

9-18-2018

September 18, 2018

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "September 18, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1109.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1109

This Article 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 18, 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
Guests: Provost Gatrell, Dr. Marita Gronnvoll (CAA), Dr. Rick Wilkinson (CAA), Dr. Rebecca Throneburg (CAA), Dr. Angela Jacobs (CGS), Ms. Brooke Schwartz (DEN)

Bruns called meeting to order at 2:03 pm.

Motion to approve minutes of Sep 4, 2018 by moved by Stowell, seconded by Abebe. All approve.

Bruns: Executive committee met with Dr. Glassman and Dr. Gatrell. Lectures series will come from President's office. Topic still needs to be finalized. Dr. Glassman expressed that his priorities for this year include focus on retention, on addressing first gen students, particular AA male students. Perhaps the Senate can look at ways in which we can work with Dr. Glassman to address this issue.

Hung: Dr. Glassman expressed that the good news in enrollment and increased in student numbers helped get us to a point of balance in the budget. But we will need continued improvement to get us to a better place.

Stowell: There was the on-going discussion on Performance based funding.

Hung: There is a bi-partisan committee on Higher Education that is looking at how funding is decided for higher education. There's a smaller portion, less than 1%, of the annual budget that is tied to performance-based funding. There is now discussion on what standards for performance should be used, how they're assessed, and the impact on funding. They are also looking at the issue of the funding over all. Since approximately, I think 2002, the budget has been fixed, and all schools get the same increase and the same cuts. The ratios have been locked down for a while now. There are now suggestions that the ratios should change, given the new environment. There's flux in the discussion. Part of it falls on to IBHE recommendation, and that's timely because the IBHE is meeting on campus today.

Abebe: Over last 3 years, for good reasons, the internal budgets have been sent back to the Business Office. Will the Senate/Exec raise the issue of devolution of our budget? That's an

important consideration. It impacts faculty, like how many steps to go through travel application. It should be an issue for Exec board to talk about, on a continuing basis.

Bruns: Absolutely. As I talk to departments on campus that is an issue that has come up.

Stowell: Election is going on, ending Fri noon. No candidate for CFR for Booth. We have 4 or 5 candidate on FacSen, still need 1 spot. Two no-shows show for COTE in CLAS and LCBT. We are a few candidates down. As committees change bylaws there will be shifts in positions so it's not terribly worrisome to not have all the spots filled immediately. Some committees can probably function well enough for now. For after Friday instead of waiting for 2 weeks, will send out results electronically so FacSen can ratify it electronically.

Bruns: Nominations committee?

Oliver: I have emailed all colleagues on the committees, sent copy of list of councils and committees. Based on recent history the question on whether the committees are functioning depend on the person in charge of convening and running the committee. So we should reach out to those individuals and keep in touch with them. Some of the committees are as-need basis so they wouldn't have to be meeting regularly when there's no need. I will send to Senator Hung the full updated list of nominated committees so it can be updated on our website.

Gordon: The Student Council has filled the VP of Student Affairs position. The official results will come out tomorrow but there's only one candidate so barring any unusual circumstances that person should be sworn in. We currently have 17 senators and our quorum is 16, so we are leaving the position open for longer, but we are meeting regularly now starting tomorrow.

Hung: I attended the staff senate meeting last week and here are some brief updates. They are organizing the Blue-BQ event and they have some funding for it. They have one change on the senate, with the AFSCME representative stepping down and a new one to be selected. There was a request to change some of the parking at Stevenson's hall – there is currently no staff parking and the dining staff who need to come in early have to park far away. They are hoping to change that and add a few staff parking spots closer to the dining hall. The lion's share of the report came from VP McCann. There are many funding decisions in the hands of our state executive branch. The legislative branch decides on a budget and how to spend the money, but the executive branch has to release the money to allow the things to take place. In the past, things that have been approved by the legislature end up not happening because the Governor's office is not releasing the fund. This year, two pots of money have been released, to the surprise of many. The first is a \$1.6M block to finish the work at McAfee and to replace the elevators at Student Services. There's also \$750K released for electrical work at the Lumpkin/Coleman/Klehm cluster. What we don't have is the money for Life Science. They had appropriated \$5M to do the HVAC in the building but

the fund has not been released, and we don't know when it will be released. Another point is that EIU puts a 2% depreciation rate, meaning that over 50 years, the buildings will reach \$0. There are many buildings on our campus that are in dire need of upgrading and maintenance. So far, we haven't received that kind of money. In fact, we haven't received any significant amount for maintenance and upgrade projects for going on 10 years now. So the admin is talking to the government to get 3% of our total budget to do direly needed maintenance and upgrades, as a start to catch up on the years of neglect. In terms of enrollment, VP McCann said that we would want to see 250 extra on top of this year's number to have a comfortable budget.

Wharram: Is that total over all, or incoming first-year?

Hung: Total overall, FTE.

Bruns: Did he mention anything about the repair work to the bridge walkway at the Union?

