

10-2-2018

October 2, 2018

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "October 2, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1110.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1110

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 Oct 2, 2018
Room 4440, Booth Library

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

Attendance: Abebe, Brantley, Bruns, Chahyadi, Corrigan, Gosse, Holly, Hung, Oliver, Shaw, Stowell, Wharram, VanGunten
Student Senate Representative: Gordon
Guests: Provost Gatrell, Dr. Okrasinski, Ms. Brooke Schwartz (DEN)

Bruns called meeting to order at 2:03 pm.

Motion to approve minutes of Sep 18, with requested modification. Motion by Stowell, seconded by Abebe. Brantley, Holly, Shaw, and VanGunten abstain, no opposition, motion passed.

Bruns: Met with Glassman to update the ongoing the campus tour. Will update the Senate with summary later.

Hung: Dr. Glassman wants input on the 360 review described in the Senate resolution from last year. Perhaps we will talk about this later this meeting.

Bruns: Dr. Glassman didn't want to assume what the Senate wants from the process so that's why he's asking us for input.

Stowell: Also talked about budget and re-staffing positions, but more to come on Wed address.

Stowell: On election, we agreed on electronic vote to install the election results. Sarah Johnson from Booth will serve on CFR. Sheila Simons from HHS will be on CGS. Our 5 new Senators are here now (Hugo, Holly, Shaw, Wharram, VanGunten). The UPC election by vote was Rose Gong. COTE is changing bylaw to go from 11 to 7. So some positions unfilled may be ok. We do have Melanie Burns voted in. I've invited others, but they said they're not interested or wanted to wait for bylaws to finish updates. Had about 25 % vote participation which is lower than Spring last year. One more item – having fewer barriers to serve for faculty. Would like to propose to change bylaw to allow people who're serving on other major committees can serve in FacSen. Currently, COTE/CGS/FacSen/CAA are mutually exclusive. So I move to strike that limit to make it easier for people to run for elections.

Bruns: We should probably discuss this more thoroughly later.

Nomination Oliver: Responded to Mark Kattenbraker, about selection departmental rep to the college level review committee for research, creative activity, and special project proposal CU. In Booth, tenured professor has been selected for this process. The question is whether it needs to be Unit A for other units on campus.

Wharram: I think the CU pool to be assigned is only available to Unit A. In that case, it makes sense then individuals on the committee should also be Unit A.

Gosse: I've done that before for CoS, I think they were all Unit A.

Hung: That makes sense to me.

Gatrell: Historically it's been Unit A but there's no language on it. Each college may want a different model. The key is to have faculty oversight on this process.

Hung: One consideration is that special projects can be assigned to Unit B. The research and creativity activities are reserved for Unit A faculty who want to apply for it. But there could be special projects like curriculum revision that is deserving of CU release. So if those proposals go to the committee then it might be good to have a Unit B voice on it.

Gatrell: In the case of major curriculum revision, if the chair in consultation with the Dean thinks the project should receive non instruction CU then they could do that.

Hung: Right so that won't need to go in front of the committee.

Gatrell: So the pool is more in line with Unit A need.

Bruns: Do we have a motion to have this only for Unit A.

Hung: I don't think we need resolution.

Abebe: It is the current practice. I don't think we need a resolution, just clarification.

Carson: Student senate now has quorum. We had a speaker election but we need to redo it due to procedural issues. So we need to redo it. Executive VP is filling in as Speaker.

Hung: Nothing to report from the Staff Senate. I am thinking after homecoming I will send out information for the joint meeting.

Bruns: Eckert and Hugo are not here, so any questions for the Awards Committee?

Hung: I do have a question regarding an issue about the awards. I recall a discussion from last year's Senate that one of our two awards used to have a cash award associated with it, but

due to reasons unclear, that practice has stopped. It stopped not because we intended for it to stop, so I want to make sure we can pick up on that practice again if possible.

Abebe: For nomination committee, we had a discussion 2 meetings ago to suggest combining awards and forum committee. No actions yet. We should probably bring it to a solution. Should I bring a resolution to combine for next meeting.

