

10-16-2018

October 16, 2018

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "October 16, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1111.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1111

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 16, 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. Jeannie Ludlow (UPI), Dr. Melissa Jones (CGS), Dr. Kathryn Havercroft (CFR), Dr. Michael Dobbs (LCBT), Ms. Brooke Schwartz (DEN)

Bruns called meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

Motion to approve minutes of Oct 2 by Stowell, seconded by Eckert. All in favor, abstention by Hugo and Eckert, no opposition.

Bruns: CUPB meeting from the week before. There was report on budget number. One thing to report is that our reserves has historically been around \$30M. When asked what our restoration to, VP McCann estimated that it is around \$16M to \$17M.

No reports from Election committee, Nomination committee, Staff relations committee, Faculty forum committee, and Budget committee.

Gordon: Student Senate now has 21 members. We are appointing committee chairs.

Eckert: The Awards Committee is now reviewing 3 applications for Mendez award, which is about average.

Ludlow: I do have a powerpoint about the changes that can be passed out. Some comments I have heard based on the new contract. Sometimes people notice some things that are already in existence, and that things that they think are new and changed are actually already happening. One important thing to draw attention to: how to do noncompensable sick leave. Now we claim sick leave in 15 min increment, instead of half day. That's new. Also new is that now we have ceiling on non-compensable sick leave that we can accrue. We didn't use to have a ceiling for that. That ceiling is 2250 hrs, which is equal to SURS time a year and a half of work for a 9-month employee. For SURS, one 9-month academic year is 180 days. On Dec this year, anything that is over that amount, will go away. The amount of accrued non-compensable sick leave that is above 2250 hrs will be eliminated. We are re-opening the sick leave bank some time between now and the December. This isn't available yet but it is being worked on. We will have a chance to donate any excess sick leave hours into sick leave bank. That is better than the extra days just disappearing.

Bruns: A way to automate?

Ludlow: We talked about it but doesn't seem likely. One of the problems with a new contract, once we agree we are on the same page, then there needs time for others to make the changes happen. So in the future, maybe. But this time will be manual.

Hung: Is that going to be the same for 10 or 12 month contracts?

Ludlow: No that will not be the case.

Hung: The contract language says 1.5 service years. So for those with 10-month or 12-month contracts, that service year will be longer than a 9-month employee.

Ludlow: Yes, and on top of that, SURS also uses a different ratio for those contracts so it's not a simple case of extrapolating.

Bruns: When will we know those numbers?

Ludlow: Once we have the complete information, we will send it out.

Hung: So just to have this on people's radar, whether it's your colleague or yourself, that if you are a 10- or 12-month employment contract that the cap for the sick leave will be slightly different for the cap for 9-month contract employees. So people need to be on the lookout for that when the time comes.

Ludlow: Another issue that comes up: does new contract require unit B or ACF to do service? The answer is no, it doesn't. It also doesn't prohibit them from doing service. People are allowed to make those decisions for themselves. Additionally, the office hours requirement has changed. The new contract says that you must have office hours spread over 4 days, for a total of 4 hours, and with each bloc of office hour to be no less than 30 minutes.

Gosse: How about online classes?

Ludlow: The new contract says that if all your classes are online, then you can hold your office hours online as well. But the contract doesn't specify exceptions in cases where some of your classes are online and some are face-to-face.

Ludlow: Another new thing is AEL (Administrative Education Leave) for ACF. It's like a mini sabbatical for our ACF for training in program and pedagogy. We would like to encourage our ACF colleagues to apply for those. The PAI system is also now different. You apply for the first PAI 4 years after your promotion to professor. You send in the PAI portfolio. If you receive the PAI, then in 3 years, you send in the summary statement, and you will receive the PAI. Another 3 years, you need to send in a full Portfolio for the next portfolio.

VanGunten: What's happening this year?

Ludlow: If you're eligible for a full PAI, you can apply for it this year. If you recently had a full PAI, you may apply for the 3.5% if you are eligible.

Gatrell: We want to make sure that if you've prepared for and ready to apply this year for a PAI, that you will have that access to it. We don't want to disadvantage anyone.

Hung: In other words, if you're ready to apply to January, your PAI is grandfathered in under the previous contract's terms.

