorrow. 2 more applications. If all of that works out, then we will have 16. This week will be orientation. Decide to leave application open. To keep open after today.

Hung: So it is after today or up to today?

Gordon: No we are extending to after today.

Staff/Faculty Relations Report

Hung: For the staff committee the first meeting is next week so nothing to report yet. Senators Corrigan and Wharram and I have some communication that we want to coordinate a meeting between the 3 Senates after the Student Senate is more settled. This will be like once or twice a semester. We will meet and touch base and then we can bring issues back to the respective constituents, to keep the communication lines open.

Bruns: When you said "meeting of all three" what do you mean?

Hung: It will be the representative from each of the 3 Senates.

Bruns: Oh I thought you meant all three senates together.

Hung: No. I am not going to try to schedule that. So maybe 2 to 3 people from each constituent to just touch base on issue of the campus that we need to know.

Awards Committee Report – no report Eckert

Forum committee Report

Abebe: forum will be this Thu 3 pm. Please post the posters. Thank provost for the support and providing refreshment. We do appreciate it very much. He's been very supportive in the effort, as well as inviting Provost from ISU. Please invite friends and students to attend. We will be embarrassed if only 10 people show up. I ask for your support in that regard. As before, we should re-evaluate the forum series. The 4 participants in this forum are Aylesworth, Delman, these are highly involved and informed faculty from here. Our own provost who participated last year. Also provost of ISU.

Burns: thanks for pulling together.

Budget Transparency Report

Hung: Nothing to report on Budget Transparency. Still need to reach out to Business office to get the budget.

Stowell: Carole Collins-Ayanlaja from Educational Leadership. Stowell read the answers.

Bruns. Motion to approve appointment of Dr. Collins-Ayanlaja to the 1-year CAA position, Eckert second. No oppose. No abstain. Motion passed.

Provost report

Gatrell: Before I get into numbers, like to introduce our newest member on campus, our University Counsel Laura McLaughlin.

McLaughlin: Happy to be here at EIU. Great reputation. Glad to be part of it. One reason to come today is to learn about what you do here at FacSen. My biggest challenge now is to learn how EIU functions and how each parts work with each other. If you can help guide me in that I will really appreciate that. I feel confident in my role as counsel. Previously I was the General Counsel at Logan college near St. Louis. So thank you so much.

Bruns. Thanks for coming.

Gatrell: Enrollment data. Been waiting since Feb when apps started coming in. Before I start, I want to acknowledge the great work and outcome came from faculty. When I see the growth in departments like in English, other programs doing outstanding work at both graduate and undergraduate level. Biology has had several programs last year bringing in students to our campus and their numbers are above the campus average. Very pleased to see faculty engaged in the work of recruitment. We all take pride in our programs and in working with our students. Ultimately that's what makes us successful. That's the reputation that attracted me here is the high quality of outcome and our role as a regional comprehensive. What we did have a direct impact.

In terms of graduate enrollment we have had 3 semesters of growth, now at 3.6%, which exceeds strategic plan target. Transfers up 3.2% that's after having been up 12% in Spring. Total international students, even though we had challenges due to VISA issues, we actually now have more diversity in international students from 52 countries. Previously we've had 46 or 47 before. First time full time 24.5% up. This is really good news. Overall head count we were at 7030-something, we are now 7526. That's a 7% increase. Obviously, there are some dual enrollment numbers in there. But if we subtract that we still outperform our best model projections. This is truly a good day and worthy of celebration. The work from Carla Sander and Rebecca Throneburg on dual enrollment are to be commended. The leadership

from Josh Norman cannot be overstated. His energy, his attention to data-driven decisions. And then of course the leadership of Kelly Miller from the Admissions office, are the major reasons behind these successes. This is truly evidence of hard work, focus on attention to detail, and the Community effort. This is not narrative in campuses around the state. We all should be proud in message the positive things on campus. It is a good day. To celebrate as a community.