Hung: That will be done but the money will come from EIU, and not a release of money from the government.

Ecker: The call to apply for the Mendez award has been sent out. So now we're waiting for the responses.

Abebe: Fall forum last week. The forum committee hasn't met since then so no report on evaluating the activity. The forum was excellent. Need to have more faculty to attend, particularly the younger faculty, and particularly on the topic on defining higher ed. The participants were generous with their time, particularly Provost Murphy from ISU. Assuming we will continue the Forum, perhaps we need to plan for Spring forum.

Bruns: The forum went extremely well. Panel was well done. We had some good questions, including a very incisive one from a student. It's unfortunate we are not seeing the younger faculty there because they are missing out. One question: if there's an event on campus they want us to cosponsor, is that something we want to participate in. For example, open resource week at Booth they are screening the film, I think that's perfect collaboration. Thoughts?

Abebe: Anything involving faculty discussion will be a good idea.

Bruns: We will touch base with you on that.

Hung: Budget committee has no report.

Stowell: Shared governance report is tied to the next part.

Abebe: Before we move on to the next section, I have a question on your plan to go to each department. What is the goal of you meeting with the various department? What are we trying to achieve? Is it a listening mission? What will we do?

Bruns: This is an initiative of my own. It's important to me to meet with them to ask them what would they want to see FacSen to do and focus on. In my mind, this is a fact-gathering and listening tour. As we look to EIU to rebuild, the faculty needs to be a major voice in how we rebuilt. That's the message I am taking to them, what I want to hear is what are their concerns. Met with 6 of them so far, then at the end I will pull into a small report to share. Been hearing some areas of concerns, that don't need money but can be addressed. One example: some faculty are frustrated that sending in orders for equipment they need and the orders changed by Business office so what ended up being ordered isn't usable.

Oliver: What's the rationale for that event? Was it the least expensive item?

Bruns: Yes it's cheaper but it doesn't work. While I understand we want to be efficient with our fund. But what I think needs to happen is to have the communication back and forth.

Oliver: Also wondering, is it opportunity to encourage faculty to consider serving at the university level. Based on our needs of our university.

Bruns: Yes. Absolutely.

Oliver: We've lost many young faculty.

Bruns: And it's still going on. In the last 3 weeks, I've heard of 3 faculty have left.

Hung: In addition, we also had a lot of encouraged retirement in that same period, so we lost the senior faculty and the institutional memory. So we have lost the younger faculty and also the more senior faculty.

Eckert: I found out that the number of Unit A faculty has gone down by 20 compared to last year.

Bruns: Yes, that's a major concern. I did this without consulting you all but it's been a positive experience. I'm hearing that people say it's refreshing to have someone go talk to them.

Abebe: I think it's great thing. But you're also setting an expectation so that if we don't do anything about the information that we're gathering it'd be disappointing. So it is in the spirit of that that I asked this question.

Bruns: Yes, I agree. I wouldn't be happy to gather the info but nothing changes, as well. Clearly, we cannot address everything. I hope we can address at least some if not most of them.

Corrigan: When will it be done?

Bruns: It will take the full semester.

Corrigan: So we will get the full report later next year? So any changes will take place next academic year?

Bruns: Some of what we can address immediately we will do so, others will have to wait.

Combining APERG/STHC

Stowell: A proposal from Spring to combine the two rarely-meeting committees. A suggestion, not a resolution. To bring them together instead of populating them separately. Need to address that through the contract.

Wharram: We didn't call it a resolution. It was a suggestion. We recognize the importance of these committees, but the rare frequency of their work being needed, it makes sense to combine the membership. But ultimately we need to have the school and the union to address this. In the contract Section 18.2 it says the APERC shall be composed of the sanctioned and termination hearing committee, whose membership is described in section 16.1. So the question is how do we make this happen?

Hung: I think the path is to talk to the Provost and Dr. Glassman, and then contact the UPI. We need to bring them together and convince them both that this is the right idea to get them talking about it. If they are convinced, or if they see a different way, then they can sign a Memorandum of Agreement to the Contract.

Wharram: Currently, it says in 16.1 each of the 4 colleges will select 1 member, and the Library shall participate, and a member to be at-large. So with the reorganization the details will change.

Hung: The configuration will have to change due to the reorganizing anyway. Whether we also add this change to combine APERC and STHC will be a separate consideration. So do we as a Senate endorse this and then bring it to their attention?

Stowell: I have another line of thought. Do we need a separate program elimination committee? So, CAA already reviews program creation, and you were already consulted in the last time for elimination.

Bruns: That raises a good point. Particular in the context of college representation. If we change the composition of the Senate to reflect college representation. In that case, maybe we can tag APERC to CAA, so that when the need for APERC comes up then members of the CAA will be called. Then when the STHC is needed, we can call on FacSen to do the work.

Hung: I also think that we don't need to recommend just one thing. We can present them all the options that we think will be good and let them choose. Maybe they'll see something we don't and do that instead.

