

## MINUTES OF THE 2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE February 13, 2018

### ROLL CALL

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

Members absent with Proxy: Howard Motyl (Sarah Lewison), Marcus Odom (Alice Noble-Allgire proxy)

Members absent without Proxy: Shawn Cheng, Sandra Ettema

Proxies absent: Matt Gorzalski (proxy for Elizabeth Cox)

Ex-Officios and guests: Carlo Montemagno (Chancellor), Lizette Chevalier (Associate Provost for Academic Programs, APAP), Dave Dilalla (Associate Provost for Academic Administration), Julie Partridge (Graduate Council Vice Chair), Ruth Anne Rehfeldt, Dave Johnson

### MINUTES

The minutes from the December 12, 2107 Senate meeting were presented for approval. K. Zivkovich made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; seconded by J. Mathias; minutes approved by voice vote with two abstentions.

### REPORTS/REMARKS

1. **Faculty Senate President - K. Chwalisz** started by welcoming everyone back and stated that the Senate didn't meet in January, but the Executive Council worked hard to represent the university and our great faculty at the Board of Trustees meeting last week (February 8, 2018). Chwalisz commented that prior to being the President of the Faculty Senate, she had never been to a Board meeting, but here's my experience in a nutshell, we tend not to be good at blowing our own horn and sharing our good news as compared to the SIUE folks. Instead we tend to bring a lot of serious issues to the Board for consideration, which is important, but we (Executive Council) thought it might be nice to share some good news for a change. The Executive Council spent the first couple days of the semester going around and speaking with the Deans of the colleges, with the exception of the Med School, who did not reply to our invitation. These meetings lasted anywhere up to an hour and produced 31 pages of written notes which were boiled down to the four page handout you have in front of you ([Attachment A](#)). This handout was presented to the Board. Chwalisz stated that she did hear feedback from several people that appreciated hearing good news from us. That is what we (Executive Council) did to try to do something at the Board of Trustees meeting on behalf of the Senate.

Chwalisz continued by saying we are back in session with a new semester and back in session as a Senate. We will have our usual spring business to attend to and undoubtedly an uptick of activity which is related to the reorganization process which is underway in a variety of forms. Chwalisz added that she finds herself thinking a lot about shared governance and have been doing some reading about it. Chwalisz mentioned a [2009 article in the Chronicle of Higher Education written by Gary Olson](#). Chwalisz provided a few ideas for everyone to reflect on going in to the semester and noted that she does not take credit for these ideas, they are stimulated by Gary Olson's article. Chwalisz continued by saying shared governance implies a collaborative process involving faculty, staff, and student input in key decision processes often through elected constituency groups. While certain groups

such as appointed search committees and budget committees have the responsibility of specific areas of decision making. Chwalisz added that Olson noted that everyone has a role in shared governance, but everyone does not participate at every stage or every decision of every activity. Chwalisz quoted directly from the article, "Genuine shared governance gives voice (but not necessarily ultimate authority) to concerns common to all constituencies as well as to issues unique to specific groups." Chwalisz continued by saying we all have a role to play in the change and growth of this institution and we need to work together. In the article, Olson also suggested that "governance is a collaborative venture and the key to genuine shared governance is broad and unending communication."

Chwalisz continued by saying in May 1998 when our Faculty Association was established, our constituency groups had a joint task force and established principles of agreement that define the roles of each of our constituency groups. ([Attachment B](#)) The Faculty Association was given jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to wages, hours, and working conditions for all the faculty within the bargaining unit. The Faculty Senate was given jurisdiction over all academic policies and issues related to undergraduate academic standards for the University. The Faculty Senate were defined as representing all faculty including NTT, Medical School and Law School faculty as well. The Graduate Council was given jurisdiction over academic policies and standards involving graduate education. Chwalisz noted that there are very specific roles to play. Obviously all of our constituency groups have roles in interaction with administration to address SIUC's challenges and usher in a new era. Chwalisz stated that she would love to see Faculty Senate be the nexus for shared governance on the SIUC campus. The Senate is not an agent for the Faculty Association or the Administration; although we have representation of all relevant groups in our shared governance within this body. So what an opportunity for that collaborative venture that is shared governance. If we choose to accept that as our mission.

