

MINUTES OF THE 2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE November 14, 2017

ROLL CALL

Members present: Jon Bean, Jason Bond, Alejandro Caceres, Doug Carlson, Kathleen Chwalisz, Sandra Collins, Elizabeth Cox, Jon Davey, Marissa Ellermann, Sandra Ettema, Ahmad Fakhoury, Derek Fisher, Tobin Grant, Heeyoung Han, Constantine Hatziaioniu, Michael Hoane, Bobbi Knapp, Michael Koehler, Nancy Martin, James Mathias, Michael May, Grant Miller, Marcus Odom, Segun Ojewuyi, Robert Spahr, Saikat Talapatra, April Teske, Melissa Viernow, Jim Wall, Cherie Watson, Wendi Zea, Kay Zivkovich

Members absent with Proxy: Howard Motyl (Sarah Lewison), Jim MacLean (Joe Cheatwood proxy), Kyle Plunkett (Gary Kinsel proxy)

Members absent without Proxy: Shawn Cheng, Carolyn Kingcade

Ex-Officios and guests: Matt McCarroll (IBHE FAC Representative), Julie Partridge (Graduate Council Vice Chair), Alice Noble-Allgire, Cordy Love, Johnathan Flowers, Randy Hughes, Debbie Bruns, Matt Gorzalski, David Gilbert, Pamela Smoot, Phil Howze, Mary Black.

MINUTES

The minutes from October Senate meeting were presented for approval. C. Watson noted two corrections. K. Zivkovich made a motion to approve the minutes with corrections; seconded by M. Odom; minutes approved by voice vote with one abstention.

REPORTS/REMARKS

1. **Faculty Senate President - K. Chwalisz** opened by welcoming everyone to the meeting and added that what is being discussed today is more than question as to whether or not to keep departments; who wouldn't vote to keep departments; we all have concerns about the logistics and implications about the potential eliminations of departments; Chwalisz stated that it is just not that simple; departments have been decimated by the loss of students, faculty and staff; we are dealing with a very complex question; Administration has proposed a reorganization that has been suggested as a means to build critical mass and interdisciplinary collaboration by combining the departments of the schools; we have heard from Administration that we have to eliminate departments in order to make the structural changes that are being proposed as a means of moving the institution forward; Chwalisz drew attention to the minutes from the Faculty Senate's working meeting with the Chancellor ([Attachment A](#)); this document was distributed and shared multiple way across campus; Chwalisz pointed out that the argument that was seen in the document was that we have to eliminate departments in order to move forward with the proposed structural changes; because departments have been defined in a very specific way in a collective bargaining agreement or other University policy documents such that the existence of departments precludes the existence of schools at the same administrative level in the proposed reorganization; Chwalisz continued by saying we have heard from the Faculty Association President in an email that went out on November 13, that a contract does not rule out having departments in schools; on a related note, we have seen a group of faculty that have been having meetings on and off campus; these meeting have included Faculty Association and non-association members; they are known as the Coordinating Committee for Change (CCC); the CCC are working on core principles for change, which are promising, but those core principles or any kind of plan has not been seen; the two basic positions that we are dealing with is that we can have departments or we can't have departments; we have not seen clear evidence supporting either of those positions; Chwalisz continued by saying that there are representatives of the Faculty Association and the CCC in the audience; they composed the resolution that we are going to be talking about today; there

are not Administrative representatives present; the Chancellor and Co-Provosts are away on University business and are not here to represent the Administrative position; Chwalisz closed by saying there is one final question inherent in the discussion we will have today, it is the question as to the roll of the Faculty Senate in issues such as these; this is an important question we all need to ask ourselves as Senators; the Faculty Senate Executive Council has been discussing this and has been conceptualizing the Senate's roll as a bridge; a neutral party to weigh arguments on all sides; Chwalisz added that this has not been a discussion of the full Senate, but it is something that she would like to everyone to think about today.

2a. **Chancellor Montemagno** No Report

2b. **Provost Office - Lizette Chevalier (Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Acting in Capacity of Co-Provost)** No Report

T. Grant made a motion to suspend the rules, move the resolution from the CCC and discuss it now. Seconded by J. Bean. A vote was taken by show of hands; 23 in favor, 5 opposed, 5 abstentions.