Wharram: Yes, ultimately, it's their decision on what to do.

Bruns: I do wonder if it'd be a good idea to give a recommendation instead of just a list of options.

Hung: That's fine too, but that means the Senate will have to make that call.

Bruns: Okay, how about if you summarize the list of options and we can make a decision next meeting.

Hung: Okay.

Bruns: Next, College representation at FacSen

Stowell: Last time, we proposed – 1 from Booth, 4 from CLAS, 1 LCBT, 1 HHS, 1 CEPS, and 7 at large. As I think about how we go about this in terms of soliciting participation, we might need some coordination in terms of filling the designated seats and work with them to make sure the right slots are filled.

Hung: So like if someone chooses to run as an at-large position but there's a vacant slot for the college-specific seat then we can ask them to run for that instead?

Stowell: Yes, it will take some negotiation with the candidates once we get a slate. But this isn't that different from what we currently do for committees that do have college-specific requirements.

Bruns: Maybe we can just have a pool of candidates, then, and slot them into places. That way the candidate wouldn't have to make that call. They just have to run. Does that seem reasonable?

Hugo: That seems like it'd be the best way to do that.

Eckert: Wouldn't that be unbalanced. Like if we have 10 from CLAS and none from HHS? Wouldn't that be 4 CLAS senators and 6 at-large but nobody in HHS?

Bruns: Well I don't think so. Let's say there are 12 from CLAS running. They will take the 4 college-specific slots and then 7 at-large slots, so the 12th one just wouldn't serve on the Senate, and the seat for HHS will remain vacant.

Eckert: Okay I see.

Stowell: Each year technically we should only have 5 seats open at a time, so hopefully we won't run into that sort of problem.

Hung: As we discussed last time, we need to have language in here to address what happens if a college-specific seat is not filled. Do we leave it unfilled and then try to fill it the next election cycle? Or do we devolve it into an at-large position? In the former case, we will end up with 14 Senators. Or maybe even 13, or 12. In the latter case, we might end up 16 the next year.

Wharram: In that case we will just have to go bang our drums to get people to participate.

Bruns: And I also think that at that point perhaps the Deans and chairs will want to get involved in encouraging their faculty to participate because if I were a Dean and my faculty isn't represented at all at the FacSen, I would be concerned.

Hung: Okay. I just want to make sure we have language in there to capture that.

Stowell: This will be a by-law change. Ultimately, if we have other changes, I hope we can improve in principle things that affect our by-laws, then we rewrite them together and get one approval.

Hung: I agree. We should get all the changes we need and then just do it in one shot. We will need to accept it and then send it to the Board of Trustees and the President?

Stowell: No for by-law changes we just need 2/3 of the Senate. For Constitution changes we need the full faculty vote and then also Board of Trustees.

Motion to adopt this framework as described made by Abebe, seconded by Wharram. No oppose no abstention. Approved.

Comment from New Dean of Library Services, Zack Newell.

Newell: Hello. I am Zack Newell and I have been here since August from north of Boston at Salem State University. I am excited to be here. Getting a sense of optimism, and a sense for renewal. I am fortunate I have a lot fabulous staff and faculty, with great appetite to move forward. As academia changes, so does library. We need to reflect both digital, as well as student services. We did just open the Flu exhibit. We do really good exhibits here and I encourage you all to come and join us. I am very excited about this because it signals interdisciplinary opportunities, which is something I really advocate. It is informal dialogue. We will have different speakers throughout. Our Spring exhibit will be moon landing, which I am very eager about since I am a fan of space exploration. I will be happy to take any questions.

Gosse: I am a distant educator in nursing. The Booth Library, especially Stacy Knight-Davis, has been so helpful for distance education. What do you see for engaging distance students as far as library resources go?

Newell: I will want to advocate for more online presence, like in D2L space. Also advocating connection with the library, like a widget, to interact with the library so it's clear to the students. Maybe advocate with open access educational material, so access is more readily shared so they don't need a formal IP network. Booth should partner more formally with faculty to promote open access material.

Gosse: Lots of students have iffy connection. So the more we can make the access easier and stable would be wonderful.

Hung: What are your thoughts are on the changing needs of the academia, like in the development in digital access points. We're seeing more students and faculty doing their scholarly work on various digital platforms. What do you see is the role of the library in this environment?