- 2a. **Chancellor Montemagno** welcomed everyone back and stated that the reorganization is proceeding well. The result of all the input has resulted in over 100 changes to the original strawman proposal that was first presented in August 2017. Montemagno added that this is a result of me personally having over 68 meetings with faculty, staff, and other constituency groups. I [Montemagno} have personally met with the faculty in every proposed school. The results of this dialog has resulted in the merging of two schools; this came as a consequence of identifying synergies which weren't originally apparent, which the faculty showed. There have been over 20 different name changes that have bounced around as we looked at redefining our organization. The actual process is moving forward. We have one school that voted early to leave the 90 day process. We have the School of Accountancy which was already formed and solidified. We have eight proceeding outside of the 90 day window today, and four that are in the process of where they are and have extended the clock until we know what is going on. We have six that voted to extend. The process is moving forward quite smartly. As we move forward, I will continue to engage with the proposed schools that have elected to extend. For those that have moved on in the process, I will work with them and help them envision what they want their school to be and look like. We are working on identifying resource requirements to see how we can help develop resources to support those schools to move forward.

Chancellor Montemagno continued by saying that he would like to talk about something that he spoke about at the Board of Trustees meeting which is having a renewed emphasis on our student's success. For those who may be unaware, our four year graduation rate for our institution is 25%, only one in four of our students graduate in four years. This is what it has been for at least the past seven years; that is as far back as I looked. In addition, if you are an African American student, your chances of graduating in four years is one in ten. That is not acceptable, nobody would think that is acceptable. You are going to see a big push that is coming down on invigorating our efforts to support the students that are here to ensure that they are successful. You will find that we did a study in 2014 which was supposed to be fully implemented in 2016 to deal with issues associated with student

success. For some reason it was never acted on. We will be acting on that and looking at other things we can put together. Montemagno said to take heart. We can achieve the successes we need. If we look at our report I just got from Athletics about two weeks ago; the six year graduation rate of our athletes is over 70% in comparison to only 47% for our University. Our athlete out perform in terms of success the average student body by 25%. So what we are going to be working on as faculty is how we close that gap and how we work towards improving the success of our students to get to wear we have our students succeed.

- 2b. **Provost Office - Lizette Chevalier (Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Acting in Capacity of Co-Provost)** commented about the motion that passed in December regarding the Double Majors in the catalog and noted that this issue has become a lot larger than first thought. It is impacting a number of students. A perception of where the registrar sees how we look at our catalog and what the practice is of the Advisors has students caught in the middle. All students that were caught in that will have a petition to go forward with their degrees, however, I [Chevalier] have asked for a task force to be put together to look at this because I don't think the decision belongs with the Registrar, the Advisors, or the APAP office; it belongs with the faculty. That committee is coming together and it is an important issue to report back on.

Chevalier continued by saying all of the program reviews are finished. The research centers and institutes are being reviewed through Jim Garvey's office, the Vice Chancellor for Research. Chevalier noted that she does not have the actual reports yet, but the actual on-site is completed.

**Dave Dilalla (Associate Provost for Academic Administration, Acting in Capacity of Co-Provost)** Nothing to add.

**J. Bean** asked Provost Dilalla if he could clarify how things will move forward in the process.

**D. Dilalla** responded by apologizing for not getting back with him on the previous day and will get a document by the end of today with details laid out and bullet pointed that were talked about yesterday with respect to the process.

**C. Hatziadoniu** asked if that document will be distributed to all faculty.

**D. Dilalla** stated that he will provide a copy of it to K. Chwalisz to be distributed to the Senate members as well as provide a copy to all department chairs. Dilalla added that he does not have email access to all faculty.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that we will get it to the Senate and to all faculty.

**J. Bean** asked D. Dilalla if he could confirm what he said earlier this week about RMEs going out simultaneously to the Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, and other relevant college curricular bodies.

**D. Dilalla** stated that he wants to double check that his information is accurate, but his impression is the same as when we talked in Executive Council that when there are program change plans in the language that the Article 9 document uses, so whatever emerges from the discussion period and becomes a program change, that it will be forwarded to Graduate Council and Faculty Senate, then back to faculty, to the Faculty Association President, and if appropriate, to college curriculum committees simultaneously. Dilalla stated that this was based on his provisional ready that there is not an order to those issues except that the Council and Senate cannot make their final recommendation until all other recommendations from faculty, curriculum bodies, and the Association are in hand.

**J. Bean** asked if that includes votes.

**D. Dilalla** replied yes, what will happen is the plan will go to faculty, the Senate will already have the plan in place and the point when the vote is supported, it will be immediately transported to the Senate and Council.

