

MINUTES OF THE 2014-2015 FACULTY SENATE
March 17, 2015

ROLL CALL

Members present: Shaikh Ahmed, Philip Anton, George Boulukos, Joe Cheatwood, Terry Clark, Lucian Dervan, Bruce DeVantier, Mark Dolan, Anthony Fleege, Jordan Forbes, Edward Gershburg, David Gilbert, Steven Goetz, Laura Halliday, Edward Heist, Eric Holzmueller, Holly Hurlburt, Andrea Imre, Carolyn Kingcade, Sajal Lahiri, James MacLean, James Phegley, John Reeve, Benjamin Rodriguez, Stacey Sloboda, Gray Whaley, Lyle White

Members absent with Proxy: Judith Davie (Randy Burnside proxy), Ahmad Fakhoury (Jason Bond proxy), Ruth Anne Rehfeldt (Shane Koch proxy), Rachel Stocking (Dave Johnson proxy)

Members absent without Proxy: Sandy Fark, John McSorley, Nancy Martin, Howard Motyl, Rachel Whaley, Mingqing Xiao

Visitors and guests: James Allen (Associate Provost for Academic Programs), Randy Dunn (President/Acting Chancellor), Provost Susan Ford (ex-officio), Lori Merrill-Fink (Director, University Honors Program)

MINUTES

Minutes of the February 10, 2015 meeting were presented. L. Dervan moved to approve the minutes as presented. P. Anton seconded. All in favor, minutes approved as presented.

REPORTS/REMARKS

1. **Jim MacLean** reported that the Chancellor's Search Advisory Committee has developed a list of 15 candidates and plans to have that list down to 10 within the week. MacLean stated that the interview process should begin the first week of April.

MacLean continued by reading the *Faculty Senate-Graduate Council joint Resolution urging the SIU Board of Trustees to take under advisement the published report of the joint Faculty Senate-Graduate Council task force before it acts on any change to the reporting structure for the first professional schools* ([Attachment A](#)). After reading the resolution, MacLean noted that when voting for this resolution, you are voting whether or not these discussions should be faculty driven and out in the open; you are not voting on whether a reporting line change should be made.

L. Dervan stated he will not be voting in favor of the creation of a joint task force because the Law School faculty unanimously supports a change in the reporting structure.

J. MacLean responded by saying that the Law School is missing the point and if changing the reporting line is such a good idea then why wouldn't the Law School like to have impartial faculty saying that they agree and share that data.

L. Dervan stated that the Law School has had the opportunity to share its data with the Board of Trustees.

T. Clark noted that the potential change impacts the entire campus and all of the colleges have a compelling interest to look at some analysis and give their opinion.

A. Imre asked if there has been discussion in the Law School about how this change would affect the promotion and tenure process.

L. Dervan replied that the Law School has no concern about the tenure and promotion process. Dervan explained that the Law School has its own tenure and promotion guidelines and it is his understanding that there would be no significant change.

Provost Ford clarified by saying that the Law School has two levels in the tenure and promotion process; the Dean and Provost. The change would make it only one level of appeal. Ford continued by also clarifying that it is her understanding that the BOT has no interest in separating the Law School from the other First Professional Schools; it is all one package.

G. Boulukos asked if the JRB's role would be affected by the change in reporting lines.

Provost Ford said that she does not know because no one has explored the parameters of this change.

R. Burnside stated that he would like to convey the overwhelming sentiment of the resolution by the Graduate Council; overwhelming but not complete due to a few who do not support it. Burnside continued by noting that the reason the Graduate Council feels strongly about the formation of a task force is because no rationale has been given to support the change and it appears as though something is being hidden. Burnside added that it seems that there is a rush to make a change that will have significant impact on the entire campus. Burnside concluded by saying that getting more information about how this change will affect everything and everyone will at least provide some level of comfort if this change is made.

P. Anton commented that having a task force to address each individual concern is a good idea because the change may work for the Law School, but perhaps work against the School of Medicine. Anton continued by saying that everything needs to be separated out; having a "blanket" idea seems like a bad plan.

J. MacLean asked if there was any further discussion and called for a vote on the resolution. Vote was taken by show of hands. 25 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained.

2a. **President Dunn** reported that it is now time to "pivot" to the next phase in dealing with the budget cuts and added that it is reasonable to assume that there could be a 20% - 22% cut of state-appropriated funds. Dunn stated the budget model being discussed as two rings outside a center core with academic instruction and core student services. The center core will be protected as much as possible. Dunn noted that units and programs are placed in the model in relation to their importance to academic mission and core student services. Units and programs furthest away from the center are more self-supporting units and may be asked to submit a budget plan that reflects the loss of significant state funding. Dunn continued by addressing the potential change in the First Professional Schools reporting line. Dunn reiterated that the Board of Trustees' original timeline was March 20 and added that he will be asking the BOT to push that timeline back to the end of the semester. Dunn stated that Jim Allen will be discussing the proposed change with various accrediting bodies, including the Carnegie Foundation, to make ensure these changes would not jeopardize SIUC's accreditation. Dunn stated that if anything in the reporting line change proposed places SIUC's Carnegie status at risk, it will be difficult if not impossible to move forward with the School of Medicine reporting line change.