Bruns: I don't recall people against it when we talked last time.

Abebe: In that case let's do a formal motion to merge the two.

Stowell: There were other committees that are supposed to combine too so let's put it all together.

Bruns: We also talked about co-sponsoring open access topic from Booth.

Brantley: Thank Abebe for cooperating and lending support. Booth is celebrating National Open Access Week from Oct 22 to Oct 28. Two movies screening Monday 22nd, "Paywall" in Doudna. We will have brief intro before and then discussion after.

Hung: On Budget transparency, the budget is not finalized yet so nothing to report. I did find the audit report from previous years. I will analyze them together when the new budget is available to make some comparison. More detail report forthcoming next semester.

Bruns: On Shared Governance implementation. I've done some revision on Senate Constitution, Stowell has proposed some ideas. The Exec team will share this with the 4 chairs on Wed. Discuss. Then bring it back. Collaborating with the councils to figure this out.

Abebe: A comment regarding the DEN report on this process. Some Senators have talked about it. Perhaps we could improve communication with the other councils on campus, namely the CAA. The report in DEN seems to make it a zero-sum game in terms of status. That's not the case. FacSen wants to work with all the parties on campus. I don't know how people get the idea. My personal goal isn't that. We want to make sure the FacSen respects other stakeholders. When we have the opportunity, we should make that clear to others. When people interpret it differently than how we have talked about here.

Chahyadi: I received similar questions from faculty in the school of Business. I think the DEN report portrayed us in a negative way, where FacSen seems power hungry. That's not close to what we have talked about. Is it appropriate to clarify maybe through an email? To clarify.

Bruns: I think that's a good idea. Maybe after the lunch meeting tomorrow then we will send out an email.

Stowell: The first resolution in question we have already voted on. The only lingering discussion is whether we want Unit B representative seat. The other issue, college representation, we've also voted on.

Hung: On the issue of Unit B, I don't think we've voted on that, or have a consensus yet on the model and process. As an explanation for our new members, the proposal is to change the current model for Senate where all seats are at-large to a model where some seats are tied to colleges – CLAS will get 4, Booth 1, CEPS 1, LCBT 1, HHS 1, and 7 at-large seats. The consideration being discussed here is whether we want to add a Unit B Seat, and if we do, will we take it from one of the 7 at-large seats, or will we increase the Senate number to 16 Senators.

VanGunten: A point of clarification, we are no COE, not CEPS.

Hung: Yes, thanks for the correction.

Bruns: From the dept feedback, faculty members seem to be in favor of a dedicated Unit B seat. I know we have some considerations on whether the seat will make Unit B members feel pressure. From what I have heard from Unit B members, they are in favor of it.

Brantley: We talked about pressure for work not specified in the contract. But what happens if it's unfilled, then will it just remain unfilled?

Stowell: It's currently what we're doing when we have unfilled seats.

Gosse: How would that change procedure? Would each college vote for their respective representative plus the at-large?

Stowell: Currently when there are college-specific seats, that's how we do it.

Wharram: Do we have to do that way?

Stowell: I've thought about that given the size of faculty body. So for instance, 10 votes from a smaller college is much harder to reach than for larger colleges.

Abebe: Unit B – perhaps if they don't want to serve. If they don't, then that's fine. They're not pressured. But there are some who do want to serve. So I don't think it will be a major impediment.

Bruns: I actually have heard from Unit B members that they'd run for that seat. So how should we proceed, do we make it 15, or 16. I think it makes sense to have 6 at-large and keep the total of 15.

Wharram: Does that mean we have to kick someone off Senate?

Stowell: Depends on who's rotating off. Since we have 5 open slots each year.

Bruns: So if we implement it starting Spring semester then we won't run into that problem.

Hung: We also have to have language in place for our current configuration since we are all elected as "at-large." So we need a plan to figure out which of the current Senators are college-specific and which ones are at-large, and then what seats should open up for the Spring election.

