

MINUTES OF THE 2016-2017 FACULTY SENATE November 8, 2016

ROLL CALL

Members present: Shaikh Ahmed, Deborah Burris, Joe Cheatwood, Kathleen Chwalisz, Sandra Collins, Elizabeth Cox, Jon Davey, Judy Davie, Sandra Ettema, Ahmad Fakhoury, Sandy Fark, David Gilbert, Tobin Grant, Michael Hoane, Bobbi Knapp, Michael Koehler, James Mathias, Grant Miller, Howard Motyl, Ryan Netzley, Kyle Plunkett, John Reeve, Benjamin Rodriguez, Robert Spahr, Saikat Talapatra, Melissa Viernow, James Wall, Gray Whaley, Peggy Wilken, Kay Zivkovich

Members absent with Proxy: Jason Bond (Seb Pense proxy), Ruth Anne Rehfeldt (Michael May proxy), Shelley Tischkau (Amber Pond proxy), Cherie Watson (Jessica Zieman proxy)

Members absent without Proxy: Shawn Cheng, Terry Clark, Wendi Zea

Ex-Officios and guests: Jim Allen (Associate Provost for Academic Programs) proxy for Provost Susan Ford (Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, ex-officio); Julie Partridge (Graduate Council representative); Andrea Imre (Associate Professor, Library Affairs), Jim Garvey (Interim Vice Chancellor for Research), Wayne Glass (Director, OSPA); Phil Anton (Department of Kinesiology, Spirit Committee representative); Randy Burnside (Deputy Associate Provost for Academic Programs); Matt McCarroll (Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE)

MINUTES

The minutes from the September and October meetings will be approved at the December meeting.

REPORTS/REMARKS

1. Judy Davie welcomed SIU President Randy Dunn.

President Dunn spoke about the SIU System Strategic Improvement Plan and provided review draft copies to those present. ([Attachment A](#))

J. Davie thanked President Dunn for addressing the Senate and continued with her remarks. Davie reported that the Chancellor Search Committee is underway and is chaired by Laurie Achenbach; the Executive Council is working a letter to send to the Illinois Senate regarding the appointment of a faculty member to the IBHE board.

- 2a. **Interim Chancellor Colwell** reported that he has been having college meetings and has received some very good input; some of the suggestions have started to be acted on; the Lincoln Laureate has been chosen and an official announcement will be this Saturday; Colwell stated that he is meeting with the President of John A. Logan College to continue discussing how SIUC and John A. can work together. Colwell announced that a couple of Extra Help staff will be hired to help make sure that the Eclipse 2017 is a success; they will be paid with money generated by the Eclipse. Provost Ford commented that the Academic Calendar for next fall was set two years ago; at that time, it seemed like a good idea to have classes on the day of the eclipse; it is clear now that the disruption by the sheer number of people coming to Carbondale to view the eclipse will make holding classes on that day absurd. Colwell added that the day of the eclipse will also be an administrative closure day as well.
- 2b. **Provost Ford** reported that Spring 17 enrollment is down in freshmen and sophomores; roughly equal to the degree that we were down in the fall. Junior and Senior enrollment is slightly up; Master and PhD is down. Fall 17 applications are down; some of this is attributed to not offering free applications this year. Fall admissions is down over 700

students; those admitted have higher ACT; stronger students are being admitted. Fall 17 transfer students are up; Master student enrollment is flat as well as PhD students. The search for Interim Dean of MCMA has concluded; Deb Tudor has accepted that position. Library Affairs Dean search is ongoing. Interim Director of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute is Jak Tichenor. Jim Allen will be retiring in December; advertising materials for a search for a replacement for Associate Provost for Academic Programs are being finalized; it will be an internal search.

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

No report.

4. **Graduate Council** reported that the Graduate Council met on November 3, 2016; the Joint Task Force on Academic Prioritization resolution was read for the first time; a resolution for creating a Graduate Council ad hoc committee on faculty mentoring and training was passed; a resolution in support of the creation a position of coordinator diversity advisement recruitment and fellowship office at the graduate school. From the new programs committee there was a resolution passed in support of an undergraduate and graduate masters accelerated entry program in criminology and criminal justice; a resolution in support of the addition of a joint masters degree in higher education with a juris doctorate degree.

