

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1-8-2019

January 8, 2019

Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 8, 2019" (2019). *Minutes*. 1114.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1114

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting on Jan 8, 2019
Room 4440, Booth Library

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

Attendance: Brantley, Bruns, Chahyadi, Corrigan, Gosse, Holly, Hung, Oliver, Stowell,
Wharram, VanGunten
Student Senate Representative: Gordon
Guests: Provost Gatrell, Ms. Stacy Knight-Davis, Ms. Haynes (DEN)

Bruns called meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

Hugo moves to approve minutes, Chayahdi second. Hung Abstained. No oppose. Minutes approved.

Exec board meeting with Glassman – (Gatrell) Updated on lecture series for last year. Speaker will coincide with African American heritage month programming. Update on 360 review process.

Bruns: Organizing the invitation of Deans and VPs. VP Drake needs reschedule. Jan 27 meeting Awalt Interim VP of ITS will attend. Interim VP Drake will come April 16. Possibly invite the IBHE representative. Will invite Drs. Shelton, Lord, and Bower to update us on the reorganization of the colleges.

Stowell: We need to work on textbook rental issue this semester.

Bruns: Maybe review IGP on appointing to textbook rental committee to include librarians.

Stowell: For Elections and Nomination Committee, we need slate of candidates for elections. Also need candidates for committees. There will be revisions to constitutions and bylaws that need to be included. Will make the changes in a public document to all Senators so we can make modifications.

Gordon: Made a new appointment to be the Speaker. We are still making Senate appointments. Have 9 to 10 positions open.

Gatrell: Welcome back. Enrollment numbers look good for Spring. Bringing in 3 candidates for Dean of CAHS. Lumpkin College Dean has 3 candidates as well. VP for University advancement – candidate coming next week. AVPAA is being assessed in terms of scope and duties, so returning to Asst. VP, staff position. Search will be chaired by Doug Bower. As per HLC recommendation, we are moving forward to set up a coordinator for General Education. I am meeting with various stakeholders to assess how that position will look like.

Meeting with Board of Trustees to bring in new programs. Dietetics & Nutrition, Family Studies, and expanded Hospitality and Tourism. These are RME (reasonable and moderate expansions). We are looking for ways to build bridges for transfers into our programs. The next new program will be Fashion Merchandising, which will be another RME.

Gosse: How's our financial situation? For instance, full time office support staff.

Gatrell: We're trying to replenish based on what we have. Revenue is down and state appropriation is down. Right now I don't see an increase.

Bruns: Thank you Provost Gatrell. In Spring, we should revisit the other revitalization proposals, other than 7. Today we want to look at work group 2, which is on technology. Next week, Josh Awalt will come to speak to us. I've asked Ms. Stacy Knight-Davis to come share with you some of the issues concerning the on-going event in reorganization of technology on campus, particularly the parts that impact on library.

Knight-Davis: I am the Head of the Library Technology Services at Booth. I am a web master and I also do software development. I want to report to you some recent events so you are aware of what's happening. I have some prepared remarks here. In Nov 2018, I was informed that ITS plans to take over all of the library technology infrastructure and control of most of the library's systems by summer of 2019. I was not consulted at any point during the planning stage, and neither were any other library faculty. The library's online presence relies on the servers and software at the library. Every aspect of library service depends on library servers. It is nearly impossible to retrieve or use library resources without using library-administered services. 75% of uses of library usage take place outside of the library building. The library is an academic unit that teaches the construction of effective search strategies and critical evaluation of information using resources that are selected and organized by librarians. Librarians build and continue to improve the systems that provide access to scholarly information for faculty and students. Again, three quarters of the use of library resources take place outside of the library walls. For the majority of students and faculty, the library web site *is* the library. The plan to remove control of library systems from the library will have a detrimental result on teaching and learning at EIU. All systems of services that the library provides are administered by professional librarians. Library Science and Information Science are well-established fields of academic study. I cannot see how taking administration of information services from highly experienced professional librarians can in any way enhance learning and research at EIU. The IT centralization plan devalues library faculty. The plan does not acknowledge that technology cannot be separated from library services. The plan does not recognize that faculty and student research, and the dissemination of that work, relies on library technology infrastructure that is administered by librarians. I do not see how the IT centralization plan advances the mission of our university. The library, as a service, enables inquiry. Library services are best provided by librarians. Removing the ability of librarians to develop and enhance library systems does not recognize the excellence of library faculty or how heavily library faculty research programs that are important to library services. I am deeply concerned at the total

lack of communication while the plan for IT centralization plan was developed. No discussion involving library faculty occurred during the development. The vitalization plan that serves as the source of the IT centralization specifically exempted library services from IT centralization. This is not shared governance, in my opinion. This change has a profound impact on teaching, research, and learning on our campus and discussions about these changes should not take place behind closed doors.