As with all things in enrollment and recruitment, we are already thinking to next year. As of today we are up about 18% admits about 22% in applications and tomorrow the number is going to bump up because they've had the weekend to send them in. We will continue to build over the next 3 to 5 years to hit our strategic goals.

Eckert: Is this specific to us? How is the situation for other campuses across Illinois?

Gatrell: I am not sure what their numbers are. I am positive that our story is unique. The work here is outstanding, and we are going to have a narrative that is unlike anything else.

Abebe: This is the most positive on campus. This will change things. Norman has done good work. Also commend on your openness and enthusiasm. I think that counts for something. Thank you.

Hung: Any update on the number of Unit A Unit B numbers released this year?

Gatrell: Somewhere 19 to 20 lines, off the top of my head. I don't have the numbers right in front of me. Most of unit A. Some additional searches in Spring. The challenge is that revenue is relatively stable. Need to rebuild enrollment and our reserves. Another round of late searches. Current lines are funded by retirements and late leaves. Authorized accounting search in summer, and multiple searches in music. Priority is to maintain accreditation, to maintain excellence. Still have some attrition going forward. My hope is to be able to do strategic fillings of positions where there are significant gaps.

Hung: Are there going to be new lines in the HHS? Part of the impetus for the new college is to create new programs and new directions. So are we getting new faculty for that, or to repurpose existing ones?

Gatrell: I see the next year as a year of transition. I think new programs are important, but I think we need to pause. Need to build the structures first before strategically invest. We will invest in new programs but it has to be intentional. We will see invest in HHS in 3 to 5 years yes. But I will wait to see the faculty and dean's wishes. The searches for the Deans are ongoing. I want the next leadership team to make those decisions. The Business and HHS dean search is going. Asked deans to write vision statements. Can't move forward without it. So in the long run we will invest, but right now I want us to take a pause.

Bruns: One question I have is when you talk about investment in new programs, it is a very important for future growth. Another topic is rebuilding existing programs. Many departments are significantly short of being able to offer full discipline. Any thoughts?

Gatrell: If you look at the specific lines authorized so far, they are made to fill significant gaps in the programs. We do not enough resources to fill every hole. But we need to make sure we have enough staff to deliver quality exiting programs. Our existing programs come first. Whatever discipline.

Abebe: One final point – I am glad we are not talking about the “bins” we talked about last semester. I like that.

Gatrell: Yes, I agree. I don’t want to talk about that either.

ACF Update:

Hung: I want to bring attention to the discussion last week on getting ACF members on the Senate. Upon review of our Constitution, there is a statement at the end from a resolution passed several years ago to clarify, specifically, that “faculty” shall mean Unit A, Unit B, and department chair. However, there is also a line in the by-law that says that a faculty is eligible to run for Senate if this is their 4th semester or more. Since ACF contracts are renewed every year, there seems to be some contradiction. If a person’s contract is renewed every year, where are we counting the 4th semester? First date of employment? What if there’s a gap because the contract isn’t renewed one year? Do we restart the clock? These complications between the language and intent need to be clarified or resolved. That’s point one. Point two is that I’ve given some thoughts to the comments from Senator Abebe from last week, as I always do for his comments. So the last week’s comment was that having this conversation about ACF in the Senate is only useful to the extent that there are requests to participate. But we haven’t seen these requests, at least not directly. So this becomes a sort of angels-dancing-on-the-head-of-a-pin type discussion. But here’s my thinking: as a body of shared governance, if it’s in the bylaw that we will have ACF members as part of the community, then it’s our duty as a body of governing to make a path clear, visible, and easy, for anyone in the ACF track to participate. The process should not be opaque. It should not be ambiguous. So that if people want to, the opportunity is accessible. I don’t think we have done that in the past. I think we need better education, better outreach, better promotion to be honest, to make it clear to these colleagues that while there are some hanging issues about this service not being part of the contract and you’re not evaluated on it, but we do value your voice in terms of shared governance. You are anywhere from a third to a quarter of the department, sometimes more. So your voice is clearly a critical part of shared governance on campus. Then let each of them individually to decide where and how to spend their time and whether to participate or not. So those are the two points I want to bring up to the Senate to discuss.