S. Lahiri asked what is the benefit of the change. Dunn responded by saying that to some degree, the Board of Trustees does not look at it as having to justify a benefit. Dunn continued by saying that he is careful about speaking for the Board and added that the argument is that the President's role with the School of Medicine is to work with multiple hospitals and the change in reporting line would acknowledge that.

H. Hurlburt asked what the range of action is for this body in response to the budget cut. Dunn responded by saying discussions need to continue to take place, but we are getting to the point of the "pivot" where more things are going to be made public and that will be the queue to become more outspoken and contact elected representatives.

T. Clark commented that Senator Kimberly Lightfoot addressed the Faculty Advisory Council at its February meeting. In her comments to the FAC, Senator Lightfoot stated that higher education has a weak voice in Springfield and that the creation of a higher education caucus would be a way to change that.

Dunn concluded by saying that there will be a budget cut, but as of now, everything is moving forward; faculty searches are not being cancelled and programs have not been stopped. SIUC is still in the business of educating students and progressing them toward a degree.

- 2b. **Provost Ford** reported that Fall enrollment numbers for undergraduates is looking good. Applications are down which was expected because of not using direct marketing to states beyond our border states. Ford added that the increase in enrollment is offset by a reduction in admissions to both the Masters and Doctoral programs. Ford continued by saying that scenarios on how a 0%, 4%, 6%, and 10% increase in tuition will impact the SIUC campus are being presented to the BOT at its March meeting. The BOT is not expected to vote on an increase in tuition until April. Ford concluded by submitting a request to the Faculty Senate to prioritize programs. Ford stated that it is her personal belief that this needs to be a faculty driven process and that it is her preference to have the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council form a joint committee by the end of the semester and provide a final report by Spring 2016.

H. Hurlburt voiced concern about the Faculty Senate-Graduate Council taking on the task of prioritizing programs without the mandate of the new Chancellor.

Provost Ford responded by saying that she would expect that members of the search committee would ask candidates about their view of shared governance during the hiring process of the Chancellor.

H. Hurlburt voiced additional concern about the process outlined in faculty contracts that speak to program changes and eliminations. Hurlburt noted that this concern would have to be taken very seriously in to consideration with whatever this plan generates.

Provost Ford agreed and stated that she nor the President is talking about what, if any, actions might result from this process of prioritization. Ford added that this process could result in information that is of value in all kinds of decisions and that at this point in time, no one is talking about program elimination.

T. Clark noted that we are facing the likely future that to some degree, cuts are coming. Clark added that he feels that it would be irresponsible for faculty not to assess programs.

J. Allen noted that even if there is a process that identifies prioritization, the Program Change Review Committee already has a document that suggests what those metrics might be. It is a document that can provide you with some ideas of what a previous group of senators thought would be appropriate in dealing with programs.

B. Rodriguez stated that nobody knows what is going to happen with the budget and asked how to plan for fall when there are no answers.

Provost Ford responded by saying that there is not a simple answer and has to rely on the fact that the President is working with the Chancellor's budget manager. Ford stated that

while it would be painful, a cut of up to 10% will not affect the core academic mission of the institution. Ford concluded by saying that any information shared about budget cuts is going to cause somebody a lot of upset and hurt and the President has likely not wanted to go there.

D. Johnson commented that if you want any faculty input about big cuts, you have to get that information out there now and actually talk about it. Johnson stated that he believes that both the Provost and President want shared governance and also want to not scare anybody, but you can't have them both.

Provost Ford responded by saying that she does not disagree.

H. Hurlburt proposed three things; a list of State Representative's phone numbers be generated and distributed among our colleagues, an informal vote be taken as to whether or not the Faculty Senate should take on the prioritizing project that the Provost has proposed, and depending on the outcome of the vote; the Senate "deputize" the Executive Council to create such committee.

J. MacLean agreed that it would be appropriate to ask if the faculty is interested in taking on the task of prioritizing programs.

T. Clark clarified that this is not a vote, it is an informal request for the Executive Committee to take up this issue.

H. Hurlburt asked that those in favor of the Executive Committee spending part of their next meeting discussing this issue to raise their hand.

J. MacLean asked if there are any that feel the Senate should have nothing to do with it.

B. DeVantier stated that he not in favor of doing it but doesn't think that the Senate shouldn't have nothing to do with it either.