Hung: Does that library TI centralizing plan involve the computer lab stations?

Knight-Davis: Yes, I believe it includes all computers, based on my understanding.

Gatrell: First, the plan is not yet finalized. It is a work in progress. We met with the library precisely to work out the details so we can maintain the integrity of the library services

Knight-Davis: I just got informed to provide documentation to initiate migration.

Gatrell: I am meeting with the library tomorrow so we will keep this dialogue going. I learned a lot from our previous meeting. I think we will continue the discussion to find the right solution. We have recently invested almost \$800k in new servers, and one goal we have is to plan for backups and maintain access to technology in all conditions, and that means we need to move the library servers to the new, centralized servers. I will say that I understand your perspective. One thing I understand clearly is how important it is to the library services for librarians to hold the relevant permissions and administrative authorities to do your work.

Knight-Davis: I appreciate your support that librarian needs to maintain the leadership role in what library functions. But I think there are some miscommunication going on, coming from Mr. Awalt's office.

Bruns: Is there a grand plan for the centralization?

Gatrell: The plan is that every server on campus be linked to the ITS core. For each server there's a personnel in backup to maintain stable and continuous service. The availability of faculty is different from that of a staff, relative to the role and expectations.

Gosse: When things go wrong with D2L, they want us to call them. But I want my students, and myself, to be able to call Stacey for assistance. She's been such a great help to keep my online courses going.

Gatrell: I don't see that changing. What we are talking about here is the technical piece, backing up, and providing coverage, to have a support team behind it. One person isn't a support team, and that's a challenge.

Bruns: So the servers we have in this building will go over to ITS, but the permissions and administration authority will remain here.

Gatrell: I have committed that they will not go away. In terms of realignment of staff, that has not been finalized. So there may be a reassignment of one position to ensure that we have cross training.

Bruns: Related to this current issue, I've heard faculty expressing concern that now that we have dissolved CATS, that we are missing an element on campus that understands the pedagogy side of technology.

Gatrell: That is why, in my mind, we now have FDIC, to take over some of those tasks. What we are trying to accomplish is that those who do have the skills in assisting faculty in pedagogy development are not drawn into doing medium or low level technology tasks like rebooting computers. And that requires a re-organization of ITS to do that. The heart of the pedagogy piece now resides in FDIC. Right now we have nobody as Instructional Design and that's something I'd like to fill once the budget allows.

Bruns: One of the concerns I have in the IT centralization is that we need flexibility and also local-level control in many cases to promote innovation and creativity, as we have seen in the example of UIUC's student technology center. If everything now goes to ITS I think it can be an issue.

Gatrell: One of the aspects of that UICU center is the reliance on graduate students to help with the work. We now have a few graduate assistants at FDIC, for that reason. I would like to see that continue. I don't think Academic Technology should be about maintaining a 30-seat lab, especially now that we're moving towards thin clients, which are significantly cheaper than regular computers.

Bruns: So that's for the public labs?

Gatrell: For some faculty as well.

Bruns: Will there be exceptions for faculty with special technology needs?

Gatrell: The technology will remain available to faculty. We will support what faculty need to do their jobs.

Hung: During the workgroup 2 discussion, where I was a member, we recognized that we needed to talk to the various stakeholders on campus with special technology needs, e.g. WEIU, Booth, residence halls. The goal was to make a plan to fulfill those needs while also making the best use of resources. The collating of technology human resources is supposed to enable individuals with special skillsets to be able to work on those, instead of doing other things on top of it simply because they are in a different operational unit. We also

recommended a position to oversee the campus technology needs to conserve our resources as we move to meet those technology needs. In that discussion, we noted that there are going to be a lot of exceptions. There will be cases where it won't fall under this umbrella because they have specific configuration and needs in their daily operations, like WEIU and Booth. So, hopefully that gives some background as to the overall direction of the centralization. I think that's mostly going with the suggested changes from workgroup 2: to gather resources and human capitals so that we can be more efficient in deploying them.