Gatrell: I think this dove tails on this this is important notion to me university citizenship. The challenge is to bring them in, to invite them to serve. Citizenship is not just about evaluations. It's something bigger than what's on the DAC. Happy to see this dialogue and an opportunity to reach out to the Unit B members to make everyone feel that they are a part of this community. It's a challenge on every campus as Abebe notices and mentions. But I think encouraging people to participate, asking them to serve. The invitation is the important piece. Over coffee or face to face. To make known to them that they are eligible to serve. I want to applaud the Senate for having this dialogue. I do think those colleagues do have many important things to share with us, like advising and workload. That impacts not just in the UPI context, but also impact our shared lived environment. On the technical side, I want to clarify the "4 semesters" is the total number of semesters to service.

Eckert: So you mentioned ACF and Unit B – are they different?

Gatrell: Well, that depends. Billy can you chime in?

Hung: So "Unit B" includes 2 tracks. It includes both Annually Contracted Faculty and Academic Support Professionals. So Unit B has two groups in it. The ACFs have their contracts renewed each year and they primarily teach courses.

Eckert: So those are the ACFs with the multiyear contract.

Hung: Well, after the ratification of the new contract, we will not have multiyear contracts any more, for the most part.

Gatrell: There's are cases where an ACF is hired but do not enter into the Bargaining Unit until Spring semester.

Hung: So the ASPs are our academic advisors, stock room managers, and other professionals who support the academic mission of the departments. These are the ASPs. And they both fall under the Unit B contract.

Eckert: Ah ok. So, half of our colleagues are Unit B. We discussed the issue about wanting their voice. We decided against asking them to serve. They feel that the university is not committing to them. They might not get a renewed contract, year to year. That's different from Unit A. I find it a bit disingenuous to say that we want you to participate but we may not have a contract for you next year. Our department can't function without them. If anyone is laid off it's them not Unit A.

Gatrell: I see your point. There are rules about removal and we follow the contract's intent and wording. I am intentional to get the contracts out as early as possible because it's critical to notify people, so they can make decisions. I do understand the challenges of the process. Having said that, historically, absent financial emergency, those positions tend to be stable positions.

Eckert: Except in the past 3 years it's been the exception.

Gatrell: Well, I will suggest that it was a very different environment.

Eckert: Yes but it's still fresh to a lot of our colleagues.

Gatrell: Yes, I certainly recognize that, and I don't mean to be dismissive of that.

Eckert: Yes, I too, want to be in an environment where everyone is a part of it. But at least when I talk to my colleagues, it's very frustrating because some of these colleagues want to be Unit A but they are part time.

Gatrell: I think it's important to make the distinction between contingency, part time, and full time. But I do not disagree at all on the main point.

Eckert: But we are still asking them to do something for nothing. I personally have problems with that.

Abebe: I may be only one voicing the concern. First, we need to provide ample opportunity for people who want to serve, to serve. That's to our advantage. We cannot function if people stay away from serving. From my personally experience, some ACF shies away from service. They don't see themselves as part of the community. Setting aside the current contract, to equate faculty members who have spent so many years to attain the rank and to put in the effort, with the differences in hiring conditions, so on and so forth, to those who do not have the same conditions and requirements. We need to open up as much space to serve. There is credit to all of us who contribute to this institution, but there are differences that cannot equate. This idea of seeing people as identical as far as faculty, I don't think I am with the rest of the group.

Gatrell: I did not intend that impression.

Abebe: I didn't think that you did.

Stowell: That's a big topic. Maybe a little thing can help. I did specify in the message who can run. I made a point to specify that Unit B and chairs can run. But I've always wondered why do we wait 4 semesters? Is it because we don't think they know the campus? Or they might not make a wise judgement as some who have been here longer? Why is that? Why wait 4 semesters? There might be people who want to jump right in. Is there justification to maintain that wait?

Brantley: I wonder if Carole Collins-Anjalas' decision to participate now is a result of having to wait for that period.