Stowell: Fortunately, we are already covered for the college level seat right now.

Hung: We should probably take a vote for the record that we all agree to do these changes. The vote will be to change our Senate Seat alignment to the 4-1-1-1-1, plus 1 Unit B, with 6 at-large seats.

Bruns: But we have already passed that.

Hung: Not with the Unit B dedicated seats.

Bruns: We should just vote on the Unit B seat part and then combine it with the prior resolution to move forward.

Hung: Ok, then I will make a motion to convert one of the 7 at-large seats to a dedicated Unit B Seat similar in how we have dedicated seats for CLAS, COE, etc.

Gatrell: We can't guarantee that a Unit B faculty will stand for election. So maybe a better way to approach is to have up to 1 Unit B person is eligible to be an at-large senator. So the highest vote-getting Unit B person will take that seat.

Hung: As of now, every seat at the Senate is open to Unit B faculty. This is also true for all the college-specific seat. Right now, in the current proposed model for college level representation at the Senate, if a seat reserved for a college isn't filled, then it defaults to become an at-large seat. Then that college-specific seat will open up for filling the next election cycle.

Stowell: Right now what we do is that we will go ask specific faculty members to recruit.

Bruns: What if this Unit B seat is a one-year term? In that case, if we don't have a Unit B member for that seat, then we will have a one-year term Unit A person.

VanGunten: As someone who's not been in the conversation, I don't understand why if the seats are available to Unit B faculty to run for right now, why do we need to have a specific

seat for that? The process is for us to invite and include them, not to have a dedicated seat for it.

Bruns: You're right that they can run any time. But there's something very specifically appealing in having a Unit B, in that it signals a very clear signal for inclusion.

VanGuten: When did Unit B become eligible for FacSen? Because that wasn't the case before. It used to be only for Unit A.

Abebe: It still is.

VanGuten: Yes but I mean being eligible to run for the seats.

Hung: That was changed with the resolution that was perhaps 9 or 10 years ago? The clarifying line in the Senate Constitution that "faculty" means tenured/tenure-track, ACF, and chair, has been on it for 7 or 8 years right?

Oliver: No I think it's more like 3 to 4 years.

VanGuten: So is this a publicity issue, and not a structural issue? I think if I go to my department and ask my Unit B colleagues if they think they can run for Faculty Senate seat I think the answer will be a resounding "no."

Abebe: No I don't think it's a publicity issue. I think it's a service issue. We do not have enough people to serve on committees around the campus. The discussion then went on to include Unit B faculty members who would not mind participating. I think the best way to deal with this is to have language in front of us before we take a vote. I would ask that the executive board prepare a written description so we can review, before voting on it.

Hung: I agree.

Oliver: To Senator VanGuten's point, we might just need to invite better. So maybe we just need to advertise better. If we designate a spot, which is a nice invitation, will it actually reduce access to the other seats? But wait they are eligible for the other seats, too, right?

Hung: Yes and that's not different from say, CLAS faculty. In the new model, they can run for any of the 4 CLAS seats, plus the 6 or 7 at-large seats.

Oliver: With the lack of incentives – PBI doesn't consider services – we haven't had Unit B faculty run. So maybe it's the lack of incentives, which will remain regardless of inviting we are to Unit B members.

Bruns: But they did say that's what they want. The service issue isn't what they told us as something holding them back from running for these seats.

Oliver: I appreciate your effort going to the departments and listening for feedbacks. I worry though that the feedback may not be a good predictor for change in behavior absent incentives.

Gosse: I think we're an incomplete voice without ACF. I think we need to acknowledge that shared governance should mean that they need to be included. It might be a change in recruitment pattern, but we need to make the effort to include.

Oliver: I agree. We do need their voice. The challenge is how to motivate that. Without some specific incentive it may become difficult to fill that seat.

Wharram: It's about representation. If we signal that we want HHS, we reserve a seat for them. It'd be the same we should do for Unit B. It's quite possible that a hinderances in the absence of Unit B members right now may be that some of them think they're "stepping out of bounds." Taking steps to make it open can perhaps address that.

