

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
November 13, 2018

ROLL CALL

Members present: Kofi Akamani, Jon Bean, Jerry Becker, Alejandro Caceres, Ying Chen, Kathleen Chwalisz, Jon Davey, Aaron Diehr, Marissa Ellerman, Derek Fisher, Matt Gorzalski, Laura Halliday, Dong Han, Michelle Kibby, Gary Kinsel, Seung-Hee Lee, Marcus Odom, Amber Pond, Ruthanne Rehbeltd, Melissa Viernow, Jim Wall, Robin Warne, Cherie Watson, Natasha Zaretsky

Springfield Contingent: Doug Carlson, Sandra Ettema, Heeyoung Han

Members absent with Proxy: Ahmad Fakhoury (Seb Pence), Constantine Hatziaioniu (Mohamad Sayeh), Michael Koehler (Nolan Wright), Jay Needham (Robert Spahr), Segun Ojewuyi (George Boulukos), April Teske (Ann Garrett), Kay Zivkovich (Joe Shapiro)

Members absent without Proxy: Nancy Martin, Grant Miller, Kyle Plunkett

Proxies absent:

Ex-Officios and guests: Meera Komarraju (Provost), Lizette Chevalier (Associate Provost for Academic Programs, APAP), Dave Dilalla (Associate Provost for Academic Administration), Jan Thompson, Matt Baughman, Tamara Workman, Brione Lockett

PRESIDENT REMARKS

Dr. **Bean** called the meeting to order and opened his comments noting the passing of two Salukis in the past month, Dr. Carlo Montemagno and Dr. Ben Rodriguez. He provided some personal reflections of Chancellor Montemagno and read a statement written by a colleague of Dr. Rodriguez, Eric Jacobs.

MINUTES

The minutes of the October meeting were approved unanimously by voice vote.

INVITED GUEST - Jan Thompson

Professor Thompson provided a presentation about plans of the Southern at 150 celebration planning committee. Other guests and Senators who are involved on the committee also provided supplemental information.

PROVOST REPORT

Provost Komarraju began her report with some updates. Interim President and Acting Chancellor Dorsey is actively involved with keeping things moving on the campus and helping to continue to get work done on a daily basis. The Board of Trustees held a special meeting and is proceeding to select a search firm to recommend a new President by Fall 2019, and also the search for a new Chancellor which will follow shortly thereafter. The Board is also on a mission to find an Interim Chancellor. The SIU Foundation awarded \$50,000 research awards distributed to ten (10) faculty among the sixty-seven (67) that were submitted. The Foundation will endeavor to keep these types of awards in the future as well as providing selected students with funds to help close the gap financially. Spring registration has opened

and she encouraged faculty to help students understand the importance of registering prior to the break. They are in the second week of interviews for candidates for Academic Advisors. The GA budget has been distributed to Deans with the guidance of keeping 20% back as a discretionary budget to be used for unanticipated needs. A planned workshop for Assistant Professors will be conducted soon to assist with resources and promotion and tenure. SIU Day for area high school students with a wider recruitment radius than the prior December event has been scheduled for Friday April 26, 2019. An SIU Open House last Saturday brought 332 high students (+40% over last year) to campus. Several other recruitment activities are planned and she requested faculty to provide her with any successful ideas used in their units. The e-sports unit will be up and running in Spring 2019 and is planned for the old Starbucks area of the Student Center. In terms of reorganization, they participated in a video conference with the IBHE seeking guidance on how to proceed. The IBHE indicated they need the “big picture” and to have the Board of Trustees affirm that reorganization revolves around the RME process and not a New Unit of Instruction (NUI), in other words that we are not proposing to build a new College that we never had before. What we are doing is taking existing programs and re-shaping them. A question and answer session followed.