Abebe: I think a correct response, or part of it, is that the attitude of the institution. Reason is that the institution has certain interest to keep certain group of faculty. The institution hires ACF due to flexibility issues and economic reasons and so on. So that attitude is reflected through what the rest of us do. That's a partial answer. It's not fair to the institution to correct that because the institution has a vested interest to keep it going.

Hung: I want to comment that the 4 semester language. I wasn't there when the language was drafted. But from just reading the language, it seems like the 4 semester issue was really about Unit A, and then they just didn't think about how it applies to Unit B. Which frequently happens because we tend to have our blinders on, as the writers were probably Unit A. I don't see a thoughtful examination on how the language can be equitably applied to the two populations of faculty. So how we resolve it moving forward – in terms of 4 semesters, I am happy to see it reduced or removed because it's a barrier, especially for any ACF. But I also think we need some bylaw to adjust for the contingency that if a faculty is elected for 3-year term and then does not get their contract renewed. As rare as that might be, that could happen. So our bylaws need to address that.

Stowell: We do have language addressing vacancies.

Hung: Ok, so that will just fall under that section about vacancies. That's fair.

Chahyadi: Can we differentiate unit a and unit b members? For Unit A they will need 4 semesters. Then for Unit B, they can serve immediately. As I understand it, for a new professor, it's good to have time to get their career going first before getting too spread out in service. It's good for new careers.

Stowell: It also protects them from doing too much service.

Eckert: Yes, I think we should leave the language as is and let people have two years before they start serving on the Senate.

Bruns: Have we had any unit b serving on our Senate? To anyone's recollection?

Gosse: Have we ever had a chair?

Stowell: Yes, Andy Methven from Biology. And Tony is currently chair for KSS.

Bruns: I ask because Unit A has a service component, but Unit B does not. What benefits do Unit B get? I mean yes there's the university citizenship component. So maybe a dedicated seat? Where they have a voice from someone representing them. That way we know there's a spot for Unit B, and we won't have to keep asking them to apply each time because the position is already marked for it. What do you all think?

Gosse: Can we ask them? Can we get a survey together?

Hugo: It's a big ask. Unit A gets evaluated on service. Unit B is primarily evaluated on teaching classes. If we have a seat dedicated then there's a pretty large pressure.

Bruns: So it's back to asking them.

Gosse: I love the idea of having different voices and different types of faculty. But we should ask. Some kind of quick survey?

Bruns: Well as I plan to meet with every departments. I could ask that.

Hung: I think if you have a dialogue, that'd be good. But I think an anonymous survey will get you a more accurate view.

Corrigan: I am hesitant to have a dedicated seat, then it comes across as we have *one* seat. That may discourage some people.

Bruns: I don't know how we'd deter something that isn't already here. They are already not running. I think if we have a seat then it's actually a step up from where we currently are.

Corrigan: Will it be othering? Like "hey we are Unit A and you have your Unit B seat." It might go against the idea of us being a community.

Bruns: We can make it clear on the election. We can have a dedicated Unit B seat and make it clear to the campus that we hope someone will run for it, and if nobody does, it remains open. I don't want to pressure people. Then the rest of the seats will be open to all Unit A and Unit B and chair.

Hung: I think this merits more discussion. Maybe come back to it next time?

Shared governance proposal:

Stowell: We began this last year, and I went to many places and had discussions. Present consensus as we go forward. CAA is okay with min level of curricular approval at FacSen, such as executive action that will be on the agenda. They can be called up for further discussion but the default is to go forward with CAA decisions. What they do not want is a separate and duplicate role of CAA where FacSen can theoretically over turn things that they have done. Also why they thought some representation at the FacSen might be important as we discuss curriculum matters. I have talked to CGS and COTE. I want to call attention to fact that almost every senate in Illinois, the FacSen does have primary responsibility for curriculum at some level, whether designating committee, or a separate committee to make recommendation to senate, at varying levels of details. Really, we are in the minority that we are detached from the process. Ultimately there needs to have some by law change. We need to figure out the relations between FacSen and the 3 bodies. The

constitution is ambiguous. It specifies the creation of these groups, but not how the FacSen relates or communicates to them.