J. Davie added that the first reading of the resolution from the joint task force is a resolution in favor of accepting that in support of it; it is intended to be a joint resolution with graduate council and faculty senate; graduate council requires two readings; this resolution will be coming to the senate as well.

5. **Non-Academic Program Review Committee**

A. Imre reported that the committee continues to work on the final report which will be presented to the Chancellor.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – Howard Motyl

No report

J. Davie carried over unfinished business from the October meeting and called on the Governance Committee chair to give the report.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – Deborah Burris, Chair

D. Burris provided some background information about the Resolution to Rescind Approval of the Resolution to Recommend Promotional Lines for Non-Tenure Track Faculty ([Attachment B](#)); in April 2013, during negotiations the NTT FA was asked by the Board of Trustees to bring to this to the Faculty Senate for study; the subcommittee did that and proposed the resolution FS1316 (page 2 of attachment B); the resolution was passed by the Senate; this created the problem in 1999 when the FA came in to play, there was a Principles of Agreement for constituencies (page 3 of attachment B) that did not override the collective bargaining groups; when the non-tenure track came in, that was never updated; the Faculty Senate should not have passed that resolution; the 2013 resolution states specifics and not support. Burris read the resolution. J. Davie opened the floor for discussion. No discussion. J. Davie called for a vote. Resolution passed unanimously by show of hands.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION POLCY COMMITTEE – Ryan Netzley, Chair

R. Netzley read the Resolution to Recommend Approval of the RME to Add a Specialization in Energy and a Minor in Energy Engineering in the Department of Mechanical Engineering ([Attachment C](#)). S. Ahmed commented that "Energy" is such a broad term. J. Mathias commented that "Energy" referenced here is self-evident because the resolution is in the Department of Mechanical Engineering. Provost Ford added the degree that is being talked about is within a major; that a specialization that focusses on energy related issues in one major and a specialization focusing on energy related issues in another major are two different things; because the majors are different. No further discussion. J. Davie called for a vote. Resolution passed unanimously by show of hands with one opposed.

R. Netzley moved to remove the resolution regarding the approval of internal reviewers from the table. Seconded by G. Whaley. J. Davie clarified that this is a vote to take the resolution off the table and open it for discussion. 21 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained.

J. Davie clarified that the previous resolution was divided into two resolutions. Davie read the following paragraphs from the Provost's office to the Faculty Senate regarding the list of internal reviewers.

"Please find attached a spreadsheet listing the proposed internal reviewers for the AY17 cycle. We are seeking Faculty Senate approval during your September meeting. Because of the state's budget impasse, which has severely limited the lack of resources, and, the limited number of external reviews in this academic review cycle (3), we have decide to move forward with desktop reviews for this academic year, and therefore, we are requesting two internal reviewers per review.

As you may already know, the Guidelines for Program Review, whose revisions were approved by both the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council in 2011, stipulate the Senate's review of the names to ensure that the proposed reviewers are appropriate and that there are no obvious conflicts of interest. If there are any reservations about one or more reviewers, please set their names aside and allow the others to proceed so all unaffected programs can proceed with their reviews.

If you have any questions or concerns about the spreadsheet or the review process, please feel free to contact Randy Burnside, Deputy Associate Provost for Academic Programs, at Burnside@siu.edu or at 453-7653."

J. Davie pointed out that the review of this list was requested to be complete by September; these reviews are already in progress; it is also noted that one of these reviews was part of the Graduate School and the Graduate Council approved the internal reviewers with no concerns or discussion.

R. Netzley stated that this is a simple resolution; the program reviews are going to move forward whether or not this body approves the reviewers; the task of the body is to approve or disapprove the list of reviewers; if you think that it is not a big deal that there are no external reviewers, then you should oppose this resolution; if you think that external reviewers are important for the quality control of this place, then this is one step in favor of that.

Provost Ford stated that she was not present for the last Senate meeting; in establishing this modification to the program review process for this year, consultation was had with Jim Allen and Randy Burnside to assure we were saying we would not have external reviewers on any review team; if it was appropriate to the program, it was a PhD program, if it were a program that had substantial laboratory and facility issues then we would move to have external reviewers on campus; this was not a move to exclude external reviewers either as a major plan going forward nor to exclude external reviewers in all cases.