T. Clark stated that the favorable outcome of the show of hands is just stating that the Executive Committee will discuss this issue at its next meeting and will come back with a plan at the next meeting.

3. **Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE**

Terry Clark reported that the most recent meeting was all about the budget. Clark noted that Senator Kimberly Lightfoot attended the meeting, voiced her support of higher education and stated that she is going to fight the budget proposal "like crazy". Clark stated that Senator Lightfoot is suggesting that a caucus be formed to articulate higher education's story in a compelling way and added that higher education is one of the most vulnerable budgets in the state.

4. **Graduate Council**

Jim MacLean reported that the Graduate Council passed the resolution to form a joint task force regarding the potential change in reporting lines for the first professional schools.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – Sajal Lahiri

S. Lahiri reported that the Executive Committee discussed the joint task force resolution and Judicial Review Board elections.

BUDGET COMMITTEE – Andrea Imre

A. Imre reported that she has nothing to add to the information that was previously shared. Imre added that the Executive Budget and Planning Committee is now meeting every two weeks.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES – Terry Clark

Jim MacLean reported that there were eight nominations for the JRB; as a committee we brought forward four that we agreed would provide the best representation, in accordance with the current members as well as based on experience. A. Imre read the list of candidates. ([Attachment B](#))

Jonathan Bean, College of Liberal Arts

John Fraedrich, College of Business

Stephen Shih, College of Applied Sciences and Arts

Janice I. Thompson, College of Mass Communication and Media Arts

Ballots were handed out to each Senator. A. Imre and A. Ortiz collected the ballots and left the room for counting. The four faculty members were unanimously approved to serve on the Judicial Review Board.

A. Imre read a motion to appoint Jonathan Bean as Chair of the JRB and Sajal Lahiri as Vice Chair of the JRB. ([Attachment C](#)) J. MacLean asked if there was any comment or discussion. The Chair and Vice Chair were unanimously approved.

FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE COMMITTEE – Holly Hurlburt / Anthony Fleege

H. Hurlburt referenced the letter composed by the FSW committee ([Attachment D](#)) and thanked those who provided feedback. Hurlburt asked if there were any comments or revisions to the letter. None voiced. Hurlburt stated that she would forward the letter to the BOT. Hurlburt reported that after a conversation with Linda McCabe Smith, the information regarding the Exit Interview Survey will now be forwarded to the Dean's Council for their input.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – Gray Whaley

No Report

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION POLCY COMMITTEE – Bruce DeVantier / Rachel Whaley

B. DeVantier read the Resolution to Add the Professional Pilot Specification to the BS in Aviation Management in the College of Applied Sciences and Arts. ([Attachment E](#)) J. MacLean asked if there was any comment or discussion. None voiced. Resolution passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

INVITED GUEST – Lori Merrill-Fink, Director, University Honors Program

L. Merrill-Fink presented her report ([Attachment F](#)) and asked if there were any questions.

H. Hurlburt voiced three concerns/comments/questions: 1) why were changes made without faculty input; 2) why not make the program harder to get in to instead of having a "watered-down" program; 3) the integral part of an Honors Degrees is having to do an extra project, please strongly encourage these students to do so. L. Merrill-Fink responded by saying that she does not want to mislead anyone in to thinking that the Honors Program is "watered-down". Students that complete an honors thesis will receive transcript recognition with "Honors Thesis" and the title of the thesis on the transcript; those completing the certificate will have "Honors Certificate" on the transcript. Merrill-Fink noted that they now have permission to cap enrollment to the Honors Program.

G. Whaley reiterated the previous concern about making the program harder to get in to. Merrill-Fink responded by saying that they are looking into ways to be even more selective that they currently are.

S. Ahmed stated that he does not understand why writing a thesis is an option; it should be mandatory. Merrill-Fink responded by saying that every student is encouraged to complete a thesis. Merrill-Fink added

that it is difficult for Education students to do an Honors Diploma because they are teaching in their final year and do not have the same connection with a faculty member.

S. Lahiri asked if there is excess demand for placement in the Honors Program, what ways are there to exclude students. L. Merrill-Fink responded by saying that they now have a deadline and can cap enrollment.

A. Imre asked if capping enrollment would have a negative effect on enrollment. L. Merrill-Fink responded by saying that not capping enrollment was perhaps previous administrations way of preventing a negative effect on enrollment.

S. Lahiri interjected and restated his previous concern; other than a "first come first serve" basis, is it not better to have higher standards when admitting honors program students. L. Merrill-Fink responded by saying that the Honors Program does have standards and are looking at other models. Merrill-Fink noted that they would welcome any suggestions.

J. Allen noted an observation that the Honors Program is no longer seen as an extension of enrollment management and is now seen as an academic program.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,
Philip Anton, Secretary
PA:ao