Eckert: The Senate constitutions say that we will run elections for them.

Stowell: Yes it says we will do that but it does not specify that we have a reporting line from them. I think the general consensus is that we would like to see greater communication amongst these committees. The FacSen can take on a minimal role, at least on new programs. I am not talking about revising existing programs or course proposals. Nothing more than what would come through to me as the accreditation liaison in similar to my role to IBHE. Also thought this will be one way to demonstrate our response to the comment from Higher Learning Commission. At a maximum if it requires Senate approval by executive action that means there's a few days of delay 4 to 12 days. It's not a dramatic change to time line. When they do present new programs, if members of Senate are invited that we go attend the presentation. That way, any concerns will get a chance to be addressed before the CAA decision gets to us. This will show that we have addressed the communication issue identified in the report. It will be one or two meetings a year for a Senator, since program creation is slowing down. We will have senate liaisons to bring the need to pay attention to certain issues to us. Bottom line is then we get investing a little more in learning about new programs, we approve them by executive action, and we have a senator who will invest more in learning about new programs. Comments?

Eckert: I thought the idea is that FacSen will oversee new programs. Did I misread him? So you're suggesting it won't happen, that we will just accept it.

Stowell: No it will. It will come to our agenda. It might be a new program in Exercise Science. We will have been involved when it is presented at the CAA. Then on our agenda, what they do at CAA is that it is an executive action request, so it doesn't require any discussion and as long as it's on the agenda it's approved by default.

Eckert: So we could axe it? We could decide to discuss and comment on it?

Stowell: That's true with anything that CAA does. If that's an executive action, then what's weird is they can put it on the full agenda for discussion. They don't want us to re hash things that they are done. So if we go to their meetings, we can raise our concerns. So when it comes to us, we just need to approve it.

Eckert: That doesn't seem like what the Provost wants.

Stowell: CAA's major concerns are that the FacSen doesn't have college-level representation. So why bring a curriculum issue to a group that, potentially, doesn't represent every college. And also, don't we trust them?

Bruns: I can see their point.

Abebe: So the FacSen shall approve by executive action unless there's already an agreement on that. I think we can overcome that problem. I don't think it should be just the executive committee.

Stowell: No, it's not the executive committee. "Execution action" in CAA means the whole committee, by default, the action is approved.

Abebe: I see. I don't see why there is a problem that they perceive, except what I read in the newspaper. If someone is against it then they will continue to be against it. Can we improve on this language by simply suggesting that FacSen shall approve by executive action on all recommendations from CAA, to address their fear? I don't think we should open up every issue and re-evaluate their decisions because it's duplicating effort. So we will have a semblance of process and we will be in line with our sister institutions. I do want some process with some accountability.

Stowell: So maybe you and I can talk some to work this out. I am by no means saying this is final. We want to get feedback before we put something out there.

Hung: It is my understanding that right now the plan is to have a FacSen liaison to the CAA. I envision it as similar to subcommittee work we currently have where a senator will volunteer for that position, like for Faculty Forum. I am trying to see the outline of their responsibility. What is their workload for being in this liaison work. Will they be required to attend X number of meetings, or just when new programs come?

Bruns: To follow up that, I am thinking to reach out the CAA and CGE and COTE to have monthly chair meeting? Will that address this?

Stowell: I think it's good idea but we need to codify the process. In the current proposal, I deliberately did not specify that. It states as "regular." I didn't want to say "every" meeting because some of them meet once a week. They should be in communication more frequently. But I didn't want to specify a particular number, necessarily.

Hung: I see two sides to the tension. On one hand, the liaison should be our ears on the ground, so to speak, so that if there are issues we know about first, we can have a dialogue before it comes to the executive action and then we say "whoah what is this." So that's the intent. In order to carry out that function, they really need to be fairly involved with their respective committee. That means that for some committees, the work load can be the same, if not more, than the FacSen itself. If we are cognizant of that, we can maybe put some flexible language in there, like "depending on the work load, we may appoint more than 1 person for the liaising."