Bruns: I want to stress that for any colleagues who have received a PAI 3 years ago, they are now eligible to receive the 3.5% increase without having to fill out a full portfolio.

Gatrell: Three service years since receipt of the PAI, not 3 academic years since application.

Stowell: The application deadline for the half PAI on the academic calendar?

Ludlow: Yes, it should be.

Ludlow: Changes in parental leave. Using sick leave to pay for FMLA is an IGP issue, not a Bargaining Agreement. After 12 weeks of FMLA, if there's a sick leave balance you can use up to 30 days to extended leave.

Gatrell: Or you can apply unpaid leave for the equivalent of that 30 days so that new parents and new adoptive parents have access to those days.

Ludlow: Now it's 30, instead of 20s. Also in the old ways, this benefits applicable to Unit A and ASP upon employment, and only applicable to ACF after 3 years. Now it starts the same time for all.

Gatrell: Also, the days are business days, not calendar days. There was an inconsistency in interpreting "days" in the past when it came to interpreting these leaves. This has now been corrected.

Holly: Can you clarify the sick leave policy for the 9-month?

Ludlow: SURS consider 299 days to be 1.5 service years for 9-month employment.

Gatrell: We don't really understand it. They just gave us a table and chart.

Hung: Because SURS counts service years for the purpose of calculating retirement benefits. In the end, when you retire, you can trade in 1 service year. That's why the cap is set to 1.5

years, so that if you get sick in the last couple years before your retirement, it won't eat into that 1 year that you can trade in. This way, everyone getting ready to retire should walk into the last few years with a full year that they can trade in.

Gatrell: If something catastrophic happens, then they will still have a buffer to make it through disability.

Eckert: I don't think Tier 2 employees have access to that trade in benefits.

Gatrell: But we are setting the same benefits for all.

Ludlow: From HR, to be recognized to be on disability, you have to use up all your sick leave. Which is really difficult if you have many days of sick days because you have to spend that all out before you can receive disability benefits.

Wharram: What's the time table to renovating the DAC?

Ludlow: If DAC revision comes to the Dean by Feb, then that's the year in which the revision goes through. Since we have 3 task forces: library resource professional AoD, CU assignment, overload pay. These 3 task forces can lead to Memorandum of Agreement, which will be modifications to our contract. There are several departments who say that they want to wait to find out what the task forces will come up with before revising their DAC. The contract says that the department faculty submits the changes to the chair in November, then the Dean makes the decision in February, and then the Provost makes the decision in March.

Wharram: What's the reason for the gap between Nov and Feb?

Ludlow: One part is that there's a holiday in between.

Gatrell: Another reason is that the process is supposed to be a dialogue. So there needs to be a time for the conversation to take place.

Bruns: Thank you for your time.

Ludlow: If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Gatrell: I don't have much for the Provost Report. We had a wonderful presentation at noon. There will be another presentation at 4 at Doudna, on social fragmentation and the modern life. This is homecoming week. BlueBQ tomorrow.

Bruns: Thank you Dr. Gatrell. We will now move to the two proposals that Senator Stowell has prepared.

Senator Stowell motioned to pass the resolution to remove the exclusion for faculty from serving on multiple campus committees like CGS and FacSen at the same time. Bruns seconded.

Oliver: So CFR is not in this?

Stowell: Correct. We are addressing what's directly written in the bylaw here.

Senator Bruns called the vote. VanGunten opposed. No Abstention. Rest approved. Motion passed.

Senator Stowell motioned to approve the resolution to combine Elections and Nominations committees, and to combine the Student and Senate relations committee, in FacSen. Seconded by Senator Oliver.

Eckert: The workload for the combined nomination election committee will be quite heavy.

Oliver: The chair can delegate the nomination type positions to be the duties to one of the committee members.

Bruns called for a vote. All approve. No opposition, no abstention. Motion passed.

Stowell: When do we want that change to be effective?

Hung: Since we already did committee options for this Fall? Should we wait till Spring or next Fall?

Bruns: This is a change in bylaws right? I think once we change the bylaws it can be effective now.