Stowell: In the call for election this Fall, we made explicit that Unit B, and chairs, are there.

Chahyadi: I don't think a dedicated seat is necessary to get every faculty voice here. Perhaps a specific email to all Unit B faculty to encourage them to run, that'd be adequate. Creating a dedicated seat, there may be unforeseen consequences.

Bruns: That's possible. Perhaps we're missing the part about formal representation. The seats dedicated to the four colleges is saying that we specifically seek representation from them at FacSen. I see the seat for Unit B in the same light. These seats are dedicated to say we represent these areas. So while there could be unforeseen consequences on that, but that's what's driving my thinking on it.

Chahyadi: But as you said, those Unit B members who said they'd run, they'll run, regardless of whether there's a seat reserved.

Bruns: But as Senator Wharram said, there can be the issue of perceived boundaries that prevent them. I think the key piece of having a Unit B seat is to have that notion for Unit B that "this is our seat," even though technically they can run for all the seats now.

Stowell: I think that's an interesting question. We are asking why don't Unit B serve, but why do Unit A serve? Why do we serve?

Abebe: For most people there are incentives.

Shaw: I was at one point a Unit B faculty, getting ready to be in a PhD program. How good it would have looked if I had the chance to serve on FacSen as a Unit B representative. So

serving on FacSen may be the incentive, even though some Unit B members already have their terminal degree.

Bruns: Maybe what we need is to do a poll on Unit B members to see what they think of a dedicated seat on FacSen, and then take that into consideration as we move forward.

Holly: I agree having a slot for representation and recruitment purpose. Having a dedicated seat is itself a recruitment tool. In terms of time, if a 3-year term is the normal then we should keep it the same for Unit B. I am sure in the past we've had senators who could not serve out the full 3 year terms and we found ways around that. So why not just do that for Unit B members as well?

VanGunten: Just a point of clarification – when we say Unit B, are we also including Academic Support Professionals?

Hung: No. We should be more clear in our language because we have been meaning ACF.

Oliver: How much participation since they have been allowed to serve. So maybe this can answer if this is understanding issue or an interest issue. I understand that this is an explicit collegial gesture to have a dedicated seat for Unit B, but it doesn't make sense to me because they can run for all the seats today.

Hung: I understand the argument that if they are not currently serving, then making a seat specific for Unit B, if that's going to change people's behavior. I would argue that given that they are not currently serving, we need to increase higher visibility to encourage participation. In addition, the dedicated seats for colleges serve in part to make sure that members from the smaller colleges can still be elected. CLAS is has about 4 times more faculty than some of the smaller colleges. The dedicated seats serve to avoid the event that the FacSen is dominated by members from the larger colleges to the exclusion of the smaller colleges. The dedicated seat for Unit B can serve a similar purpose. In general, there are fewer Unit B members on campus. So having a reserved seat for them will help ensure that if they want to, they'll have a voice at the FacSen without having to worry about numbers. If you're the only Unit B member running, you can still get a seat at the FacSen as long as you meet the minimum vote requirement, even if you are not the top populous vote.

Bruns: Let me propose that the Executive Board write up some of these issues and models before we continue the discussion. The response to HLC report is actually tabled for next meeting because we will be meeting with the chairs of the councils tomorrow. So now, report from our Provost.

Gatrell: Good to see new faces from across campus. Not too much new update. The State of University is tomorrow 3:30 pm. I encourage everyone to attend. Tomorrow morning I am going to a recruitment event for high-performing students, being held in Effingham. This is

an event in partnership with U of I, and SIU. From the Executive Meeting, I am pleased to announce that we now have a Plans Work representative for the Library, the broken window in Klehm has been fixed, and the questions about fees are being addressed. I want you know that both the President and I take your concerns very seriously and we make sure to follow up. We appreciate the reaching out of the Senate to your colleagues. I know this is sort of new, but I think it's very useful to have these conversations. There will be 2 cycles of searches this year. In fall, we have 21 searches, the majority of which are Unit A searches. We will have another round of searches in Spring. Going forward it's still a challenging fiscal environment. We received \$1.2 mil budget target gap to manage over the years. It's the best environment we been in over the past few years. I am optimistic because current indicators are positive. We want to thank the faculty in our enrollment increase. Excess funds are calculated with the State Guidelines. So we can only carry forward so much Ledger 2 numbers. We are working on minimizing the impact.

