

MINUTES OF THE 2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE October 17, 2017

ROLL CALL

Members present: Jon Bean, Jason Bond, Alejandro Caceres, Doug Carlson, Kathleen Chwalisz, Sandra Collins, Elizabeth Cox, Jon Davey, Marissa Ellermann, Ahmad Fakhoury, Derek Fisher, Tobin Grant, Heeyoung Han, Carolyn Kingcade, Bobbi Knapp, Michael Koehler, James Mathias, Michael May, Grant Miller, Howard Motyl, Segun Ojewuyi, Kyle Plunkett, Robert Spahr, Saikat Talapatra, Melissa Viernow, Jim Wall, Cherie Watson, Wendi Zea, Kay Zivkovich

Members absent with Proxy: Derek Fisher (Bethany Rader proxy), Constantine Hatziaodoniu (Themis Haniotakis proxy), Jim MacLean (Judy Davie proxy), Nancy Martin (Belle Woodward proxy)

Members absent without Proxy: Shawn Cheng, Sandra Ettema, Michael Hoane, Marcus Odom, April Teske

Ex-Officios and guests: Carlo Montemagno (Chancellor), Lizette Chevalier (Associate Provost for Academic Programs, APAP), Elizabeth Lewin (Interim Associate Chancellor for Diversity), Julie Partridge (Graduate Council Vice Chair), Ken Anderson (Final Exam Committee member), Tamara Workman (Director, Registrar's Office), Ruth Anne Rehfeldt (HLC Accreditation Committee), Joseph Brown (Africana Studies), Leonard Gadzekpo (Africana Studies), Johnathan Flowers (Graduate Professional Student Council)

MINUTES

The minutes from September Senate meeting were presented for approval. A. Caceres made a motion to approve the minutes; seconded by S. Talapatra; minutes approved unanimously by voice vote with two abstentions.

REPORTS/REMARKS

1. **Faculty Senate President - K. Chwalisz** announced that the Faculty Senate will be hosting Sips and Snacks with the Chancellor on October 19 at the Underground Barrel Room and Grill; in previous years the Senate has hosted a luncheon and coffee bar, both with poor turnout; the decision to host the event off campus and later in the day was made hoping that there would be more attendance; the JRB nomination ballots have been sent; the deadline to nominate yourself or someone else is October 19; the Chancellor's Open Forum is October 19 from 2:00 – 3:00 p.m. at the Student Center Auditorium; the Ethics Training deadline is November 7; the Faculty Senate Executive Council has been discussing how the Senate can contribute to helping this institution to not only cope with but thrive through this period of growth and change; Chwalisz suggested that one of the things that the Senate can do is to work with your colleagues, listen to their concerns, and help them reframe those things they consider to be a threat into challenges to be solved; Chwalisz continued by saying that she had to look up the definition of the "strawman" proposal and explained that it comes from the "tech" world; it is a rough proposal created for criticism and test; it is thought to facilitate feedback and discussion to allow for the development of a new and better proposal; Chwalisz concluded by challenging the Senate to think about how we can pull together ideas, pull together feedback, and think about working with proposed changes in a way that will help us see this process through in a really productive way.
- 2a. **Chancellor Montemagno** opened by reiterating Chwalisz' comment about growth and change and asked "how about change to grow?"; the framework of the colleges and schools in the strawman is fairly firm, but what falls below it is not; the leadership team has looked at the adjacency and synergy of all the programs that would enable the smaller pieces, which are scattered all over this campus, to come together to be a large coherent effort; Montemagno stated that the academic programming belongs to the faculty; the challenge we all have is to function in true shared governance manner; making decisions that are best for

the University, for your school, and for your own program or personal interest; what is the best thing for your community; Montemagno asked the faculty to dream big, think big, and act big; the biggest challenge we are going to have is time; conclusions are going to have to be reached in a short period of time; the faculty are essentially crafting a whole new university; this is an awesome responsibility and an awesome privilege; the fact of the matter is that the world has changed and we are jumping two steps ahead of everyone else; Montemagno concluded by saying that you have to understand that everything being done is positioning us for success for the future; this will attract more resources, great students and great faculty.