Abebe: The resolution was submitted almost 3 years, Nov 17, 2015. I am glad to see the President responded to it. I find that encouraging. The aim was to provide faculty some voice in the process of evaluating administrators. The faculty voice beyond the chair level are not heard so it will be useful for both faculty and administrators for that voice to be heard. Secondly at the time we were going through difficult issues and those difficulties could possibly have been avoided if faculty had a voice on it. So in that context we came up with the idea that we need modifications of the evaluation system. The current system is a 360 evaluation process. It has advantages and disadvantages. One of the advantages is people know exactly whom they are evaluated by. But it does leave some doubt about possible unwanted consequences, e.g. perhaps chairs may evaluate deans in a way that aims to keep their own jobs as chairs. So the FacSen suggested changes. So President Glassman has come back to us to see how we will want to add our voices. The document in front of you addresses the strengths and weaknesses of several models, for consideration. We recognize that there are multiple stakeholders on campus. We don't want to have a

system that is exclusively for faculty and nobody else, but a system that includes faculty voice as a part of the review. These 6 proposed systems are in use at other institutions in one way or another. I am not interested, and I don't think the FacSen should be either, in sending another resolution. What I would like to do is to submit a set of choices that we support so he can choose from the set the ones he wants to implement. One of the models proposed is one used in the SUNY system, and it is in line with the AAUP outline. Our aim is to make certain that certain group interest is aligned with public purpose. I think the evaluation of everyone around campus serves the purpose, and faculty concerns should be a part of it. I will be happy to answer any questions and concerns but I want to make the introduction brief since the you have had the chance to read the document for quite a while now.

Hung: Of the ones proposed, I am the most against the one that places the FacSen Exec committee to provide the feedback (#4), and also where selected members of a college will have the chance to provide feedback (#3). I think in both of those cases, they go against our goal of giving faculty a voice. I think if you limit the sources of input to 3, or 5 people, I think that defeats the purpose of having these modifications. So I think those are the least aligned with the purpose of what we try to accomplish. I favor option 5, which allows for input, like an open comment period, where someone on the administration side to collect these comments and put it in a package that goes into the evaluation package for that administrator. I think faculty, ASP, and civil service staff, should all have a chance to voice their input. As a high level of administrator, your actions will impact many facets on campus. So those who work with that person should have a chance to provide feedback, both positive or negative, as they see fit. I think that fits the idea of getting a deeper level of evaluation other than just the chair or dean level.

Hugo: As a faculty member I never evaluated my chair. So what's that process at that level so I have some ways to compare.

Abebe: You haven't evaluated your chair? Has your department had the same chair the whole time?

Hugo: Well perhaps you can shed some light on the whole process.

Abebe: Every 3 year, chairs are evaluated. Every administrator is supposed to be evaluated every three years. It takes the form of a survey to identify strengths and weaknesses, and submit it to the Dean with your name attached. Every time a new chair is appointed we go through that process every 3 years.

Hugo: I am surprised to hear that that's an option that we have.

Gatrell: One of the things that happened is that we've had some interim positions. One the misunderstanding might be that the review only applies to permanent positions, and not the interim appointments. There's a lack of clarity in some cases where someone was given

administrative duties but who are still faculty. We fully support the idea of including more stakeholders in the evaluation process.

Abebe: It's also possible that your chair may have been changing before the 3 years period comes.

Hugo: But there's one who has been here for at least 3 years.

Abebe: So in that case there must be some other factors at play.

Shaw: To address that, do we think we need evaluation more frequently than 3 years? I don't think our department is the only one that has chairs for less than 3 years. With so many changes around the campus, there will be individuals who will be serving for fewer than 3 years at the chair position.

Holly: I concur with Senator Hung. With models 2, 3, 4, and 6, my problem is that they all sort of rely on committees. Who has the expertise to evaluate? I'd rather be the individuals who have experience working with the administrator, instead of committees. Can someone clarify 1 and 5?

Abebe: In model 1, we will continue the current practice but add the faculty input component. Whereas model 5 says you can put in place a completely new system, different from the one we currently use, but which also includes faculty input component.

Gosse: So we can evaluate a Dean much like we can evaluate our chair. It will not be anonymous. It will go to the VPAA.

Abebe: What form it takes will be the choice of the President. What we're asking is that whatever form it takes, we have some input into it.

Gosse: Yes I will like that. A survey or a rubric from stakeholders can only be a good thing.