Stowell: I didn't want to specify the number of meetings.

Bruns: I don't think we have the perception that the CAA or CGS or COTE are rogue committees that need overseeing. I think we should address what is asked of us. The issue is what was brought up by IBHE and what the Provost brought up to us. What if we do the executive action to approve, and then if we have problems then we talk about it. Otherwise we will approve it, then it's done.

Abebe: We can address with the language. What we are trying to solve is a governance issue, not a curriculum issue.

Brantley: I envision the liaison as not attending every meeting. But they will be paying more attention to it. Since we are now all members of the D2L CAA course, the liaison will pay more attention, then attend when they see the need.

Bruns: I don't want to give them the impression of us looking over their shoulders. They do a lot of good work on these committees. I have always been comfortable with FacSen having an oversight role, but a very very soft one.

Brantley: I don't intend to sound like it's an oversight, looking over their shoulders kind of thing. Just greater knowledge and be more cognizant.

Stowell: I am comfortable leaving it in but making it as broad as possible, while also codifying it. If you just say you need liaison, then they won't know what to do. I am more comfortable with the latter part of the statement: "liaison shall provide regular updates on curricular updates to the Faculty Senate." Whether they get the information from going to the meetings or combing through the minutes, it doesn't matter to me. The key is if we want to know more, we will have to pay more attention.

Gordon: I think having a liaison is a great idea. I am serving on the CAA. If there's any concerns of questions I can also help bring those issues here.

Eckert: We originally said that the Senator will be a member of the CAA. So we just sit in and observe, right?

Stowell: In the most extreme we could have made them voting members of these committees. We could make them a voting member. The greater problems of getting them to serve has pushed that issue to the side.

Eckert: As long as they get the communications they can choose to attend or not attend. That will make things easier. That will mean you're not serving on 2 committees.

Bruns: One of my concerns too we are struggling to get people to run for senate. The executive action option solves what we need to solve. The liaison position if we do that, make it broad and open so people can choose to do what they need.

Hugo: Since CGS is same time as us then it's not possible at all for a Senate liaison to go to their meetings.

Bruns: Good point.

Stowell: I will draft more final language for voting next time. Liaisons won't, I recommend, serve on other subcommittees.

Hugo: For your other recommendations, the Award committee needs 3 people for the Mendez Award.

Merging subcommittees

Stowell: We have 3 on Executive committee. We don't have to change bylaws, but we can combine elections and nominations, with 3 people serving, including vice chair. Combine student, staff, relations as external relations committee with 3 people serving. 2 on Faculty Forum. 3 on Award. Then 3 liaisons. Some will have to do some double duty if we need 3 Awards committee. But if we combine those as is, then everybody will just serve on one. Except the Vice Chair, who is also the elections.

Eckert: And the Vice chair doesn't get any CUs.

Stowell: Yes, the Vice chair doesn't get any.

Hung: It is a labor of love.

Abebe: Who are the members on the Faculty Forum?

Hung: Right now it's just you. May I suggest we have the discussion we need to have about the future of the Faculty Forum before soliciting volunteers for the committee.

Abebe: Ok that makes sense.

Stowell: Besides we are 5 Senators down in number so it's harder to have everything covered fully right now.

Bruns: So discussion on combining committees?

Hung: I think we really need to do that. If not all of that then at least most of it. I really think the student/staff/city committee can be a committee of 3 and do all that needs to be done. I think the election and nomination combining makes sense since you communicate closely when you do your work, so might as well be one committee. I would also make the point that in addition to these standing committees, we also have plenty of ad-hoc committees in each cycle, such as the vitalization one last year and now the re-arrangement one. So the

more we can streamline these committees the more human resources we can use to address these as-need tasks.

Bruns: Question: The Award committee does 2 awards?

Hugo: Yes one each semester. So you can have a 2-people committee and draw in a third for the Mendez award.