Newell: I think we have a central role. I've been a strong advocate for digital access in our library and spearheading digital scholarship. I've worked closely with campus colleagues to make sure there's infrastructure in place to support the digital humanity platforms. In this regard, it's fortuitous that on my first week on campus, the Provost had sent out request for development priority requests. This is where I am so thankful that I have such wonderful staff and colleagues who jumped on the initiative. Our proposal for Student development innovation center was accepted to transform space on first floor to a digitization center specially targeting student success. We are working out the details. It will center on digital humanities, with partnership with FDIC and Office of Student Academic Success. The center will develop more capacity for digital scholarship. Something that's lacking is the new-age computer lab, not just computers, but other tech. When I taught First Year seminars, a lot of digital writing, like creating material. I depended on a lot of free platforms to enable them to do mix media work. It would be amazing to have a place and the support for students to do things like that on campus. I see that as a real opportunity for the library not only as a redefining of the library as a hub across campus, but also for them to have a space here where the campus can utilize. Another thing that I am interested is that I was fortunate enough to have lived around Boston area with a lot of tech companies and I want to bring some of that collaboration to Booth. As an example, GE has invested \$3M in 3D printing, and my thought is that if they're putting that money in then it should be a more impactful experience for our students. The practical side of me thinks of student success that we should provide these opportunities to our students to give them a leg up when they graduate. I see Booth as having a central role in bringing that to happen here.

Hugo: Do you have any plans working with FDIC for workshops?

Newell: Yes I've already been meeting with Dr. Newton and we will be meeting monthly. We're also bringing in Dr. Wharram for his expertise in digital humanities. We had a center of teaching and innovation and my old school where we addressed many of the topics of digitization and scholarly work. I would like to see something like that here. I had also written a grant to address if libraries are failing our under-represented students. Instead of assuming students' needs, we should go get students into hubs to design their own space and programs, and what would that look like to have the ideal space they want to use. We just assume that certain things are what they need. But we have such a diverse student body. I want to prioritize it so that the students who may not have had access to many resources in high school or before get a voice in deciding how resources are deployed to meet their needs, to help them succeed at EIU.

Hugo: I found that there are lots of benefits through workshops. Lots of time I won't think of the resources or aware of resources. So highlighting these things can be very helpful. Every time I contacted the library they've been helpful. I'd like to see more of that.

Newell: Maybe that's something we can do – to set up some feedback system so we can be more proactive in providing those services.

Gosse: I need to figure out the notice on purging periodicals. I know that we've lost several nursing journals. If I put an article in a folder for class and students access then it only counts as 1 access. That's something I'd like to figure out because while the library is very good at getting resources I need, but there are some things that I used to be able to get but now I have to wait. And that's okay. But I just want to make sure that I am doing what I can.

Newell: So what you're saying is that you're worried that the journal will be counted as only having been access once so it doesn't accurately reflects the use and the importance to your discipline?

Gosse: Yes, that's the piece I worry about.

Bruns: Maybe you can download the article 12 separate times?

Gosse: That seems time-consuming.

Newell: Well there should be some IP Firewall info that can be tracked so that it gets registered every time it's used. I don't have a clear answer to that but I will ask Stacey about it.

Gosse: Yes I've talked to Stacey and she's shown me how too.

Bruns: So these are not journals that are canceled?

Gosse: Correct.

Bruns: Okay, maybe we can talk more later after the meeting?

Gosse: Yes.

Wharram: Maybe a map for the library? I found myself in need of maps when I need to find things in the library.

Newell: We have an ad-hoc sign committee.

Corrigan: Yes we are working on that – better signage, maps, and directions.

Bruns: Thank you Dean Newell.

Gatrell: Quick update today. The final calculations on revenue will be made over next 2 to 3 weeks. Final budget soon. The budget is down but the final numbers will be known soon. Ethics training is forth coming. We used to work with a partner campus. Now we are doing our own online training to make sure to reflect our values and priorities. Happening in early Oct. Thanks to UPI to ratify contract. Happy about that. The fall semester is off and running and all processes are underway.

Abebe: We used to get emails about deadlines for various due dates. That coming?

Gatrell: The Administrative Calendar?

Eckert: Yes, the link is out.

Gatrell: Okay we will make sure that the info gets to all faculty.

Oliver: So the budget is not set?

Gatrell: No, we need to have the contract to be signed to work on that. So that's forth coming.

Abebe: Thank you for participating in the Forum.

Bruns: Yes, thank you for doing that.

Eckert: Our President has not yet addressed our campus yet this year. Do you know when the State of University Address will be?

Gatrell: It will probably be in 2 weeks. This month has been really jammed, with BOT and IBHE events. I expect that it will be no later than the first week of October.

Updating on connecting CAA/COTE/GCS

Bruns: Senator Stowell and I went to meet with CAA and some CAA members are here today. One of the models we had talked about was a method of executive action. I would like to propose a different model. According to the Constitution, CAA is responsible for making recommendation on curricular matters to the President. I would ask that whether FacSen needs to be in the role of second-guessing or rubber-stamping our colleagues. I would like to propose another method, which may need a change in Constitution. I would like to propose what I'd call "Faculty Congress." This "Congress" will consist of 4 entities, FacSen, CAA, COTE, and CGS. When we have elections, anyone who runs for a CAA position then they are representing our faculty body on the matter of curriculum. Each of the bodies will represents what they currently are. Then FacSen will address any issues not addressed in these other bodies. Thoughts and questions?

Corrigan: So it will be the same except we have an umbrella called "Faculty Congress?"

Bruns: Essentially yes. What I am proposing is to codify our current practice.