Wharram: To clarify, the reviews are confidential but not anonymous. Is that correct?

Gatrell: Yes. The current frame is to anonymize the comments and aggregate the comments. The current practice is to have representatives from each level of administration. So for instance, we may not survey all associate Deans, and instead focus on a few to provide feedback.

Wharram: Great document. So maybe synthesizing 1 and 4, or 1 and 2. So we will have a committee to gather and present the information, but they will not be the ones who write the final evaluative report.

Abebe: Two points. One – evaluating individuals is a sensitive issue, a personnel issue. I don't think the FacSen can make that decision for the administrators. An administrator is paid to do that. So I think we should leave that job to them. Two – we haven't specified if the feedback should be summarized, because that's also a sensitive issue that should be decided by the evaluator.

Wharram: Determining what that will look exactly wasn't my intention in raising that comment. I am saying that we should have a model for the faculty input to be organized.

Oliver: Does the current system allow chairs to hand select faculty to evaluate them, or for Deans to select chairs by hand? Or is it randomized? For instance, in the CHHS there are 7 departments. Would 3 or 4 of those chairs be selected without that Dean knowing to provide that anonymous feedback? Or will the Dean be able to select those chairs? And that is reference to the fear of "log rolling" in the practice.

Abebe: The process doesn't allow for a chair to determine it that way, no.

Oliver: I have written evaluations for my chair and I wonder if I was selected by my chair or was I randomly selected.

Abebe: When the survey is sent to you it will be from the Dean, not the chair, in that case.

Gatrell: It will be all faculty in that case. Ordinarily the challenge because the "N." The expectation is that in that scenario of evaluating a Dean, the Provost will consult all chairs and all Associate Deans as well as representative faculty, as well as the Dean's colleagues, to provide the 360 review.

Oliver: So everyone below you, whom you supervise, right?

Gatrell: If I were doing it, I would also include representative faculty across the entire unit to be invited to participate.

Wharram: Sounds like we need open dialogue between VPAA and Faculty to make sure the process is more smooth, that the correct time table is clarified.

Gosse: Do we vote on a model? Model 1 will be an improvement and makes the most sense to me.

Abebe: Maybe we give the President 2 options? That way he won't have to come back to us again. If we can identify 2 models and send them to the President, I think that will move the things along the best.

Bruns: I will make a motion to recommend models 1 and 5 for the President to consider.

Holly: Seconded.

Hung: I think those are the two best models. So I will support that motion.

Abebe: There are schools that use models 3, or 4. So I presented them all for consideration. I do personally think 1 and 5 are the best.

Brantley: What if President choose 5. What happens?

Hung: If the President chooses 5, he will have a lot of administrators wanting answers on what the new process is.

Gatrell: I am worried about the “all” aspect of the proposal. I think a hybrid approach that will include representative faculty members instead of all, with perhaps at least 1 Senator invited. When we say “all” are invited to participate as opposed to randomly selected to participate, the number of responses will be subjected to a self-selected process, for both good and bad. When I think of the current 360, we are involving individuals who have meaningful and regular interactions with the individual. I think that’s a challenge with any evaluation system. I 100% support expanding the process to include more faculty. It’s just how do we do that needs to be the focus for the Senate.

Hung: The way I read is that it says “faculty at all levels,” not “all faculty.” To me, that means if we are evaluating a Dean, in the current system, the faculty don’t evaluate the Dean at all. That’s the part we want to change. I don’t think the intention was to say “all faculty” has a say. We will still maintain that the faculty who has direct, meaningful interactions with the individual.

Gatrell: That’s a good clarification. I’d say that we need a clarifier on that.

Hung: Yes. But it’s not my understanding that, say, when we evaluate the Dean for CoE, we will open the evaluation comment to all faculty, to faculty from CLAS or from the Athletics Department.

Gatrell: But I think there’s a compelling case to be made that perhaps as the Dean of CoE, with teacher certification training, the Dean has had meaningful interactions with faculty from across campus. And so those people are now the stakeholders, even if they’re not part of CoE. I think that’s the challenge – how to draw the line.

Stowell: I think there’s a precedent in our hiring practice. Whenever an administrator is being hired, there’s an open comment period where faculty can supply input. That seems like it’s a reasonable parallel that can be implemented in this case.