Bruns: Maybe combine forum and awards committee?

Abebe: Yes, I was thinking the same. But what does the Award committee think?

Hung: Eckert is the point person that.

Eckert: Can we make the Awards committee in such a way that since the Mendez award is by the whole Senate, can we just make the whole Senate vote for that?

Hugo: I think that's going to be very hard. Some years we have 3 or 4 applicants. Having everyone review and then come to consensus will be a lot more time consuming.

Eckert: So the second one you need a committee anyway.

Hugo: Yes that's a set award so you need a set committee for it.

Bruns: So do we want Stowell to prepare a final proposal and bring it back to us? Does it require bylaw changes?

Stowell: Yes.

Eckert: Yes and we still have to do faculty forum.

Hung: Especially since we now have a Presidential lecture series, it's time to think what the role of Faculty Forum is. I think that merits a discussion before we proceed. Let's get over this Faculty Forum first.

Bruns: I like the idea of combining. They can run the awards, and then run the forum.

Eckert: But anyway it wouldn't happen right now, but after we get the bylaws.

Hung: It probably won't happen till next year by the time we get the bylaws through.

Corrigan: Changing the name of the Student/Faculty and Staff/Faculty committee to "External" maybe opening up too much. Does it mean we're also relating to the administration? The city? Is that opening up too much? Or is that the point?

Hung: Is there a better name for it?

Bruns: Senate relations?

Hung: What about Campus Governance or Campus Relations?

Bruns: There are other bodies involving in governance though.

Hung: We will try to come up with something more fitting as a name.

Corrigan: I don't have a problem with that I just want to clarify on the name.

Hung: Well we did forgo the city representative, reference last year's discussion about the city committee involving Senator Wharram. So I am the same thought as you do with the word "external" because it seems to be between campus and the rest, and not within the campus.

Bruns: Why don't we call it the Senates Relations committee? Because that's the relations between the Senates.

Hung: That's as good as any other name.

Bruns: Stowell will figure something out.

Representation by college:

Stowell: Our current roster does have good representation across campuses. Maybe half the seats are tied to colleges. Except we are missing from CEPS. We have 4 from CLAS, 3 from Booth, 1 from LCBT, 2 from HHS. So this relates to the discussion at CAA – if FacSen is getting involved in curriculum matters, then there should be college representation. That means that for some of the smaller colleges, we're just adding more burden to their workload in service. One idea is that we can have half the seats reserved for colleges and some at large. It might be 1 from Booth, 4 from CLAs, 1 from CEPS, 1 from LCBT, and 1 from HHS. Then the other 7 seats will be at-large.

Hung: I like the idea.

Eckert: Yes that makes sense.

Hung: I like that there's at least 1 seat for each college. Half the body is at-large. Only downside I can see is that it can be very difficult to get someone to run. So what happens if we can't get a candidate from a particular college run? So we might need a by-law line addressing this.

Bruns: How about we move that seat to become at-large.

Hung: So the bylaw can say that it becomes an at-large seat when that happens.

Bruns: Does that make sense?

Eckert: Do we need to make a motion?

Stowell: No right now it's just a discussion.

Bruns: I think Stowell's proposal, with Hung's comments, makes sense.

Stowell: Another issue came from last semester regarding committees that are important but rarely meet. Hung and Wharram made a proposal to re-organize the APERG and STHC to allow people to serve functions on both committees. Another suggestion is to existing committees for those purposes. When we ran the program elimination process, we had FacSen input, the CAA input, and the APERG recommendation. Since CAA handles curriculum issues, will it make sense to have them also handle elimination? Or do we want the FacSen to handle that? Is there a better process to use existing committees for these functions? That's one option. Essentially the similar considerations for the STHC- perhaps the FacSen can serve that function. So there are some options.

Bruns: I think the concern for forming these committees as-needed is the worry for specific biases/agendas.

Stowell: Also, the timeliness.

Bruns: Right. I think we should table this for further discussion.

Brantley motioned to adjourn, Stowell seconded. All in favor.