Eckert: How will it address the issue of not having enough people to serve? Also, the HLC's critique was that the various bodies that address important issues are not cohesive. So the idea originally was to find some way forward that can address that. This "Congress" idea – how does it work and how will it address these issues?

Gatrell: I think the "Congress" is rather elegant idea. The fundamental problem from HLC was – what is the role and purpose of the FacSen. You can correct me if I am wrong here.

Stowell: Yes, I can read from the report – EIU approaches the matters of curriculum, student learning assessment, and curriculum reform in a manner that differs from many other institutions. Rather than organizing various committees under one umbrella, like a FacSec, the university takes a disaggregated approach with each as a stand-alone entity. The value of this is that many people seem to touch and be engaged various dimensions of assessment and curriculum development; however the limit of the model is that the work can overlap and there can disconnects and gaps in the model.

Bruns: So one thing I would question is that do we actually have overlaps in our functions. Like right now, CAA isn't overlapping with FacSen at all. In fact, if we go to the FacSen approves CAA items model, then we will end up doing what the HLC thinks we're doing.

Gatrell: And there're actually a number of alternative approaches. If the approach is to take a minimalist approach, then this dialogue in itself is a response to the HLC report. We can substantively show that we've taken a serious, reflective process, but reaffirm X, or Y, or change Z. Or whatever we have to do, I think in order to ensure that the expectations from HLC is met, we would need a resolution to this discussion. Maybe there'll be a formal recognition that maybe we are fine with X or Y, whatever that is, and I don't presume to

know what the faculty wants. But I do believe we are under obligation to produce something that is a response to that observation.

Stowell: This year. Because the response is due in June next year.

Gatrell: Part of that will speak to Senator Eckert's concern, which is that as the size of faculty changes over time, how has our governing framework change to accommodate that. I don't have an answer for that, but it's clear that the HLC report's language articulated the desire for us to have a response.

Hung: I think I agree that in part, if we as a campus, the faculty together having a discussion, that "yeah, we do things differently, and we're happy with that." Well, that's a response. Maybe that the most political response, but it is a response. What I don't want to see is for us to do something for appearance's sake, with no substantive change to how we run our business in a way that will help us run things better. If we can see a way forward to change the process to make us work better, then I would support it. But creating things for the sake of creating things to answer a critique is not what I would like to see. If we do this "Congress" issue, I would like to hear what would be the purview of the "Congress;" what would be its roles and functions? If it's a simple matter of "we will meet twice a semester and we will talk," then we can do that electronically without setting up a "Congress." That is the kind of thing I want to see. I am not opposed to the "Congress" idea, but I want to know what is the function, what is the problem we are solving?

Bruns: Let's say for example "Faculty Congress" is simply an entity. It doesn't meet. It isn't intended to do anything in particular. It is an organizational umbrella of CAA, which does undergraduate curriculum, COTE, which does the teacher education curriculum, CGS, which does the graduate curriculum, and FacSen does everything else. So it's not "this is one more thing we need to add people to." It's not like that. It's basically codifying to say that CAA, CGS, COTE, and FacSen combine together to represent the whole faculty body.

Hung: That sounds okay. That doesn't sound like any extra work that needs to be done. But I also think that one area that the HLC may be looking at when they said things are overlapping is that I know that when the CAA was developing the learning goals, a lot of the work you did closely with CASL and Assessment. So maybe that's where some of the comments were coming from. In order to have a successful curriculum, you will need to assess it. Then you have a separate assessment unit that is separate from the CAA. But part of the charge to the CAA is you need to review the curriculum. I think that's maybe where the HLC may see as overlapping. Apparently in other schools, the division of labor is set up in such a way that it doesn't set up two entities that partially overlap. I am fairly comfortable with the fact that we see the overlap and we actively tried to cooperate. So that may be the response we need for the HLC.

Wharram: I am not sure how we can address the HLC's comment. But from our point of view, the issue doesn't seem to be as complicated as it is turning out to be. In my opinion, reading

minutes of meetings just doesn't convey the same range of information as attending the meeting. From my perspective, having people attend meetings and talking is really valuable, not in the sense of "we are here to approve what you're doing." It's just a matter of we knowing what you're doing and you knowing what we're doing.

Abebe: When we started the conversation, I made the comment that we should not do, or justify what we are going to do, based on HLC's comment. Whether it's accreditation or this group here, I have served on that group before, all we have to do is to justify what we're doing. We just need to give reasons for what we're doing. If we want to change what we're doing, that's fine as well. Point number two, it's hard to be a Saint by doing only the things you want to do. We can look to things, other structures. But creating a "Congress" at a small place like this? This is contrary to what we talked about in reducing the number of committees. The "Congress" will be an expansion, and contrary to our thought. Third, I really didn't understand what you had in mind when you proposed it. I think the best way for me to understand it, and maybe for others, is to see this in hard copy. I wish to see what the rationale is, how you think this is going to work, what it improves in terms of the objective of improving governance. I need that kind of information before I can intelligently discuss this issue.

