

11-13-2018

November 13, 2018

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "November 13, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1112.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1112

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 November 13, 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, Holly, Hugo, Oliver, Shaw, Stowell, VanGunten, Wharram
Student Senate Representative: Gordon
Guests: Brooke Schwartz (DEN)

Bruns called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

On the minutes from October 30, Bruns notes that the time of adjournment should be 3:35 instead of 2:35. Motion to approve minutes with this change by Wharram, seconded by Stowell. Approved; no opposition; abstentions by Brantley, Bruns, Chahyadi.

Executive Committee report

Bruns: We met with the President and Provost on Monday. We discussed the think tank idea: 4 administrative appointees, 4 faculty appointees, 1 student; not too prescriptive; name for the group? We also discussed the 360 review and our preference for models 1 and 5. Who do we mean by "administrative," all VPs? How are faculty invited to participate (e.g., President selects faculty to review)?

Abebe: It's beyond our responsibility to tell the President how to carry this out, but we would like this to be implemented.

Bruns: President and Provost were curious about why not Faculty Senate (e.g., evaluating other VPs)?

Oliver: More likely a role for those who have had significant direct interaction.

Wharram: Can be part of the process; also keeping track of the timeline (who should be up when).

Bruns: I'll clarify with the Provost. As to APERC/STHC, how would it work? President would like us to send him recusal language.

Wharram: Is it necessary to recuse?

Hugo: Yes, it is, due to bias. Program area is called on to provide info.

Eckert: Is there any language in the contract?

Stowell: No, not on recusal.

Eckert: So why should we be concerned with this?

Stowell: We can present them with a note, let them draft the language.

Wharram: We addressed this a couple of years ago with the ad hoc committee (re: vitalization).

Oliver: I agree with Hugo—conflict of interest is assumed, but someone could be influencing on the back side.

Wharram: Has there been any conflict of interest with STHC in the past?

Abebe: No, it has never come up.

VanGunten: This is for the Union to hammer out; contract language is beyond our purview.

Wharram: Having a pool makes any such conflict less likely.

Elections Committee – No report

Nominations Committee

Oliver: Library Advisory Board has modified its bylaws to adjust membership according to the newly constituted colleges. They decided on two representatives from CLAS. They are also adding a library faculty member. A call was made, and Steve Brantley is appointed effective immediately. Other changes will be effective Fall 2019.

Eckert: Even alternates have been expected to attend meetings in the past.

Bruns: Is it necessary to have that many people?

Eckert: It's tradition.

Wharram: I'm on the ad hoc committee (on college reorganization). Perhaps I could talk to Dr. Ghent (LAB chair) and Dean Newell.

Bruns: Yes, the board's too big. Since we nominate to this committee, do we need to make a motion?

Eckert moves to approve Brantley's appointment to LAB, seconded by Oliver. Approved; no opposition, no abstentions.

Student and Staff Relations Committee

Gordon: Student senator applications are due Thursday at 3:00 p.m. Elections will be held online November 26-27. We're holding a Thank a Professor event tomorrow, 12:30-2:00 outside the food court. We're deciding whether or not to pass a resolution on the BLM flag.

Awards Committee

Eckert: Melissa Ames has been selected as the recipient of the Mendez award.

Eckert moves to accept Ames, seconded by Brantley. Approved; none opposed, no abstentions.

Forum Committee – No report

Budget Transparency Committee – No report

Shared Governance Implementation Committee

Stowell: I shared our proposed language with the President and Provost; it was well-received.

Bruns: There will be no Provost's report, as Dr. Gatrell is absent. Our invited guest Interim VPSA Drake isn't here either. Other business: We've stricken II.C.5 from the Bylaws. We've also worked out language combining the subcommittees. APERC/STHC is close to done. The shared governance proposal is done. Further discussion: the think tank, and revisions to the Constitution (need to put to bed by second February meeting, on ballot for election). On a personal note, I was planning to go on sabbatical in Spring, but I'll be deferring for one year. Who else should we invite to talk to us? Josh Norman will be here November 27 (re: strategic enrollment planning). I was also thinking of VP McCann, Tom Michael, Josh Awalt, Tim Zimmer.

Abebe: I'd like to hear updates from the academic deans on structural planning, vision, etc. They may be interim, but their job is to plan out.

Brantley: I'm assuming the associate deans would come as well.

Bruns: Is the think tank still under discussion?

Stowell: We accepted it with minor language changes.

Wharram: I believe the President wanted us to finalize a name.

Bruns: Stowell and I will clarify.

Eckert(?): Are appointees internal to the university, or out to the broader community?

Bruns: I believe from the administrative team. We don't need to come up with a name; those appointed will have an idea. We should move forward on appointing people. I'll send an email to faculty—describing the group, soliciting those interested in serving, indicating three-year commitment, frequency of meeting TBD. I'll send the draft to you.

Oliver: This group originated with us?

Bruns: With the review committee.

Oliver: We should establish an identity.

Stowell: Send that out with the call.

Bruns: As to my meetings with departments, I've met with Bio and Music. I'll pull together a bullet point document with the Provost's response. Some things have been directly addressed, some have been misunderstandings, also some triage issues (e.g., computer refresh cycle). Travel, budgets, staffing (number, and ratio of A to B) have been common themes.

Oliver: Reliance on Unit B conserves savings, but there's no incentive for service. What if an incentive was developed, such as PBI-S? Could they earn based on service?

Bruns: It wouldn't come up until the next contract.

Brantley: MOUs.

Abebe: This has been more than worthwhile. It shows that Senate is doing something to solve non-contract problems.

Bruns: I have done some follow-up. They appreciate that someone's listening to them. President and Provost have been open. I haven't been able to meet with English, History, or Business; I've also met with only one Education department.

Stowell: Regarding the Constitution, we've revised language about new programs and our relationship with other committees. The Constitution outlines the scope of duties for the major committees, which sometimes conflicts with updated committee bylaws—how to resolve? We could update the Constitution.

Eckert: We could give the general scope, then refer to the committee bylaws.

Bruns: I'll get feedback at my meeting with the council chairs tomorrow.

Wharram: The President want us to propose a topic for the presidential talk next year. Sace Elder and the History department are preparing something for Spring.

Bruns: I thought we'd do that in Spring.

Wharram: The sooner, the better; like a Fall kickoff to a new year.

Bruns: Ideas?

Holly: Dovetail with something else going on, something broader and campuswide like library exhibits or Tarble and Doudna programming.

Bruns: The president's lecture series is substantial, although that doesn't mean it couldn't tie in.

Wharram: Constitutional crisis.

Brantley: Automation and rural America.

Holly: AI.

Brantley: Tyranny of big data.

Bruns: Brainstorm, and bring ideas next meeting. About the dedicated ACF chair on Faculty Senate, I will bring a proposal in a couple of weeks. It can be filled with the top at-large vote-getter if no one runs.

Motion to adjourn by Wharram, seconded by Oliver. Adjourned 3:11 p.m.