Bruns: Before questions, I want to thank our President and our Provost. When I met with the departments there were concerns that I will share with the Senate later as a summary. But there were some specific issues and concerns that can be acted on immediately, like a broken window in Klehm that has not been repaired for a while. Both our President and Provost have been receptive and collaborative on those issues.

Gatrell: I haven't seen the full report either but I understand that there are concerns over staffing level. One of my concerns is that we can deliver the curriculum. A second concern is that we have the resources for the programs, be it study abroad or undergraduate research. But on top of that, I also want to make sure that for instance when someone goes to the theater department the door is open to sell tickets. I want to make sure programs are supported, like nursing needs a full-time administrative assistant. This is a balancing act for a lot of needs. The focus is on teaching to make sure academic standards are kept up.

Abebe: Very satisfied in most cases with the leadership. With every progress, there comes new requests. Faculty write me emails about the budget devolution back to the departments. Decisions at the lower levels tend to be better, more responsive, generally speaking. There're reasons why the budgets are gathered under Business Affairs. I don't think the best decisions can be made there. So I will like you to keep this in mind going forward.

Gatrell: I mentioned this in yesterday's meeting with the Executive board that Just because our impasse is ended, it doesn't mean everything is now back to where things were 3 years ago. Our resources are still low. State appropriation to EIU continues to be down compared to 2015. Tuition revenues continue to be down. Cash flow is still a critical issue. I think the president will discuss this in broad strokes tomorrow. I agree with you in general that the local decisions are better. I realize that there's a perceived bureaucratization of processes and I am working to address that. There are some changes to travel guidelines that actually came from the state, so we must follow those guidelines. So there are externally imposed changes that affect how we manage our campus. We are adapting as we go.

Oliver: Speaking of travel – to clarify. Utilizing “the least expensive” option. If we have faculty in Champaign heading to Chicago, they take their own car and report mileage, versus if they come to Charleston to then go up to Chicago. Is that correct?

Gatrell: That depends where the “home base” is. I think that’s part of the problem – how do we define “home base.”

Oliver: I ask because 5 of our faculty are running into that problem.

Gatrell: AS a rule of thumb, we have to prioritize “least cost” approach. Sometimes it may mean reimbursing at the rate of a fleet car instead of reimbursing for mileage. If you’re a student teacher supervisor, you shouldn’t be checking out a fleet car every day. That doesn’t make sense to me. Or if is a clinical field placement situation, personal cars make a lot more sense. Ledger 1 or Ledger 2 makes a difference in terms of reimbursing. There are some cases that will be unreasonable to do the “least cost” approach. So there are exceptions. In general, the least-cost is the preferred approach.

Abebe: I agree that some of the past practices should have altered. For instance, in the past, our school used to pay moving reimbursement for faculty who live in, say, outside of St. Louis, when the reimbursement should have stopped for the cost to move to Charleston.

Gatrell: The good news is that we are working with departments on the issue to find the most sensible resolution for each case.

Oliver: How’s the state been with in allocating funds.

Gatrell: Our comptroller has been amazing getting reimbursements to us and she’s been very supportive of higher ed. We’ve had no problems in terms of reimbursement from the state.

Bruns: Thank you, Provost. The next topic is Homecoming BlueBQue. I am confused on this because there was apparently a donation, but the FacSen doesn’t have a budget. Did the Provost’s office make a donation on our behalf?

Gatrell: I am not aware of something like that.