J. Bean read the resolution ([Attachment B](#))

K. Chwalisz noted that everyone should have an opportunity to speak about this resolution and suggested that speaking time be limited because of the number of Senators present and the amount of time for the meeting.

J. Mathis made a motion to limit speaking time to two minutes, seconded by C. Haziadoni. A vote was taken by show of hands; 29 in favor, 0 opposed, 4 abstentions.

J. Bean stated with regard of the role of the Faculty Senate, under the powers and responsibilities as stated in the operating papers, speak directly to the question today; Bean quoted the Faculty Senate operating paper Section 1.B.1.c. *"The Faculty Senate is charged with the responsibility for encouraging and facilitating active and effective faculty involvement in policy determination and decision-making particularly in all academic units at all levels within the university"*; today's discussion is about the most basic academic unit under our current structure which is Departments; Bean added that he understands that people want change and he accepts that; there is concern that the "baby will be thrown out with the bath water" and there are positive things that departments can do to pull us forward in support of the overall restructuring; keep in mind that the elimination of departments means the elimination of operating papers; when you rewrite the operating papers, there is no authority beneath the school, it is all advisory, it's all input; the position of Division Coordinators is the position the Chancellor has likened to that of Undergraduate or Graduate Directors except that they do not report to your department, they report to the School Director; individual faculty do not have direct input; Bean quoted a faculty members concerns "the operating paper is going to be a mess, here is a problem no one has realized yet, Administration is forced to honor the rules established by our operating papers, faculty have enormous control over all aspects of our professional life, the new operating papers have to be approved by the new Provost, the faculty will have every disadvantage."; (two minute limit was called, another Senator gave their two minutes to Bean so he can continue) "I think departments and programs must retain their own operating papers, this is extremely important"; Bean continued by saying that many have persevered through troubles at SIU; think back one, three, five, or ten years ago, out of the many problems that have been discussed about SIU, has anyone thought the problem we had was having department and departmental operating papers; if anything, trust is probably better earned and received in your departments as compared to administrators who come and go; Bean added that he understands that there are those that want to wait and see, unfortunately, as was indicated by the Chancellor, we are on his timeline; it is our responsibility as stated in the operating paper, to discuss this; we have been through troubled times; from unsupportive legislatures to budget catastrophes; some have turned down offers to teach elsewhere hoping that SIU will make changes; during two decades of crisis, departments have offered many of us solace, a place to feel like we make a meaningful contribution to our students and community.

C. Hatziadoni stated that the issue is not so much as department or school, the plan takes different programs and creates schools; the Chancellor says that such plans and structure already exist at SIU; this structure resembles John A. Logan, no other university in the United States has this kind of structure.

S. Lewison suggested amending the resolution to say this process has to be done in phases; if administration is really serious about governing from below, some department and colleges need time to consider this.

S. Lewison made a motion to make a friendly amendment.

S. Lewison suggested "Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate opposes the universal elimination of all academic departments on campus for now so that all of the bodies concerned can take time to do it right." and the second one would be "...faculty be encouraged and allowed to pursue all productive proposals for change, including those eliminating departments or retaining departments."

J. Bean restated the suggested wording.

Brief discussion followed about the wording of the friendly amendment.

T. Grant clarified that the discussion now is about the proposed friendly amendment; if the vote is no, we would go back to the original resolution.

J. Bean read the proposed amendment "Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate opposes the universal elimination of all academic departments on campus for now so that all of the bodies concerned can take time to do it right." and the second one would be "Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the faculty be encouraged and allowed to pursue all productive proposals for change, including those eliminating or retaining academic departments."

More discussion followed.

A. Teske stated that she would like to restate and rephrase to make sure she is understanding the issue; she hears that people are in agreement that changes need to be made and that people are fairly in agreement that changes need to happen quickly; so the main issue is with his starting point; the Chancellor has said that he is entertaining proposals, a lot of which include not eliminating departments; so the issue is not that we have not had a say-so or have not been allowed to send in proposals, the issue is that the Chancellor is saying regardless of what you send to me there will be no departments.

J. Bean replied by saying yes, that is the heart of the issue; the resolution only addresses the issue of departments.

C. Watson stated that any changes will reset the timeline and that is why we would not be able to get that through; they are to going to reset the timeline.