R. Burnside commented that in principle, he does not disagree with statements made by R. Netzley and added that he does not believe the entire story has been told; there were three reviews; one was the Paul Simon Institute; the other two were interim reviews because both programs had done substantial restructuring and they are required to have an interim review; both of these will be reviewed again on their regular cycle in five years instead of eight years; both of these programs will go through external review on their regular cycle; we felt that because of budgetary issues, we didn't need to go through the expense of an external review for an interim review. Burnside added that there is a second issue that has not been told; a proposal had been put forward to UEPC in which Dr. Ford described to some detail about moving forward with a more efficient way to do program review which by all means includes external review; it does not get rid of external review; it gives more flexibility and power to the unit being reviewed about how they perceive their need for external review. Burnside continued by saying that there has been a huge issue made about external review; both he and the Provost believe in external review; it is important to understand that external review is not mandated; there are plenty of universities that do not do external reviews; we should not be one of those institutions. Burnside stated that he has not received any comments regarding the proposal from the Provost nor has that proposal been mentioned in this particular discussion. Burnside added that program review does have to move forward, but that

doesn't mean that the office of the Associate Provost doesn't take serious consideration what the Faculty Senate believes about this proposal or any proposal. Burnside concluded that he is happy to answer any question about this process.

G. Whaley asked if there is any mention of the interim review versus the regularly scheduled review and is it that hard to put that kind of language in the document.

Burnside responded by saying No it is not hard to put that language in; it was never our plan to completely get rid of external reviews; this decision to not have an external review for this program was made because it is an interim review; they will have an external review in a few years; it was a budgetary decision because that is the sad reality we are living in.

B. Rodriguez stated that we are going to lose quorum if we don't move forward and reviewed the two questions that are being presented to the Senate; one is the recommendation of the UEPC to reject the internal program reviewers list. B. Rodriguez asked if that was ever voted on. J. Davie said no, it was not. B. Rodriguez stated that we need to take a vote on that recommendation as a Senate. Rodriguez added there is a second question that is mixed in which is are those listed on the internal reviewers list capable of being internal reviewers.

J. Davie stated that importance of the revised policy is the chance to incorporate all comments that are coming off the Senate floor in to what we move forward with. Davie added that she feels that is a very important role of the Senate and would like to see that proceed.

J. Davie stated that the question that is before the Senate is the rejection of the list of internal reviewers and a second resolution stating that Faculty Senate recommends that the Associate Provost of Academic Programs proceed with the full complement of internal and external reviewers as detailed in the existing program policy review.

Provost Ford reiterated that the internal and external review process is time delimited; the Senate is given time to respond and then we move forward; if you don't respond, the assumption is you choose not to give your input; at least one of those reviews is completed; the others are in process; the programs accepted the reviewers list.

G. Whaley it has become pointless to vote on this since the process has moved forward.

A motion was made and seconded to table the resolution to reject the list of internal reviewers. The move to table did not pass.

R. Netzley read the Resolution to Recommend Rejection of Internal Program Reviewers List. ([Attachment D](#)) J. Davie called for a vote. 7 in favor. 10 opposed. 6 abstentions. The resolution did not pass.

R. Netzley removed the Resolution that the Associate Provost for Academic Programs and the Provost proceed with the full complement of external and internal reviewers as detailed in the existing program review policy.

FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE COMMITTEE – Ruth Anne Rehfeldt/Shaiikh Ahmed, Co-Chairs

S. Ahmed reported that the Faculty Exit Interview did not move forward when it was presented in 2014; the committee is looking in to it; the committee is discussing the grievance procedures and the ICE form.

BUDGET COMMITTEE – Gray Whaley/Kathleen Chwalisz-Rigney, Co-Chairs

G. Whaley reported that the committee is now called the Planning and Budget Advisory Council; the Chancellor does not attend these meetings, last meeting discussed tuition and fees and recommended that SIUC maintain its relative position as the third least expensive research university.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES – Ahmad Fakhoury, Chair

No Report

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Rodrigues, Secretary
BR:ao