Hung: So what I am hearing from this room is that we are largely in agreement that options 1 and 5 are the best. However, as in a lot of cases, the devil is in the details, and without a lot

of details it is hard to definitively say one or the other. However, I see this is as a dialogue. So right now it is one part of the dialogue where the FacSen recommends 1 and 5 to the President. And the President, after receiving this, wishes to have further dialogue, then we will do so. Does that seem reasonable?

Gatrell: I think any of these will be improvement over the current process.

Brun called for vote: All pass, no opposition, no abstention.

Bruns: Next, let's look at the shared governance proposal. I'd like to invite Dr. Havercroft from CFR, and Dr. Jones from CGS to join us.

Stowell: This is an ongoing discussion. I am glad we have the chance to work with the chairs of these other committees to get their input on this. As a result, we've made some changes. I see this as an opportunity that doesn't compete with the other committees, and which might fill a gap that isn't being covered now. Right now there are no specific evaluation of new programs' alignment with university vision, nor on allocation of resources. The councils are doing excellent job on programmatic parameters, but not on the two issues.

Abebe: Thanks Jeff for working on this for so long now, almost 3 years. We have common interests, among the affected groups, in public purpose. We may want to guard our own areas of expertise but we have an objective that is higher than that, and I believe this proposal addresses the common interest. I want to thank you for the time and effort you've put into this.

Gosse: When I was on CAA we did review programs. We did have questions on alignment in the process.

Stowell: In the new program proposals to IBHE, there are specific questions about program alignment issues, and how is the allocation of budget and personnel to support this new program. So that is information that is part of the process so it's not additional work. One concern is the timing of this in terms of the proposal pipeline. One suggestion is to have it start early in the process. Perhaps this FacSen review step can take place when they're consulting the provost, which is a new step added recently.

Bruns: I like that aspect. I have brought up that issue before about new resources for new programs. I am glad to see the Provost is having that discussion with the departments. If faculty can be a part of the process then it wouldn't be extra work. We will just be a part of that discussion.

Stowell: What we have here is not explicitly the HLC concerns about communication. That issue is resolved by the monthly chair meetings.

Hugo: When the Senate provides recommendation, how do we do that? Is that a summary? Or some other form?

Stowell: I haven't come to those details. I wanted to wait till we pick an option.

Bruns: I don't know if it will work out this way, but one possibility is that there won't be a report unless there are issues.

Stowell: This is a way for FacSEn to partner with other parts of the campus to voice our support on new programs. Also, the rate of new programs creation may be slowing down. So I expect that we may have one, no more than two, new programs this year.

Shaw: Maybe there will be more because some FCS reorganization will lead to new programs.

Stowell: Is that new programs defined by IBHE?

Shaw: Some will be and some won't be. I think we are doing Reasonable and Moderate Extension in some cases.

Stowell: RME will not be part of this new program process, according the IBHE regulations.

Oliver: Will this be part of exec meeting with President? Or part of the provost report to us?

Stowell: That's from our constitution.

Oliver: How would the information flow in this regard?

Stowell: Perhaps we can have the provost invite the executive committee to participate in the process. I'd like to see the Provost follow this part of our Constitution where he will bring issues of new programs to our attention.

Bruns: One concern from meeting with chairs is whether if this will delay the approval. So we moved this to the beginning, but it could still perhaps delay. So we may want to have a Senator present during the dept meeting with the provost. Or have it happen during FacSen meeting which is every 2 weeks. In either of those two cases, it will prevent a long delay.

Abebe: I think that's one way. A second way is that no Department Chair would propose a new program that need additional resources without getting the Provost's approval. I cannot see that happening.

Jones: I don't think it will be a delay if it's done on the front end. I think it's better to have Provost report to the whole senate. You've been talking about giving the faculty a voice. It'll be difficult for that one person be the voice of all faculty in the model where you have

one Senator at the meeting. In our normal work flow, our committee will have to add an item one week before it can be discussed next week. So I don't see that the proposal here will add any sort of delay.

VanGunten: What is "Consulted?" Can we reject a proposal and send it back? Or will that move on regardless of our recommendation.

Bruns: The way I am reading this is that we're basically given a chance to ask the Provost "have you considered *this*?"