Gronnvoll: Maybe I am misunderstanding the context then. From what I gather, Senator Bruns what you're saying is that this is a rhetorical construct. You're talking creating a "Congress" but you're not saying to create something new. It's just giving name to what we're doing.

Bruns: Some of the points that Senator Abebe raised is to get this on paper so we can be on the same page on what we're talking about. I think the value to that is to codify it. I am thinking essentially is a rhetorical construct. Essentially, CAA does what it has always done. It's just that FAcSen, COTE, CAA, CGS combined to represent the Faculty. It doesn't mean we have to do anything differently than what we do.

Gronnvoll: That will also eliminate the notion that we are siloed. Right now, you cannot serve on CAA and FacSen at the same time. So if you're eliminating that, then we eliminate the autonomous apart from each other.

Bruns: You mean the fact that the construct of the "Congress" where we are all members of?

Gronnvoll: Yes.

Bruns: Yes, that's a part of it. I am also going to have monthly lunch meetings with the chairs of CAA, COTE, CGS. This is an informal thing. But this can be a formal thing where it's in the by law for the chairs to meet regularly. I think there's value to that.

Chahyadi: Is there a specific need in creating the term "Congress." Can we just say there will be collaboration between the councils. Why would it need to be so formal?

Bruns: My thinking is that this will underline the point that CAA is the faculty voice for undergraduate curriculum, that CGS is the faculty voice for graduate curriculum, etc. If we are all under this rhetorical umbrella of "Congress," it emphasizes the issue of shared governance. So part of this is to address the HLC report. But also, I don't want to be in a situation where I, as chair, think this is a good idea, and then next year, a new chair wants to do something different.

Stowell: I think maybe we should start at the beginning: What does our constitution say our relationship is to these committees? Currently, it says that we specify their existence, and then we don't specify what we do with them. We spawn them and then we orphan them. We specify them and then we don't do anything with them. I think having a clear relationship between the committees is important in this constitution. One way to give us a reason to collaborate more is to say that we are related. I might suggest that if one word is added to the Constitution to say that "These are committees of the FacSen," then all of a sudden we have a relationship that we'd want to cultivate with these committees. Also, there's the 4th committee, the Council for Faculty Research, that we spawn. So we need to include that in our discussion. So the real question is: What is the relation with the faculty to these committees? I don't think we need to change the curricular flow if we specify that we are connected. Then that gives us justification to have liaisons to these committees, and we should be attending their meetings when important matters come up. This is not adding another layer of approval. We just specify that the FacSen is the governing voice of the faculty. We already have existing power which allows us, if we feel need, to address concerns that these committees bring up. So we are not claiming any more authority that we already have. It gives us reason to collaborate more and to feel that we are connected more.

Throneburg: With all due respect, but I really don't like that idea. That essentially says that CAA is a subgroup of FacSen. I am okay with that if the FacSen is representative of the colleges. In other campuses, maybe all members of CAA are members of FacSen. So the FacSen is this huge thing that has all the members from all the other elected bodies – that'd be like the "Faculty Congress" idea. So if you have a seat on the Senate then you're doing the duties for the position you're elected to serve. If FacSen is a representative body of that people, then that's fine. Otherwise, we really don't like the model that CAA, COTE, etc., are subcommittees of the Senate, with just a liaison.

Bruns: If I can jump in for a second. My concern here is that our colleagues are doing really important work in these committees. I don't want to undermine what they're doing. When I am on FacSen, I don't deal with any of that because that's what the other councils do. That's partially why I want to propose the "Congress" idea because you can have the 4 entities to combine and form this representation without creating new duties.

Hung: So like a Faculty Voltron. I see what the contentions here are. Am I correct that CAA, CGS, COTE, CFR, don't have Constitutions for their existence. They have by-laws. Which is really odd to me. If they are separate entities, then they should have their own Constitution for

existence. Right now, these committees exist under the Constitution of the FacSen. However, if you read the Constitution, it refers to “The Faculty.” That leaves the impression that whoever drafted the Constitution considers that all the faculty on campus forms “The Faculty.” The way I read that, that makes sense to me, is that “The Faculty” spawns the FacSen, CAA, COTE, CGS, CFR, but the FacSen is deputized to run the elections to populate these committees instead of having each committee run their own elections. That’s the most sensible way for me to read the Constitution and you all can form your own opinion. Under this understanding, I think what Senator Bruns proposes is more in line with the spirit of that and with what we do, and what Senator Stowell proposes is a more literal understanding of the language.

Gatrell: First of all, I think a lot of this depends on who our reviewers will be. So we don’t know what will pique their interests. But some of the issues identified will be something that there will be a discussion about. How that will end up will really be in the hands of the faculty. At the least, we need a collaborative statement about this process that we have undertaken, to Senator Abebe’s point, to fully identify the process we went through to affirm the process of X, Y, or Z. On the other hand, I do know that the Constitution is functionally for the FacSen. So there is already an implied relationship – it’s just not explicit.