S. Ojewuyi stated that he is going to respond to the last two presentations; the first point is that the Chancellor has given the opportunity to participate in in the formulation of this proposal; the second point is that when it comes to the issue of eliminating departments, the Chancellor has said no; that immediately neutralizes the first point in that we have been given room to participate in the discussion; the resolution has already taken care of the proposed amendment because it says "allowed to pursue all productive proposals for change"; that includes all new proposals; if we are working from the premise that according to the Chancellor, all departments should be eliminated, to introduce the wording "to eliminate or retain", that wording is already there.

B. Knapp pointed out that the wording "for now" is not measurable and suggested eliminating the first "therefore" and keeping the final "resolved" as previously suggested.

T. Grant made a motion to divide the question and vote on the first part which is to remove the first "therefore" and then vote on the second part to keep the final "resolved" as previously suggested; "...the Faculty Senate recommends that the faculty be encouraged and allowed to pursue all productive proposals for change, including those eliminating or retaining academic departments."

Discussion and clarification followed.

T. Grant clarified that there will be a vote on the wording changes first then vote on the two "therefores" separately; we are not voting on the final resolution, just on the proposed amendments.

S. Lewison retracted her proposed amendments and stated that she was just trying to discuss the issue of the timeline and the elimination of departments.

No proposed amendments, discussion is back to the original resolution and the proposed amendment from B. Knapp.

T. Grant made a motion to eliminate the first "therefore" and keep the second "therefore" stating "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the faculty be encouraged and allowed to pursue all productive proposals for change, including those eliminate, reduce or retain academic departments."

Seconded by B. Knapp.

Discussion followed.

J. Cheatwood noted that taking out the first "therefore" takes the teeth out of the resolution.

S. Ojewuyi stated that the concern is no having the word "opposes" takes the heart out of the resolution; the second part states that the "faculty be encouraged and allowed to pursue"; the Chancellor may argue that he has already done that by asking for our email feedbacks.

J. Bean stated that the second "resolve" certainly allows for the elimination of departments, merging of others, and retaining of others; the first "resolve" certainly gets at the heart of the matter; what we are opposing is any elimination of any department; we are not opposing any mergers, we are opposed to the universal elimination of departments; that is what the Chancellor has put on the table for us to consider.

Brief discussion followed about having a timeline. It was noted that the administration has a fast track timeline.

J. Wall made an observation that the question before us is about this amendment and not about creating some alternative proposals, which perhaps this body might consider at some point.

C. Hatziadoniu called the question of the amendment vote; seconded by M. Odom; 5 in favor, 22 opposed, 4 abstentions. Motion did not pass.

Discussion is back to the original resolution.

G. Miller stated that he wants to address two things; one is the concern of time and the other is the confusion we have had in regards to the definition of departments and chairs in our operating papers and policies; in terms of time, in Teacher Education, the State raised the cutoff score of admission; as a result we went from 130 applicants to 8 in the next semester; over the past two years we have been in the process making changes and having these discussions; secondly, what is challenging about this proposal right now is being totally confused about if the definition is departments being so restrictive right now; basically to the point that if there are departments, there is no restructuring; we have heard two different sides of that argument; No one has presenting language on this; Miller stated that he is suspicious of a "one size fits all" and added that he would have liked this resolution to be presented at the December meeting so that this language could be presented from both sides.

T. Grant stated that when Article 9 was put in the CBA, they weren't thinking of eliminating all departments on campus; it was written with the idea that History and Political Science might need to go together; Grant added that his reading of this resolution is that it is just saying no to universal elimination of departments; the Chancellor can move departments around in to new colleges and new structures as long as he keeps academic units in place he can make the changes like that without FA approval and without Senate approval. Grant continued by saying that goal number one is to eliminate all departments on campus.

A. Fakhoury stated that it is his understanding that the Chancellor has nothing against departments; they want to eliminate the Chair position and they cannot have departments without Chairs; if you go back to the minutes from the November 7 working meeting, you cannot have a school where you would have schools and departments in the same colleges; so that is going to affect the restructuring; there is other information that we do not have.

A. Fakhoury made a motion to postpone the original question until the December Senate meeting in order to get more information from Administration where they can convince us one way or the other. Seconded by C. Watson.

Discussion followed about opposing the delay, the Chancellor having many opportunities to discuss the elimination of departments, the argument to move this quickly, the academic units becoming very large and the dilution of the disciplines, the elimination of departmental operating papers.

No further discussion.