VanGunten: So we are basically consulting with the Provost, and not with the program.

Stowell: Yes that was a point I wasn't to make, too. Ultimately, this is between FacSen and the administration, not between FacSen and the departments.

Hung: Also, in response to Senator Abebe's point – the purpose here is not to say that a program proposal hasn't cleared the resource check. The point for the FacSen input is for us to look at *how* the allocation is done, to examine whether a specific reallocation decision is the best for our school in a larger context.

The meeting took a 5 min break.

Bruns: Sounds like we're reaching close to a consensus. There's also proposal for Constitution change. I suggest we ask Senator Stowell add the language under Article II, and we can review next time.

Wharram: I don't see a direct connect to the Constitution changes.

Stowell: There are very similar languages to the current Constitution.

Hung: We're calling this "shared governance." But we are proposing that the FacSen has a new consultative role in looking at program alignment and resource allocation, so I think it's appropriate to have it documented in our Constitution.

Stowell: Well, either there, or in the bylaws.

Wharram: I was under the impression that we're just clarifying what we should have been doing, but which we haven't been doing.

Stowell: I am glad you brought that up. Is this a clarification? Or a new addition? One of the question is what triggers this process. In our Constitution it says any changes that have "major effects on curriculum structure." So maybe it's a clarification that that means when there's a new program. The only concern with that, is that when the process is triggered, is that you need to have 90 days, minimum, for feedback.

Bruns: What if we add some language to speed up the timeline?

Wharram: Yes that will require changes to the Constitution.

Bruns: In the interest of moving this forward, can I ask Senator Stowell to clarify the language and come back to the Senate.

Hung: For the record, I want something, writing down, to spell out what it is that we're trying to do. The current language "consultation upon major changes" is rather vague. If we can do it via clarification to get the idea across, that'll be great. If we need to spell it out in a different subsection, that's also good. One of the problems we had was that the roles were not clearly defined. That led to groups making efforts that overlap and contradict each other. So I want to see the intent clarified in whatever way to avoid further complications.

Bruns: So moving on to the Think tank idea. I would like to invite Dr. Dobbs to joining us in this conversation. Dr. Dobbs teaches organizational strategies. The think tank idea came out of the review committee last year. We want a group to look at big macro issues that affect higher education. To look towards the horizon to identify issues, trends, and potential problems, not necessarily to provide solutions.

Dobbs: There are many ways a group like this can inform different levels and groups across campus. Typically in a strategic process, there are three parts: strategic analysis, identifying options, and then you make choices and implement. This focus of this think tank will be on strategic analysis, not on identifying options or choice/implementation. What this think tank can offer will be material that many groups across campus at various levels can use to make decisions.

Hung: I think there's value to have a body like this on campus, so that we can be more prepared and proactive on upcoming issues. But I am concerned about the perception of having a group of people who're doing things in a way that isn't transparent or accountable. So when I came up with the draft proposal for how this group will be formed, I put in some elements to address those concerns. For instance, in the working of this group, there are elements of seeking feedback from campus. Another element is in how the membership to this group is selected. I want to maintain some accountability for the members in this group when they come up with suggestions. Accountability not in the sense of being responsible, but in the sense of the campus understanding where they come up with the reports.

Bruns: But this think tank isn't recommending solutions. I agree that if this body ends up saying that we should do X or Y, then yes, they should be accountable. But here we are having a group that identifies issues, so it's more important to have people on here who are good at doing this sort of thing.

Abebe: I don't see this a recommending body. How do real think tanks work? You have a collection of individuals with different ideas who come up with all kinds of thoughts, looking to the future, analyzing issues, identifying institutional strengths and weaknesses. It should be put out to the public. There's nothing here that should say this is not transparent. It should be as transparent as possible, as open as possible, so that there's considerable participation by the campus. This is not a recommending body, but a body that identifies issues. This is to create ideas. So, for instance, should we have a program in applied sciences? What would this think tank group think of this? We should have a position paper on this. Then the administration can decide what to do. That's how a think tank works. In higher education, we tend to be a little bit shy in thinking of ourselves as capable individuals and we rely on others to come up with ideas instead of owning them and generating them ourselves. This is what this is about – let's generate our own ideas. We have very smart and capable individuals, let's come up with our own ideas. Maybe they won't be useful, but this is one way for us to generate these ideas.