- 2b. **Campus Climate Data Related to Diversity – Dr. Elizabeth Lewin, Interim Associate Chancellor for Diversity** ([Attachment A](#))
- 2c. **Provost Office - Lizette Chevalier (Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Acting in Capacity of Co-Provost)** read a statement from Ruth Anne Rehfeldt regarding the impact on HLC Accreditation. “The purpose of reaccreditation is for the institution to show that it is continuously evaluating its own quality. For purposes of reaccreditation the institution must provide compelling evidence that it is constantly engaged in a culture of improvement. Moreover, student persistence and completion are currently national priorities in higher education, and figure prominently in the Higher Learning Commission’s criteria for reaccreditation. Not acting to reorganize would reflect a lack of a culture of continuous improvement, and a lack of responsiveness to recent trends on student enrollment and retention. The Higher Learning Commission maintains that higher education today must encompass the diversity of society, currency of the curriculum, and expectations for student performance (Higher Learning Commission, 2016) Further, the Commission is poised to evaluate the institution’s “wise management” of its resources (Higher Learning Commission, 2016). Thus, taking steps towards broad, institutional change runs parallel with preparing for a successful reaccreditation.”

J. Mathias made note that in the strawman, there will no longer be a Department of Mechanical Engineering, there will be a School of Engineering; Mathias asked if there will still be program office with a copier and mailboxes.

L. Chevalier responded by saying there are many different ideas on how this is all going to happen, this is shared governance; we still plan on offering the degree programs; faculty own that curriculum; how we find our resources, how we do our committees, some of that is administrative logistics, some of that is shared governance and the redefinition of operating papers; it’s all going to look different a year from now.

S. Ojewuyi stated that there seems to be an assumption that faculty are afraid of change, that assumption is wrong; faculty are not afraid of change, but are afraid of the details; the strawman looks good to some, to others it doesn’t; there are essential issues that were here before the strawman: enrollment, retention, and fiscal challenges; how do we go from the strawman to reaching and solving these problems; that gap is there and it raises speculations; how do we respond to these challenges; if we are to respond in terms of where programs go, where departments go, where we go; we can do that if we understand the vision; otherwise we will be responding to personal opinion and perspectives.

S. Ojewuyi added that the Chancellor stated in his State of the University address that we want to reach the goal of a Research 1 institution; how does the strawman get us there; everyone here has stayed because we have kind of embraced some hope that we can move from here to the other place; we need leadership to help us begin to articulate that.

L. Chevalier responded by saying that the strawman gives us the conceptual framework and from there we can start redefining ourselves; we have an opportunity to get ahead in education and attract and retain students and faculty; we have to do something; the direction we were going before the Chancellor started envisioning the future of SIU wasn’t serving us well; our core values remain the same; the

structure is going to change. Chevalier stated that she is not sure what else she can say other than let's do this, all hands on deck.

S. Ojewuyi stated that faculty want to do this, but not blindfolded; there are very quick deadlines which limit how much time there is to process the information; if you look at the chart, and question some of the changes, you see some unintended challenges coming up; what is going to happen to the Graduate Program; where is the funding and recruitment of the graduate students.

L. Chevalier responded by saying she has been on this campus 22 years; we have been coming up with ideas with limitations like stagnation, budget, and being told no over and over again; this is an opportunity for these ideas to come forward; in the strawman, it didn't show the Graduate School or the Library; there was no intent to marginalize the Graduate School or the tenure and non-tenured faculty in the Library; they are not academic units; we aren't saying those go away; we are saying they are not part of the change that is being proposed.

K. Chwalisz noted that it would have been better if the Chancellor had stayed for the entire meeting; it was discussed at the Executive Council meeting and will hopefully be different in future meetings.

L. Chevalier asked if the Senate would consider having a whole two hour meeting to only discuss the reorganization.

K. Zivkovich stated that it is her understanding that the strawman is a framework to be torn down and rebuilt; leadership is important to do this and leadership is something we have been without; a leadership group was mentioned earlier and it appears that this group has been working with the Chancellor on a variety of different issues; who are these people and why don't we know who these people are so that we can have another venue to share information and ask questions; there is a lot of discussion out there, but not all are being asked; sometimes people need to be asked rather than being in that select group.