Question called for the motion of postponement of the resolution; 9 in favor, 21 opposed, 1 abstention. Motion did not pass.

Discussion is back to original resolution.

G. Kinsel stated that he has heard from Undergraduate Advisors that students are coming up to them and saying that they have heard that they are eliminating their departments and added that students choose to go to colleges with departments that they can be a part of; this plan will undermine that process; Kinsel added that the only institutions he knows of that has schools instead of departments are Junior colleges; why would students want to come to "a four year comprehensive research university" that no longer claims to have any departments?; the notion that the responsibilities of a chair being combined with other departments is ludicrous and naive.

C. Watson commented that as a parent with two children, one through college and one looking at colleges, they are not as worried about departments, they are worried about degrees and added that is something that she feels faculty focusses on and not as much as what students focus on.

J. Mathias stated that the point is really recruitment and retention; what we need is a model that moves forward with having resources to do what we need to do; Mathias added that as far as the resolution goes, he does not have enough information and will probably abstain.

K. Zivkovich stated that it is her understanding that colleagues in COLA are concerned that across the board elimination is not really allowing us to have a choice.

M. Odom stated that he has also consulted with his colleagues as well as students; it is agreed that students are not coming to a department, they are coming to a program; Odom added that his colleagues feel that the restructuring might make it possible for them to do some things they weren't able to do before; Odom continued by saying that all of the faculty he polled said vote no to the resolution because they don't see any new things that can help what we need to do here; based on what has been presented today, this resolution is not going to solve anything.

S. Ojewuyi stated that the Chancellor raised two negative ideas at the beginning of this process; 1) there

are people who are resistant to change; 2) as a result of their resistance, they are fear-mongering; these two are not true; we should all work from the premise that we are working towards a better University; we have been here for quite some time; we have gone through several changes and have been willing participants; this resolution says that we oppose the universal elimination of all departments; it doesn't detour those that want to have schools; what it encourages is a more robust conversation and the participation of faculty in the process; departments can go back and review their resources and see if they will be able to continue to exist and then decide if they want to be a school or not; Ojewuyi continued by saying that this proposal has not really been well thought out; for example, Theater has forever shared a PhD with Communication Studies; under this proposal, it would be uprooted and moved to Social Sciences; we do not know who will own the PhD in Theater because it would be moved to Social Sciences; if this was a properly examined process, we would be able to clarify all this; this is why we have this resolution to say let's not do a universal elimination of departments; Ojewuyi continued by saying he applauds the Chancellor for his initiative and courage to come and step in here with this; he has engineered this conversation.

J. Davie stated that it is worth noting that this timeline is set for having new offerings next fall; if it delays beyond this time, it won't happen; our timeline will constrain the Chancellor's.

D. Carlson stated that the School of Medicine has their first year students and departments of the School of Medicine are housed at the Carbondale campus; it is proposed that the departments of the School of Medicine located in Carbondale will be absorbed in to this new structure, leaving Springfield alone for now since what we do in clinical departments is quite different; there are some regulatory issues; the School of Medicine is proud to say that we are the only medical school in North America to go through the last two cycles of accreditation without a single demerit; no other medical school can say that; in fact the medical school at St. Louis University is on probation largely because of an issue where the responsibility for the School of Medicine needs to report to the Dean of the Medical School; we are concerned about our accreditation if this goes through and involves the departments within the School of Medicine as has been discussed by the Chancellor.

S. Lewison stated that it has been said that our vote has consequences, can we explore those consequences before we move forward with a vote?; what will it look like if we slow down this process; Lewison added that she feels that the Senate putting its feet down and pushing back is a part of what we do; another part is to give productive proposals for going forward; what will it mean if this process takes a lot longer?

S. Ojewuyi stated that the first opportunity or timeline that we have and probably the only one we have is the 90 day response period; if total elimination is not off the table, then we are constraining our response; the Senate has platform to say this is what we want; the Senate's roll is advisory and it is up to the Chancellor to take it or not; this resolution gives us the room to be part of the process.

A. Fakhoury stated that he agrees that the Senate's roll is advisory; the concern is that by the Senate doing this, especially after the working meeting with the Chancellor which was very positive, we are basically saying in spite of your efforts, we disagree; the Chancellor is going to proceed the way he wants to proceed.

M. Odom stated that he also agrees; this resolution is making a statement is only advisory, so it's not really going to accomplish anything; the only thing it is going to do, if it is passed, is to tell the Chancellor we want to put up as much of a road block as possible.