Brantley: I think improving efficiency makes a lot of sense. However, you mentioned it makes sense to have programmers to work in their specialized area. As of the moment, EIU doesn't have web application developers at all.

Hung: Well, we have some people who do programming under Banner.

Brantley: So in that sense, one might happen in this centralization is that these people will be deployed in additional areas.

Hung: I meant the opposite.

Gatrell: An example of that will be the ISS people. They were spending a lot time doing things like imagining the computers or fixing projectors. So they now don't have the time to work with faculty on pedagogy development.

Gosse: So is the problem the physical location of the servers? Or is this about efficiency for upkeep and maintenance?

Knight-Davis: After this conversation, I've gained a lot of clarity on what's going on, so thank you Provost for explaining this. What I see now is that there's a severe break down of communication between Mr. Awalt's office and the library. In the last two times I've talked to Mr. Awalt, he told me that everything that the library needs done will have to go through the ticketing system so that it's escalated. In other words, as a librarian, I will get the user's complaint and request, but I wouldn't be able to do anything about it until it is routed through ITS.

Gatrell: My goal is to make sure that in your role as a faculty member, that your server permission remains as it is.

Knight-Davis: Then I think it's best that this is done in writing, and to have ITS slow down the pace of the move.

Gatrell: I do know that a lot needs to be done to prepare for the move, so there's a time schedule for that. Our limited resources simply do not allow us to invest in keeping another set of servers here.

Knight-Davis: I understand the budget constraints we have. What concerns me is that from what I have seen, when ITS begins overseeing a unit, there's an erosion of control over time. When the plan is now to take over total control from the beginning, I am worried how that will affect my work and the library services.

Gatrell: I think with further dialogues and discussions, a lot of the issues can be worked out.

Bruns: The key issue in my mind is the access to the servers and the permissions for Stacey. As long as we can work on our servers, without going through the ticketing system, then things should be okay.

Brantley: Is it even possible to segment out the permission to the servers?

Knight-Davis: It is possible to do that.

Gosse: I was a system administrator before and I understand the importance of maintaining that access. The servers are your work. You put your time and energy into upkeep and making it work. These servers are essential to the quality of service at the library. So I understand the need to keep the permission with the librarians.

Gatrell: I hear these concerns and I plan to have the relevant and essential permissions stay at the library. But at the same time, gathering resources and making things more efficient is the only way we have of moving forward. There are a lot of talented folks at ITS and I can think of much better tasks for them to do than to update operation systems.

Bruns: Thank you provost for weighing in on this issue. Let's move on to the next topic: Revisiting 360 reviews. In discussion with Dr. Glassman about the new format, we talked about whether the Senate does have a role in the review process for the VP positions. So I want us to have a discussion on what does "having faculty involved" mean in the context of reviewing the performance of VPs?

Hung: We had that discussion before. If the Senate has a role in it, how will it look like if we speak as a Senate. In that capacity of representing our colleagues, will that give certain weight to the comments that we produce. In that context, we would need a process for the Senate to gather the information to write that comment. At that point, we decided that maybe it's best to let individual faculty speak, as appropriate, instead of having the Senate write a report.

Gatrell: For Deans, all faculty in that college will be involved. For Chairs, all faculty in the department will be involved. The challenge is at the VP level how to identify the faculty cohort who are relevant to the review. We want to be intentional to have representatives from the Senate in the process of reviewing VPs. The Senate is made up of faculty who hear from their colleagues and who are informed, and in many cases you all work with various

VPs on campus in many initiatives. I am thinking there should be 5 faculty Senators in these VP reviews.

Bruns: I agree that the Senators are already stretched pretty thin in terms of our duties. But I also think that this is a pretty important task, and it's worth our while to take on this additional work.

Hung: I am not opposed to the idea, but a lot will depend on the details in terms of how this will work, for the Senate either serves as a voice, of the voice, of the review process. I would need to see some outline of the process before I could endorse. How would we do this in a way that is informative and useful, and also responsive to our constituent. We should have a discussion on how the Senate can achieve that before we endorse the plan.