Hung: And it’s ambiguously implied. Whoever wrote that never let their intention clear in the language they employed. I don’t know how to read the Constitution that way. It leaves room for both types of interpretation.

Bruns: I am in favor of amending the Constitution to clarify that.

Stowell: I consulted a member of the former member of FacSen who has been on the campus for a long time as to what is your institutional perspective regarding the Constitution and the relationship between these committees. He pointed to the part of the Constitution that talks about the right to review any matter that concerns faculty as a whole, which includes matters from committees. In the rare case that the Senate will have a different recommendation than the various curriculum committees, that he felt that the FacSen opinion should weigh stronger. And that creates tension.

Gronnvoll/Throneburg/Jacobs: Yes

Stowell: Yes, that has happened in the past. This is a FacSen problem: what is our role and how do we relate to these committees?

Bruns: My perspective is pretty clear. Our role is to populate those committees and then they run the things that they run.

Hugo: In my understanding, one of the issues is there is a disconnect between the communities. So improving communication between us is one of the goals we have. Your proposal about executive action approval doesn’t seem to be addressing this concern. It’s kind of a one-way

communication for FacSen. My issue with the other framework, is that if we are trying to communicate with others, if we don't have meetings, and I am not saying we need to have meetings, but at least the idea of liaisons, where there'll be more communication, without an authoritative figure overseeing everything. I think that's what we need to do: more communication, and not overseeing.

Throneburg: I've talked to Senator Stowell and I support to have some FacSen seats with dual membership. If you really want a role, then be at the table. You will hear the stories and you will have a voice. Of course, you will need someone to go to both meetings.

Hugo: Yes that's one big issue.

Throneburg: In CAA, we always have a member at CASL, so that there's always that communication between assessment and curriculum. If you all feel that you're not informed enough, then have a seat at the Council.

Hugo: Yes we discussed that option. But we have hard enough time filling the seats as is. Also, there's the problem of CGS meeting at the same time as FacSen. I would like to see move more in the direction of better communications. We just need to find the best way forward.

Hung: Well, CGS meeting time, or FacSen meeting time, can change.

Jacobs: Part of our concern is that we all want better communication, because there's really nothing about the processes that are broken. I certainly don't want to be going to both FacSen and CGS meeting, and I won't want to burden my colleagues with that. I think CGS is running pretty smoothly. Talking to Dr. Gronnvoll, CAA is also running smoothly. So I don't think we need to find new layers or new seats even, but just to find ways to improve our communications.

Bruns: What if we say that the chairs of the 4 committees meet monthly to facilitate communication? I am not in favor of a model where FacSen can override the decisions of CAA, CGS, etc., because we are not part of the conversation. I would prefer that CAA is the authority on undergraduate curriculum. If a faculty has problem with it, then they can run for CAA, or COTE, or CGS. I think this idea that the FacSen is above the 3 other bodies is rife with tension and problems. That's why I think the structure of a "Congress" is better.

Wharram: I think there's a general consensus is that better communication will be good, and also that asking people to serve on two committees is too much. To codify this, all the bodies have to do this at the same time. The 4 committees have to get together to write a resolution and work on this together.

Bruns: So I think what we need is for me to write something up here first. As a resolution to the FacSen, which will mean Constitutional change.

Wharram: Does it have to be Constitutional change?

Hung: For my own sanity's sake I would like to have the clarification to the Constitution.

Gronnvoll: A monthly meeting of the chairs makes sense. Since we are getting CUS for this, having a meeting makes complete sense. Having served on CAA for a long time, how FacSen defines or interprets the Constitution has sometimes been the rub. On CAA, we understand that our role is on undergraduate curriculum and we have a set of rules for that to maintain a set of standards. Sometimes it felt, least in the past, that some members on FacSen were more interested on the issue of academic freedom. So they have perceived things that we have done as infringing on that. We've had cases where things that the CAA has spent years working on gen ed and learning goals came this close to being derailed because of that concern. That's part of the reason why we feel very strongly that we cannot be perceived to be a committee under the FacSen and that's why we are here to be in this conversation.

Abebe: There's an easy solution right in front of us: Have we made an attempt to justify the current system? And can we do that? I think we can. And if we do that then there's no need for change. What we need us to justify why the current system is working out well for us. If we cannot justify it then we need to find a new way of doing business. That has not been done as far I am concerned. I think that's the first step. I would be very concerned taking an action for change without having seen a document of trying to justify.

Bruns: I would say that 90% of the time the way we do things, everything has been working out fine. And when things aren't working out in the other 10% of the time, it stems from the confusion about the relations between our groups. So what I am trying to address is that 10% of the cases. I want to make these relationships very clear. Whether this will go to the Constitution, or not, we will get to that when we get to that. But I think that's where we need to go.