K. Chwalisz stated that she attended on of the CCC meetings and actually encouraged this resolution to be sent to us in the first place; Chwalisz added that the struggle is what exactly are we saying; it come down to "he said" "he said"; the Provost office is saying if we have departments and department chairs we cannot have the school structure; the Faculty Association is saying there is nothing in the contract the precludes that; we have not seen documentation supporting either side.

S. Lewison stated that she has asked three people for that language and it didn't come.

K. Chwalisz stated that we have also not received any language from the FA; we have heard arguments on both sides; we do not know what the truth is.

J. Cheatwood stated that this resolution says that this is the one thing we see as a non-start, the wholesale elimination of our academic homes, the places where we agreed to take jobs, the places where we agreed to stand for tenure and promotion.

More discussion followed about keeping departments and letting those that want schools, have schools; the loss of competitive advantage by not having departments.

C. Watson commented that the Chancellor stated that he is not opposed to going back to the department model; the Chancellor came and told us what he was going to do and he's pretty much done it; we've had input and changes have been made because of that input; so far he has been a man of his word; Watson added that she would hate for us to get bogged down in something like this and miss an opportunity to realize our success in the future.

W. Zea stated that she feels the Chancellor is being somewhat disingenuous last week when he talked about this all being about shared governance and about the faculty getting to make their own decisions; when in fact his proposal takes a lot of power away from the faculty; Zea added that she feels this resolution states we are against universal elimination of departments and it still leaves plenty of room for change.

K. Chwalisz called for a paper ballot vote on the resolution; ballots were distributed and collected; G. Miller and A. Ortiz tallied the ballots.

E. Cox made a motion to reinstate the rules, seconded by K. Zivkovich; motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3. **Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Matt McCarroll**
([Attachment C](#)) ([Attachment D](#))
4. **Graduate Council – Julie Partridge** reported that the Graduate Council approved four resolutions at its November 2 meeting; Resolution in Support of Master's Degree Changes in Psychology; Resolution in Support of Online MBA Concentration in Analytics; Resolution in Support of a Change to Credit Hour Requirement for Accelerated Master's Programs; Resolution in Support of a Modification of the Policy allowing for the Exemption of the TOEFL Requirement. Partridge added that they started discussion on the Visiting Scholar Intellectual Property Agreement.
5. **HLC Accreditation Committee – Ruth Ann Rehfeldt** – No report
6. **New Student Programs – Cordy Love, Director** started by saying his department oversees the orientation, transition, and retention programs for the campus; Love stated that Saluki Startup is really big for all incoming students; his office collaborates with a lot of different departments from across campus; the Weeks of Welcome (WOW) program is going to be expanded to six weeks bringing it right up to Family Weekend; we want to get the support of the academic side and include that in WOW; we want to make the last three weeks of WOW about how we can support our students from the academic side.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – Ahmad Fakhoury – K. Chwalisz provided the results of the voting ballots for the Resolution Opposing the Elimination of All Academic Departments; 33 total ballots; 19 in favor; 11 opposed; 3 abstentions; resolution passed.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION POLCY COMMITTEE –Sandra Collins, Chair read the Resolution to Recommend Approval of Proposed Internal Program Reviewers for the University Core Curriculum Program Review ([Attachment E](#))

FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE COMMITTEE – Bobbi Knapp / Marissa Ellermann, Co-Chairs No report

BUDGET COMMITTEE – Derek Fisher, Chair No report

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – Jim MacLean, Chair J. Cheatwood reported that the committee is currently looking for a person to serve as parliamentarian for Senate meetings.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES – Cherie Watson, Chair reported that the JRB election is complete, a final slate of candidates has been chosen by the CoC and Executive Council; the slate of candidates will be voted on at the December 12 Senate meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS K. Chwalisz stated that the concern of Graduate Student teaching and Instructor of Record came up at the November 7 working meeting with the Chancellor; it was suggested that the Senate forms an Ad Hoc committee to look in to this issue and come up with best practices; J. Mathias asked if Graduate Council should be included.

Chwalisz made a motion to form an Ad Hoc committee to look in to Graduate Student teaching and Instructor of Record; seconded by C. Watson; motion passed by show of hands with one abstention.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,
Grant Miller, Secretary
GM: ao