Hung: Last year, what happened was that they were trying to raise fund for the event and while I was at the Staff Senate meeting they asked me if I would bring the issue back to the Senate and ask faculty to contribute. So I did. But the timing was short. By the time we figured out who’d take the donation, there were only 3 days left to make the donation. I wasn’t given an record as to how much money was raised in that process.

Gatrell: I know that this year the VPAA office is sponsoring/helping with the event.

Wharram: What is the BlueBQue?

Gatrell: It's a community celebration for homecoming, with faculty, staff, student workers, and community members.

Shaw: Looks like it will be Wednesday Oct 17th from 11 am to 1 pm at the Library Quad.

Hung: I will contact Stone to get some info. And then send general email out.

Bruns: Two other issues for updating – the panther statue, and the bike path through campus. I contacted VP McCann. He said that the panther statue is being worked on. The original spot appeared to not be able to work because of the weight and the construction issue. I am assuming he's working with the Student Senate?

Carson: Yes we are working on it. The new site will be the street across Stevenon Hall, where the brick memorial is. We are working on the logistics. I was told that it will be up for graduation.

Bruns: Bike path – city is working on it as part of rebuilding Lincoln Av. They are putting in wider sidewalk. Whether the path goes through campus is still up in the air. I got an update from the city saying that there'll be a committee that meets quarterly to talk about these issues. There'll be a committee to talk about. Now, on to the reorganization of APERC/STHC.

Hung: I sent out the summary via email. To bring people up to speed: we've been talking about streamlining the work of elected positions because we have troubles filling these positions. Both APERC and STHC are contractually defined and have to exist. Both require elected faculty in them. The two committees both meet rarely. So to reduce the work load we want to combine or reconfigure these two committees. There are two models for this. The first model is to combine APERC and STHC into one pool. People are elected into this pool, and then are called to serve as the need for each committee arises. This does require a re-writing of the contract language. This means that the FacSen ends when we make the suggestion to the UPI and President Glassman. In the second model, the proposal is to make the function of APERC into being part of CAA since CAA already handles curriculum issue. Similarly, the function of STHC will become part of the FacSen since FacSen is moving to a college representation model. In each case, people who stand for elections will do so knowing that in addition to serving on CAA or on FacSen they may also be called on to serve on the APERC and STHC.

Wharram: Will the second model still require change in contract language?

Hung: No, I don't think so. The contract language says that the committees need to exist and then delineates the composition, but it doesn't say that members on these committees must be exclusively to those committees and cannot serve on other things. As FacSen, we are given the responsibility to run the election to fill those positions so I think it's within our right to determine how to staff those positions. But clearly, if we choose this model, we will have to consult with the UPI on this to make sure.

Abebe: I appreciate the work that has gone into this. Each model has advantages and disadvantages. The first model has the advantage of saving us a lot of the mess that the second model will create. The disadvantage is that it requires change in contract language. The second model creates more of a mess that Senator Stowell has to face every semester in finding people to run for these positions. I suggest adopting model 1, urging the union and the university enter into a memorandum of understanding.

Bruns: Can you explain what you meant when you said there's more of a mess for model 2.

Abebe: The mess is that we have to manage it. We have to figure out whom to select for these committees, and how to select them. This will turn the process into a political process. And I don't want to see us there.

Hung: I am not sure I follow that. In model 1, we still have to manage and staff them. FacSen is still responsible for electing people into the shared pool. So that's still one election we have to manage on top of electing CAA and FacSen. In model 2, I would like to hear your thoughts on why it makes APERC more a political tool than what it currently is.

Abebe: In the current way, and in model 1, the people elected to APERC are elected for just that purpose. They're not elected to do another job first, from which they will be selected to serve on APERC. That is what will make it a political tool.

Bruns: In the case of APERC, it will be all of CAA becoming APERC. In the case for STHC, that will mean we have to choose from the 15 Senators to be on the STHC. Is that where the aspect of politics come into play?

Abebe: Yes, possibly.

Hung: But we don't have to do it that way. When we call for a run of election, we can announce the position as FacSen AND STHC seat. So if someone casts a vote for a person, they will know that they are electing someone to be on both FacSen and STHC.