Bruns: One suggestion I have from Dr. Dobbs is to put a 3-yr window on this so that after that period we can come back to see if it's worth continuing.

Stowell: Along those lines, maybe we should call for volunteers to see who wants to do this. I think there should be a mechanism for someone to be part of the process. Maybe they don't need to be a part of the committee. But they should have a way to relate their ideas to the process.

Bruns: I think there's value to that. I think there should be ways for all faculty to forward ideas to the think tank for discussion. I want to have a Senate appointment piece to the membership so we can appoint people we know on campus who has the expertise to be on the committee.

Wharram: Does the size of the think tank matter?

Dobbs: I think 6 might be too few and I'd not recommend going below that. When it's 10 or more then things become a little unwieldy. I think 8 is about good.

Bruns: Would a good way to do this to have 8 people to meet and talk about issues, then come up with position paper, a white paper, on here're the issues we see coming. Is that a reasonable model?

Dobbs: As an example, last time I looked, about 23% of people in Illinois under 18 are of Hispanic origin. I don't think that's widely known on campus. How would that piece of information be of use to recruitment, program development, etc. I think if this group can come together to discover many of these pieces of information that can be of use to many areas on campus, that'd be a very good thing.

Bruns: Why don't we move forward to bring this to the President, who did express interest in this and said he'd like to be a part of this if time permits. Should we put together something more formal, with some more details?

Abebe: Yes, I think that's a good starting place.

Bruns: Of course, anyone we'd want to nominate, we'll talk to beforehand, so they know it's coming. I intend to nominate Dr. Dobbs and Senator Abebe. How should we proceed to get the other names?

Hung: I suggest we let the other Senators come up with recommendations of people whom they think will be a good fit for this type of committee work. Then we forward that list to the executive committee.

Brantley: Before we reach out to people, perhaps we need a more concrete proposal. It seems right now things are a little murky.

Hung: Maybe something more structural, like how many times to meet, what products we expect from the committee. Is that what you have in mind?

Brantley: Yes, but also the goal of the work. What is the intention here. Have that stated more clearly.

Bruns: My main concern is that we don't overlook anyone on campus who would have the right skillset for this. We do have representation for all colleges now on our Senate. So I think it's a good starting point to get suggestions in a way that we don't overlook areas. We will put forth a more concrete proposal and move forward.

Oliver: I am thinking about the issue of student representation.

Gordon: I am thinking about it as well, but if the appointment is 3 years that might be a problem.

Hung: There are many ways to do this. For instance, the student member may be a one-year appointment.

Oliver: From what you read so far, do you think a student representative will be useful?

Gordon: The term of service is a problem. But if that can be resolved, I do think have a student participate in this will be a good idea.

Hung: Just spitballing idea here, perhaps the Student Senate will use a similar method of selecting from the student governance body or outside of it to find the right fit for this work.

Dobbs: Having done this kind of work, I want you to be aware that this is quite a time-intensive set of work. People who volunteer to do this should make sure that they have the time required. If they have some sort of graduate assistant assigned to the task that would be great. If I was on this committee, I would be devoting a lot of time to it, and I'd hope other members will take it as seriously and devote their time to it.

Bruns: So do you have the time for this?

Dobbs: For this spring I don't have a graduate assistant yet. But I might be able to request one.

Brantley: I think your concerns are really important to remember. In the current era of scarcity that we operate in, do we have the infrastructure to allow our faculty to provide this work. I think it's valuable and it should be done. But I worry about how it might tax our faculty.

Hung: I think that will be part of the consideration going forward. When we reach out to individuals, we want to be very clear in our expectations so each individual being asked will have to decide if this is something that they can participate in.

Brantley: Will that mean that they will have to pull out of other services to do this?

Hung: I think that will be up to each individual being asked to decide for themselves.

Dobbs: Another point to consider is that in our DAC, producing a White Paper is one item, though obviously not the same as publishing a paper.

Bruns: Okay, we are nearing our allotted time, so we will have to revisit this topic next time.

Hung motioned to adjourn, seconded by Brantley. Meeting adjourned at 4:01 pm.