L. Chevalier responded by saying that she would first like to address the earlier concerns about the Graduate School and then address these concerns; the Graduate School is funded by undergraduates; State funding is drying up, so more and more Graduate programs are relying on undergraduates; if we don't increase undergraduate enrollment by providing programs and a campus that attracts students here, the Graduate programs are going to go away without the restructuring. Chevalier shared an example; Mechanical Engineering Graduate program is still in place, it is not going anywhere; it's not a department of Mechanical Engineering; there are going to be shared resources from smaller and larger departments so that we can take down some of the barriers. Chevalier stated that now is the time where leadership comes forward; now is the time that the Faculty Senate can operate at a fundamentally different level than it did a year ago.

K. Chwalisz stated that arrangements will be made to have a meeting with the Chancellor specifically for discussing the proposed reorganization.

T. Grant stated that we need to answer two basic questions; 1) what is a school; is it a group that has P and T control over everybody in the unit, do they have the curriculum of everybody in the unit, or is it an administrative person with shared resources; 2) what do chairs of departments do; you want feedback from faculty, units, and programs; what does that entail; who do we tell; do we go to the Dean; do we go to the Provost; do we send something up to the Chancellor; is there a form to fill out; is there a vote that needs to be taken; show us a model of what a school is and then a nuts and bolts, what do you want us to do.

L. Chevalier responded by saying a department usually has one degree program in it; it may have undergraduate, PhD, Masters, and other units in it; these are loosely defined, there is no set definition; the traditional definition is one central area; for example Mechanical Engineering, it has three degree programs; a school would have several degree programs like Allied Health many more; degree programs are lined up under schools; a degree program should have something that allows synergy between the faculty; Chevalier added that she believes P and T will be the responsibility of the faculty to redefine how

the school will be operating; that is shared governance.

T. Grant followed up by clarifying that faculty within the school would then decide how they would divide up P and T, curriculum, and things like that.

L. Chevalier said yes, that is how she understands it and added that if ideas and concerns can be submitted to the portal on the Chancellor's webpage; <http://chancellor.siu.edu/vision2025/feedback.php>.

3. **Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Matt McCarroll**

No report

4. **Graduate Council – Julie Partridge**

J. Partridge reported that there were no action items at the most recent Graduate Council meeting.

5. **HLC Accreditation Committee – Ruth Ann Rehfeldt**

The site visit of the HLC will be Fall 2019 and Spring 2020; an assurance argument, the updated term for self-study, will be submitted in Spring 2019; the process basically involves a 10 year review; the HLC will want to see that the institution has been evaluating itself and making improvements provided by evaluations over the past 10 years; there are five subcommittees that are working hard to collect evidence showing how the institution has met the different core components for reaccreditation; these subcommittees are made up of students, AP Staff, and faculty from across campus; the first deadline is to have written drafts of the assurance argument by this December; there is also a steering committee made up of 49 people from various constituency groups across campus; the steering committee has met twice and delivered feedback from the information provided by the subcommittees; starting Spring and Fall 2018, there will be several opportunities for feedback on the assurance arguments; there will be meetings for feedback; there will be a reaccreditation survey; one of the issues with reaccreditation and the criteria is that the Universities mission has to be very accessible and visible; Rehfeldt asked those present to please let her or someone on the reaccreditation committee know if you have any input or suggestions on how to make the Universities mission more visible to everyone on campus.

6. **Academic Calendar Committee – Jane Nichols**

J. Nichols was not present, but provided a copy of her report for the Senate to review ([Attachment B](#)). K. Chwalisz encouraged Senators to email J. Nichols with feedback regarding the information provided in the report.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – Ahmad Fakhoury

A. Fakhoury reported that the Executive Council has two resolutions to present today; the main objective of these resolutions are to show support of programs on campus that support diversity. Fakhoury read the Resolution Calling Review and Support for Culture-related Programs at SIUC ([Attachment C](#)).

T. Grant voiced concerns that there are just three programs mentioned in the resolution; there are Latin American studies, International studies, Native American studies, American studies, Global studies, and East Asian Civilization studies; Grant suggested a friendly amendment to include those culture-related programs as well.