Corrigan: Would that be just for the at-large seats?

Hung: It could be any of the seats because the FacSen term is always 3 years. The STHC has college-specific ties. So all the college specific seats for FacSen will have to be automatically part of the STHC seat.

Corrigan: But it really just needs a person from the right college, whether they are in the college-specific seat or at-large seat.

Hung: You're right.

Brantley: The net amount of reduction in election workload is better in model 2. Given the rarity of these committees, model 2 makes more sense to me. People in those committees are already doing relevant work so when the need comes up, they are already there.

Holly: I agree with Senator Brantley. It seems to me that there'll be more expertise in model 2 since we are drawing from people who are familiar with the issues. I don't really have a sense for how the committees are staffed now.

Hung: Right now, they are elected to those positions when we run election for FacSen.

Holly: In this current way, we have not much background on who the people running for those committees as to whether they have the right expertise. In model 2, we can expect some familiarity with curriculum issues.

Hung: In that sense, the pairing of CAA to APERC does lend some strength to that model.

Oliver: We got up close and personal with APERC last year. I wonder which of these models would have worked better this recent time. We also need to keep in mind too that we are having a hard time recruiting for CAA and FacSen. Do we want to make the job look bigger?

Okrasinski: That's actually when I wanted to attend the meeting today. I am one of the few people who got to serve on both the APERC and STHC before. In my experience, the work for APERC is quite intensive. We met for 3 weeks, two to three times a week, for 1 to 2 hours each. It was time intensive. I think adding this to the CAA is going to put a strong time strain on the people doing these two duties. Also, APERC and STHC election candidates need to write a short essay explaining their expertise and views, so it's not completely random selection.

Stowell: That's a good point. But in this past round, the administration went to APERC, FacSen, and CAA to solicit input. It just seems to me that it'd be more streamlined if instead of 3 bodies we have just one.

Okrasinski: I agree. I just think that the timing will be difficult. For the STHC, we were called into service one time. You just have to be able to really read facts and be willing to make hard decisions. But if you're in an elected position, I don't think it will be a big deal. That's different from the APERC situation, which is just such a time sink.

Wharram: I agree that this will streamline things. But I also see great value in having multiple committees coming out with similar recommendations. This allows faculty input from different venues. I support model 1. At the ad-hoc committee last year, we talked about making APERC and STHC be the same pool, and we can possibly reduce the number on the committees to 5. STHC is rarely called up, and when they are, the issue often resolves itself before actual work is done. I imagine a lot of people signing up for CAA may not want to be on APERC. And similarly, people who run for FacSen may not want to be on STHC. Model 1

does put the onus on the union and the university to come up with a MOU, but they should be able to do that.

Stowell: One point I want to bring up is what does CAA think about this. Do they want to be involved in this? We need their input, too.

Hung: I think we can bring this up tomorrow when we meet with the chairs. Another point I want to make is that whatever option we decide on, I am okay with it because both models have pros and cons. But in model 1, our role is the salesman. We pitch the idea to Dr. Glassman and Dr. Ludlow (from UPI) and they decide. They can say that they like the way it is, and we will be back to square one.

Oliver: Another point is that there may be issues of conflict of issues. If we condense the membership, we are likely to run into issues where people may want to recuse themselves from considerations that touch on their own specific department.

Hung: Well, right now, as it stands, each committee doesn't have a whole lot of margin in it.

Oliver: Is it 5 and 5 for the two committees?

Hung: For STHC it's 5, for APERC it's 7. If we look at STHC, the membership is 1 from each of the 4 colleges with Booth being considered as part of the college with the lowest faculty numbers, plus one at-large member. So if the issue in front of STHC comes from, say, CLAS, it's foreseeable that the CLAS representative and the at-large representative will both recuse themselves. So I don't think condensing the membership is going to worsen the situation in any meaningful way.