An **unidentified Senator** asked for more detail on the planned open houses. **Halliday** asked about those Departments and Colleges who have not yet voted on RME’s and what it means going forward, and what the plan is administratively in terms of Deans and Chairs. The **Provost** responded that they want to minimize chaos and continue the work that is being done. To keep things as stable as possible while at the same time a gradual change may occur. They will be taking things one step at a time. **Becker** asked about the next steps and what specific documents will be going forward. **Zivkovich** asked for more specific information on what the IBHE asked us to do, and what the plan looks like. **Provost** responded that IBHE gives guidelines on program requirements and metrics, and the plan going to the BOT is the proposed structure. **Zivkovich** followed up and asked what happens to the RME’s that list specific concerns from constituents that make up the proposed configuration and whether the BOT becomes aware of those concerns. **Provost** responded that there appear to be two different sets of circumstances. There are some RME’s which are less controversial and have gone forward, and there are others where there have been concerns raised. And what we are doing is going back to those units to have discussions about those concerns. And there is also a last batch that are still in draft stage. **Zivkovich** asked whether the Faculty Senate will be able to see the final structure and any documents before it goes before the BOT and the IBHE. **Provost** responded that the Chancellor’s Blog has much of the information, and she will provide more information as things progress. **Zivkovich** also asked whether or not it might prudent to send the less controversial ones forward now in order to see how they respond, which might be useful to other units who are still formulating their own structure. **Provost** responded that the President’s office will be sending some forward. Associate Provost for Academic Programs **Chevalier** stated that there has been some uncertainty whether what we are doing was an RME or an NUI, however the IBHE stated that this restructuring falls under the RME process, and what is necessary is to have the BOT confirm that this process is indeed an RME. **Bean** (as Senator and not President) asked why we couldn’t have just sent RME’s directly to the IBHE as normal, and also relayed concern over what the final structure may actually look like and whether the structure the Administration originally proposed is where we are heading. **Provost** responded that the IBHE meeting was necessary in order to clarify who speaks to the IBHE and to obtain guidance, and second, they are aware that what was proposed is evolving through a process of collaboration. **Kinsel** stated that the concern seems to be what actually is going to the IBHE. **Provost** stated that the IBHE wants the big picture. **Kinsel** asked whether there is a danger that it then becomes the path we are supposed to follow, and is somewhat uncomfortable in seeking approval for a process that essentially has been approved by only one-third of the faculty, and does not want the IBHE to presume that this is the way it is going to be. **Provost** responded that the IBHE is seeking a framework. **Boulukos** asked if there is a way to give the IBHE the process rather than the outcome. **Provost** affirmed that is what essentially is being asked. Associate Provost **DiLalla** added that the intent is to give the IBHE an overall sense of what we are shooting for, but they are likely going to get individual RME’s. He also pointed out that it is possible that an RME which did not get approved by an

advisory body may still go forward from the President's office. Although the President has been clear that there will not be a "rubber stamp" process, and that his office will thoroughly review all of them before moving forward. **Odum** asked about those RME's that were rejected and where they are in the process. **Chevalier** responded that there is ongoing discussion and meetings on how to address concerns. **Spahr** asked whether the IBHE is being asked to make a decision on a plan that continues to be in flux and not fully supported. **Chevalier** responded that it helps us to have definitions and direction as we move forward so that it doesn't get sent back to square one. The IBHE wants something formal from the BOT. **Bean** (as Senator and not President) asked what the BOT will be told about faculty initiated RME's and whether they are aware of them. **Provost** responded that they are or will be made aware. **Zivkovich** asked for a mechanism of publication so that faculty, staff, students, and the community can be made aware. It would help to minimize bad morale by putting it out there for people to see. **Provost** said they will do so. **Unidentified Senator** asked about status of the other RME's (MCMA, Science) and noted there hasn't been much feedback or guidance for the "middle group" of RME's and the process seems somewhat muddled.

FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL TO THE IBHE

Not present, no report

GRADUATE COUNCIL

Not present, no report

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION ADVISORY COUNCIL

Deadline for self-study is January 2020 with the site visit in February 2020. The team is working on assessing the institution's strategic plan and showing how it relates to some of the HLC criterion, and collecting data for presenting to the HLC.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Wall provided an update of discussions at Executive Council as well as expressing thanks to all who expressed interest in being a candidate for the Judicial Review Board along with thanks to those who helped to administer the elections process and especially those who took time to vote. A final slate of JRB candidates will be presented to the full Senate at the December 11th meeting. A resolution for Senate consideration to be forwarded to the BOT requesting their endorsement of SIUC Reorganization is on the agenda. (Document may be found as a part of the Agenda document for November 13th). Discussion ensued.