M. May stated that he thinks this resolution is very clever because it actually supports any programs to come forth and ask for support from the Faculty Senate in response to any plans that come forth from the Chancellor's proposal and added that we need to be very careful about how we craft the wording of this resolution because there are a lot of programs out there that can fall under this resolution.

K. Chwalisz responded by saying that the idea behind this resolution is the diversity related issues; the climate data from the Dr. Lewin's presentation made that pretty clear; the presence of these programs on campus supports diversity

M. May replied by saying that this is a slippery slope because we are putting ourselves in a position to contradict ourselves if there are programs that the Chancellor want to eliminate; May stated that he feels that we need to be careful about how this body proceeds with supporting one program and potentially later on contradicting itself by not supporting another program that might be in a similar situation.

S. Ojewuyi suggested replacing "culture-related" with "diversity".

J. Bean suggested that we add all of the programs that T. Grant previously mentioned.

Discussion followed; concerns about enrollment numbers in these programs; providing support for all programs that feels they are in jeopardy; the damage the institution causes when it uses numbers to evaluate a program and not see the value it provides to the students.

K. Zivkovich suggested replacing "review" with recognition".

M. May stated that he would be in support of the resolution if all the names were taken out; let the programs be culturally based; for instance, African American males are over-represented in Special Education; Special Education has to figure out a way to work with that over-represented group of males in a school setting, so is that considered culture-related.

K. Chwalisz responded by saying points have been raised that there has not been time to think about; there are a lot of important programs on campus that to a lot of culture-related work; Rehab and Special Ed are definitely important.

B. Knapp stated that there are individuals putting their time in these programs; that is not the same experience in Special Education; you [M. May] are in Special Education; you [R.A. Rehfeldt] are in Rehab; I am in Kinesiology, but and I'm doing work in Women, Gender, & Sexuality Studies; that doesn't necessarily get recognized, reported, or used for promotion and tenure; the point of this resolution is to not only recognize the importance of diversity in the community, but recognize these specific programs as diversity in the college; Knapp added that taking the names out would minimalize the importance of these very specific diversity related programs.

K. Chwalisz reread the resolution with friendly amendments ([Attachment D](#)) and called for a vote; resolution approved by voice vote with one opposed and two abstentions.

A. Fakhoury read the Resolution to Support and Develop Africana Studies at SIUC. ([Attachment E](#))

S. Collins stated that the Chancellor shared data about Africana Studies during his interview on WSIU; during that interview the Chancellor stated that Africana Studies impacts 10 students and added that if it was modified or changed and goes in to the core curriculum, it would impact 14,000 students; Collins asked where that data comes from and what is accurate.

K. Chwalisz stated that there are definitely questions about how data are compiled and this is a really good example of how these interdisciplinary programs are harmed by the way things have been counted up to this point.

J. Wall stated that he is support of this resolution and added that with the challenges ahead, he is leery about seeing a resolution for every single program that may be in jeopardy over the next six months.

S. Ojewuyi stated that this is the minimum that the Senate can do for this program; asking for recognition and support is the first movement; there are several issues; the IBHE is often sighted by administration as the source for all kinds of things they do to programs and faculty; the IBHE made recommendations when the program transitioned from a minor to a major; it is the institutions responsibility to provide the resources to make the program grow; IBHE recommended this and the University did nothing.

K. Chwalisz called for a vote. Resolution passed by voice vote with one abstention.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION POLCY COMMITTEE –Sandra Collins, Chair

S. Collins read the [Resolution to Recommend Approval of the Proposal for Modification of the Final Exam Schedule](#); Collins stated that the Graduate Council and GPSC is in support of this resolution.

J. Davie stated that this is a faculty developed software tool; we've had these in the past; faculty have left and we couldn't use the tool; will this be available to use in the future.

K. Anderson responded by saying yes; it runs through Microsoft Excel; it has been made as bullet-proof as possible; instructions are being written out word by word so anyone can use this; there is nothing proprietary about it.

K. Chwalisz called for a vote. Resolution passed unanimously by voice vote.

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

BUDGET COMMITTEE – Howard Motyl, Chair No report

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – Jim MacLean, Chair No report

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES – Cherie Watson, Chair No report

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,
Grant Miller, Secretary
GM: ao