Wharram: Have we communicated our concerns to both the administration and the union? Seems like that's something they should look at. In our role as FacSen, can we make sure that they are aware these issues exist?

Hung: I am on the UPI Exec board so I have brought it up. But the initial reaction is that "we are happy with where things are." I just said that wait till you hear the proposal. The point is that regardless of what the FacSen says, it is really up to the university and union to make that final decision.

Bruns: I think for these difficult issues we really need time to digest the information and think on it. So why don't we postpone any decision till next time. That will give us time to meet with the 4 chairs as well and get their feedback. Should we talk about the sexual harassment issue or the think tank proposal in our remaining time?

Gosse: I want to talk about the sexual harassment policy issue since it's been on the agenda for a few meetings and it kept getting postponed.

Bruns: Certainly, we can go ahead with that.

Hung: The issue was brought up by a faculty email to me, about the change in guideline from the Department of Education regarding how sexual harassment and sexual assault reports are to be handled on college campuses. Right now, no formal guidelines have been issued. The report is on what those changes are likely to be. I've attached EIU IGP 175 and 185. Those are our current policies. Some of the proposed changes could probably change how we do things. We will probably have to update our policies. That's really not in the hands of the Senate since these are changes in IGP. I think the concern, from what I gather, is that we want EIU to maintain an environment that protects the people who are making the complaints, establishes a positive environment for people seeking redresses in these complaints, and that we don't slip into doing the minimum because the bar has been lowered. Just because the bar has been lowered it doesn't mean that EIU has to follow. We can keep doing what we think is best in serving our campus community.

Gosse: Thank you.

Bruns: The other issue is the campus strategic think tank. This came from the vitalization review committee. It was suggested that it's a good idea to have a think tank of people who'd look at the broader pictures for higher education, to look over the horizon, so that our institution can be nimble and responsive. The administration seems to like the idea and Dr. Glassman wants us to come up with some ideas on how to implement this. So I want to bring this to the Senate to talk about it.

Abebe: I think it's a great idea.

Gosse: So will that be in a consultative to the administration?

Bruns: Well they will be on it. The President expressed interest to be part of this. When I asked President Glassman if he'd listen to any of the suggestions from this group he said that he would hope so since he would like to be a part of the group. We don't know what the size of this committee will be or any of the details. The way it was proposed was that the Senate will appoint people to serve on this.

Hung: My thinking that to keep things nimble and responsive, the size should not be too large. Say, 6 total. That will allow for faster resolutions, faster finding of consensus. Of course, the trade-off is the diverse voices in the group. So you'd want people who are good at listening to diverse voices on campus so that a broad range of opinions can be brought to the group, without necessarily have to have a large group.

Abebe: I think you can also argue the opposite. If it is truly a think tank, it should benefit from the ideas and visions from a lot of people. It doesn't have to be constrained by time or number. In fact, when it is set up, it should hear from as many people from campus and from the community as possible. So I am not sure a limited group membership will work. If

this is truly a think tank, to look over the horizon, they will need to listen to as much input as possible to do justice to the concept of a think tank.

Hung: That's fair.

Bruns: Before we continue, I really want us to make progresses on issues. One of the comments I hear from colleagues is that sometimes it seems all the Senate does is to talk and talk. Well, some of the discussions are important to have. At the same time, we do want to make progresses and concrete steps. We've tabled a few issues to next time. I'd like to ask Senator Abebe to write up something about the 360 review so we will have something to look at next time. I will write up a report on the Unit B seat. We will also work on something more concrete on the think tank as well. The senate by-law changes on whether CAA/FacSen membership can be exclusive. So the Oct 16 meeting there will several resolutions. Doesn't mean we have to resolve all of them, but I hope we can make progress on it. Another thing is that since our meeting always runs to 4 pm, would it be useful to do a 5 min break around 3, to freshen our mind and allow us better focus for the second half of the meeting?

Hung: We can certainly try it and see.

Gosse: Yes I think that'll be great.

Bruns: Okay. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Wharram moved to adjourn, seconded by Abebe, passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.