Wharram: I appreciate having the insight to the genealogy of things. I think that's important. That sort of information sharing will be great to have in the future. So we can think on how we can improve things for the future. When I look at the Constitution, I see that it says the CAA, COTE, CGS, and CFR shall be standing committees of "the faculty." It doesn't say "of the Faculty Senate." So that's what I see as problematic for interpretation. I don't know that we need to do Constitutional amendment if we can clarify it through an understanding. I do think that an essential part of this is to improve communication, echoing Senator Hugo's sentiment.

Gosse: On the other hand, can't we make everybody a Faculty Senator for CAA, CGS, etc.? To empower them and make them all Senators?

Throneburg: Yes some schools have large Senates.

Gosse: It will be clear, then.

Bruns: Yes one of the discussions we had was to have a large Senate like that. I hesitate to do that because we do important work here, the 15 to 17 of us here. That's why I favor the "Congress" model because we keep the entities apart and we each carry out our functions.

Chahyadi: So how were the conflicts that come from those 10% resolved in the past?

Gronnvoll: I would like to point out that all the committees are currently revising our by-laws. Can't we all just change the by-laws to say that the chairs shall meet month, or something? Would it have to be a Constitutional change?

Bruns: We can definitely do that. Dr. Throneburg would you care to address the other half of the question?

Throneburg: Of course. I've heard many people say that you see these bodies as independent entities. When I look at the FacSen now and in the past, I see a lot of colleagues I respect. But to explain that as a consultative discussion, and I am talking as someone who has come to FacSen many times, and I was reporting to FacSen many times, I would like to have on paper somehow that we do need to communicate, but also what are the relations, and is there or not a hierarchy. I think many of us who have come here in various roles have felt very grilled, that our years of work in becoming experts on curriculum and assessment, are dismissed, and we felt attacked. And it shouldn't be that way. I would love to have, at the end of this process, that talks about communication in a collaborative sense. I'd rather not have an umbrella structure, and instead to have us as equals.

Bruns: So to further clarify, something that Dr. Gronnvoll already brought up. A few years ago, CAA was working on revising gen ed and learning goals. Then some Faculty Senators had issues with what's being developed out of CAA. Did it end as a vote to the faculty?

Gronnvoll: No it stopped before it got there.

Bruns: But there was this push to put in front of the entire faculty as to whether they would want to override the work of the CAA or not?

Chahyadi: So would this "Congress" model solve that 10% of the problem?

Bruns: I think what this will resolve is to say that curricular issues reside with the CAA and eliminate instead of saying "it could be CAA, it could be Faculty Senate."

Abebe: But we've been saying this all along. We are not solving curricular issues. We are solving a governance issue.

Hung: Well, right now we are. But in the past when there were problems that wasn't the case.

Bruns: Why don't I write up something that we can put in front of the Senate so we can further this conversation. I will share that with the other chairs of the committees.

Stowell: I think that's an important step. This has been a year now. We started this last year with the chairs of the committees. I think this should be resolved amongst the chairs this year. I would like to see this resolved because I need to put it in the report. I do have that responsibility. I am happy to have the chairs work it out as long as we have responded adequately.

Abebe: I think there's still valuable service here to be done. Can you put pen to paper to give us a justification on how the current system has worked, or not worked. So we can see the benefits of change, versus the cost of justifying what we have. If we can do that then we can make better decisions.

Stowell: I cannot get inside the heads of the HLC visitors. I've related what they said. I've been to many meetings to bring this news to them. My final purpose here is to have something we can agree on.

Bruns: How about if I include that part in what I intend to write up.

Abebe: I am not trying to be unreasonable. But in all types of commissions, you can justify what you do. You can do what you're doing provided you have proper explanation and documentation. You don't have to do what they want. You don't have to.

Jacobs: I was going to echo that sentiment. From what I heard, there's the appearance of overlap, etc. Maybe there's the appearance, but in reality, things are working out well, and here's how.

Stowell: Except that in the past, we haven't. We haven't even circulated the minutes back and forth since last year.

Jacobs: That goes back to the question of what the main issues that need to be addressed? Where is the problem?

Wharram: I think it is important that you know that we would want you to come not as consultative discussion or as underlings. We have Deans come and other constituents to come, not as justification or get our approval, but to just keep the lines of communication open. I think clarifying that relationship is very good and important.

Oliver: Regarding the minutes, I can see having a web site where all the minutes are posted to the same site. Would that help?

Hung: I think that would be helpful to the faculty to just go to one spot and find all the minutes. That's something we can work on.

Wharram: A central location will be good.

Bruns: Can I ask Dr. Gronnvoll and Dr. Jacobs to work with me on sharing minutes.

Dr. Gronnvoll: Sure.

Dr. Jacobs: Yes.

Abebe: I want to point out this conversation is itself an important step to address the issue.

Throneburg: Right now you have 3 of the 5 stake holders here. So yes we need to get all the chairs together as a next step.

Bruns: Yes, I will write up something to get to all the other people.

Motion to adjourn, at 3:55 by Eckert, second by Wharram, all pass, no oppose and no abstention.