Bruns: Isn't there a process?

Gatrell: It's a survey we send out.

Hung: Right. So when a Dean is reviewed, the survey is sent out. When it's the VP, does that mean that the 5 appointed Senators will receive the survey, and their input will be the voice of the faculty? Or will there be more to that?

Gatrell: Well, using my review, the survey will be sent out to all faculty and people should be able to log in through their EIU email and submit the responses. The challenge is how to make it work for VP Student Affairs, or VP Business Affairs.

Bruns: It seems to me that for those VPs, the surveys will be sent out to the faculty senate.

Stowell: How about sending it out to all faculty, since submission of response is voluntary? While it is true that the people in this room may have more of a chance to work with these VPs, there probably are people on campus who're not here who will have significant interactions with them as well.

Gatrell: I just assumed that having the survey sent to all faculty was the default.

Stowell: No, that's not the case. It's been a very long time to have a chance to answer a survey for other VPs and that happened only once.

Bruns: I don't think it's the standard practice to send out surveys for reviewing VPs.

Wharram: And I think that was why it was brought up in the first place, which is that we haven't had any meaningful way of participating in these reviews before.

Hung: For VPs who do not supervise faculty directly, what's the Senate's role in the review process? Some of us work with units on campus that fall under those other VP's area, so we

might have an opinion and a suggestion that we'd like to share during that review process. How should the Senate serve as that conduit of information?

Bruns: I think it is our responsibility as the elected Senators to be informed and be knowledgeable. So we are the right people to provide that review.

Gatrell: Maybe it's as simple as each VP sending out the survey as a Mach form to the Senate, plus certain numbers of faculty who have worked closely with them.

Oliver: Perhaps an ad-hoc or a subcommittee at the Senate, sending out the survey, collecting the data, summarizing and then sharing the data. Not too much different from our Elections committee sharing out the information.

Hung: If we send out a request to all faculty, what would we do with comments we receive that come from faculty who have not had any meaningful interactions with the VP or the offices in that area? Do we simply package it and send it on? If that's the case, is that really what we want the Senate to do, to simply collect, reformat, and re-send?

Bruns: I think it doesn't need to be complicated. Just have the survey sent to the Senate, and we will provide the feedback, because that's our role as the elected representatives.

Gatrell: I think having faculty senate on that list is appropriate, but I also think having the list be as broad as possible is a good idea.

Oliver: Many of us in this room have limited interactions with the other VPs. If we keep it to only this room, the usefulness of the comments will be limited. How difficult will it be to send it out to all faculty?

Holly: To me, the simplest way to do this is to send it out to all. Some faculty out there will have more meaningful and more informed interactions. Of course. But as a faculty, I have students who show up at the last day of class and fill out an evaluation. There's going to be situations like that.

Hung: In the recommendation forms I fill out for my students they always ask how long have you known the applicant and what capacity. So maybe we can have that included in the survey?

Oliver: Yes, to provide some context to the comment.

Hugo: What is the response rate when we send out requests like election?

Stowell: About 30%.

Holly: And part of the job of the person evaluating the performance is to make sense of the comments collected and give each piece appropriate weight.

Stowell: I think getting the survey to all and letting those response go back to the review process makes sense. I think having the Senate collects it or comments on it just adds a layer of interpretation. When I get my student evaluations back, I get the raw data, whether I like it or not. I think we should make it simple and give the faculty a chance to speak up.

Bruns: So our role is to send out the survey, gather, and then send it out.

Oliver: I think it's important that everyone has the opportunity and that the target audience isn't selected.

Hugo: I think we will have more of an issue if the survey only goes to a select group, that people might be concerned about bias and not including voices. We can avoid that if we send it to everyone.

VanGunten: Do we have a role in aggregating? I think we should solicit responses, but are we entitled to view those responses?

Gatrell: So perhaps the standard process is that for each VP to send out the survey.

Hung: I agree. It's just as easy for the VP office to set up a Mach form. What would the Senate add to the process if we collate the responses?

Bruns: So it sounds like the consensus is that at the VP level, survey of review should be sent out to all faculty and the responses go back to them. The Senate will solicit and promote participation, but that's our role. The Exec Committee will take this back to Dr. Glassman.

Oliver moved to adjourn. VanGunten seconded. All approved. Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.