Kibby (a member of EC) noted the reasons for this resolution included ensuring that reorganization is placed on the December BOT meeting agenda and that it also provides general support from the Faculty Senate for the concept of reorganization. **Bean** noted that he received several phone calls and comments on this particular resolution, many of whom may not necessarily be in the one-third. The major concern expressed to him was that faculty opinion campus-wide has not necessarily been made known to the BOT. Faculty are eager to move ahead, but where do the faculty on this campus stand? His fear is that not all voices may be heard. Questions were raised concerning the Senate process regarding resolutions. **Wall** noted that the EC, mainly because of time constraints for meeting deadlines of the BOT, has already sent a similarly worded resolution from the Executive Council to the BOT and that this particular resolution is asking the full Senate to send an additional resolution in support of the concept of reorganization. **MOTION** made and **SECONDED** and passed by voice-vote for this resolution from the full Senate to be placed on the floor for further discussion.

Boulukos commented that as a participant in one of the faculty-driven proposals, that he supports and now better understands the concept of this resolution and its intent and not approving a final picture. **Chwalisz** (a member of the EC) commented that the EC knew nothing about this particular resolution before today and that it was put on the agenda without going through the normal process of discussion at the Executive Council, and may have personal differences with some of the specific wording. **Odum** asked about the necessity of this “new one” that came out today and what it adds. **Bean** replied that the EC document talks about those that are in favor of working on reorganization, and does not necessarily address those who are seemingly opposed. But it reiterates and supports much of the EC resolution and is communicating full Senate support. **Chwalisz** explained the problematic language in the resolution states, to only move forward with those that have the support of the majority of the faculty that have already been approved, and does not believe that is the message we want to send. **Boulukos** noted that original concerns with the EC resolution among some faculty was that it seemingly said, hey board...approve whatever is in your hands right now in its current form. The new resolution clarifies many aspects of the ongoing process and puts into the record that the BOT is not voting for approval of a specific plan, but voting on the process. And that is the anxiety that the second resolution would help to clarify. **Odum** commented that this particular resolution seems to be in a negative outlook. **Wall** noted that there was a great deal of discussion at EC and perhaps out of a necessity to meet deadlines, wordsmithing might have been better, but there was no intent for the EC resolution to give a “carte-blanche” to others. It may have resulted in that. **Watson** (a member of the EC) disagreed because she did not believe that is what it says. **Spahr** noted the EC needed to speak for the Senate under time constraints, and now the Senate needs to speak for the faculty as a whole. His belief is that the BOT does not understand and this resolution does not call attention to the many groups that are working on alternative proposals and are being left out of the conversation. **Kibby** suggested that the Senate work on acceptable wording of the resolution today rather than table it or not pass it. **Boulukos** stated that the second resolution does not contradict but clarifies the EC resolution. **Odum** commented that it seems that this resolution was written five minutes before the meeting, and that it was not fully considered. **Unidentified Senator** pointed out that this resolution is not asking for a plan to be approved, but a process to be approved. **Chwalisz** commented that the EC resolution was done basically to put the process on the BOT agenda. And then her thought was to come up with a full Senate resolution after thorough debate and consideration at EC and full Senate, to go forward to the BOT. But EC had no idea this was going to be introduced, and nobody had any opportunity to go back to their constituents to see how they feel, and that this should not even be on the agenda. **Bean** responded to perceived negativity of the language, noting that much of it is highly positive. He suggested as dropping the third and fourth paragraph. **Pond** suggested simply rewriting those two paragraphs now. **Bean** withdrew the resolution.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION

No report

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION POLICY COMMITTEE - Melissa Viernow

Reading of the proposed NUI to add a Department of Emergency Medicine in the School of Medicine was waived by voice vote. Viernow presented a brief overview. NUI passed unanimously by voice vote.

FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE COMMITTEE

No report

BUDGET COMMITTEE

There is a CPBAC meeting on November 28th and will be reported on in future Senate meetings.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Almost every committee has a full complement of faculty.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

No report

OLD BUSINESS

none

NEW BUSINESS

none

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,
James Wall, Vice President
transcribed 020719 from SOM video linkup recording