**S. Ojewuyi** asked if the Chancellor would list the six schools that have voted to move forward.

**Chancellor Montemagno** stated that there were eight that are proceeding normally because they voted not to extend.

**S. Ojewuyi** asked if the Chancellor would provide a list of those schools please.

**Chancellor Montemagno** stated that he does not have the updated list currently with him.

**C. Hatziadoniu** what the Chancellor means when he says they proceeded normally.

**Chancellor Montemagno** stated there was a 90 day initial period, the 90 days has ended, so you proceed to the next phase.

**C. Hatziadoniu** asked D. Dilalla if faculty wanted to prepare an RME, how will it proceed.

**D. Dilalla** replied by saying it will follow the same procedures that are in Article 9 an administratively initiated plan, but there is language that has to be in the faculty initiated plan as well. Dilalla added that he would encourage consultation with the Faculty Association if there are questions about the language, but believes it is pretty straight forward; it is the same process that we follow with administratively initiated plans.

**C. Hatziadoniu** asked what the timelines were.

**D. Dilalla** replied by saying it is going to depend on the timelines that apply to a proposal. One could envision a faculty proposal which is under review for 90 days, one could envision a faculty proposal which is under review for 120 days, and one could envision one that is under review for 10 days if they vote out early. It's not possible to say.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that C. Hatziadoniu raised an important point. It was discussed a few months ago with the S. Collins, the UEPC co-chair, that it would be nice if all the related proposals that affect certain units would come to us at a certain time. So if a faculty waits until now to come up with their alternative proposal, and starts a 90 day clock, that is going to create a lot of delays. It would be nice if we were aware of another proposal related to that unit because that would go in to the UEPC deliberations about that program.

**C. Hatziadoniu** stated that we need some good housekeeping about these issues because I'm sure there are going to be several units that are going to try to counter the proposals.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that it is good to have counter proposals but not to delay the process with another 90 or 120 day process.

**T. Grant** stated if you had a faculty led proposal right now, it would kind of be on its own track. If I started today and said I want my department to go somewhere else, it may or may not affect the Chancellor's proposals; it wouldn't delay it. It would be on a parallel track.

**D. Dilalla** said thank you Tobin, much more eloquent than I.

**K. Chwalisz** added that if you think of it from a faculty status and welfare point, being in limbo and not knowing what was happening with your unit would be kind of a bummer.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that it is something that the UEPC and EC need to think about how to handle these proposals that come in at different times.

**C. Hatziadoniu** said we need a response quickly.

**T. Grant** commented that a report had come out about looking at the budget numbers for the proposals and stated that he wasn't concerned about the money part of it but is concerned about the plans for the Associate and Assistant Deans. Grant stated that the report he saw was FOIA'd and included the elimination of all Associate and Assistant Deans as a category.

**D. Dilalla** said that he believes that is a misunderstanding.

**Chancellor Montemagno** stated that it is not true.

**D. Dilalla** stated that when they have been in other meetings, the position that is taken is that on a proposed school by school basis and college by college basis, we are going to need to work with the faculty and administrators in the unit to determine what the resource needs are and the staffing needs are in the unit. The one size fits all approach doesn't make sense. So it's impossible for us to say right now each college would have a Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean or whatever it might be. We have already begun reaching out to our current Deans to say if you were beginning to think about a college structure that might look like the one that has been proposed, what would the resource needs be and what would you need to be effective. We have talked to some of the prospective schools about the same issues. It is not correct that there has been a decision that there would not be an Associate Dean position, for example, that personally seems unworkable.

**T. Grant** commented that that was his concern as well, but they had that FOIA'd document about how that calculation was done and there was a line on there that said Associate and Assistant Deans.

**D. Dilalla** replied by saying certainly in colleges where there will be a Dean's office eliminated, you would certainly say that there would no longer be a Dean in that office, there would not be an Associate Dean in that office. It is possible that the numbers were related to that, but no decisions have been made going forward about the structure of Deans offices.

**S. Ojewuyi** asked if we should assume that the \$2.3 million is just a projection and not based on actual numbers.

**D. Dilalla** replied by saying he cannot comment on that.

3. **Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE – Matt McCarroll** submitted a report ([Attachment C](#))
4. **Graduate Council – Julie Partridge** reported that the Council passed one resolution at its meeting on February 1, 2018; Resolution in Support of an Accelerated MA in History. Partridge reminded everyone about the Speed Networking Event at SIUE on Friday, March 2 from 10:00 am – 11:30 am. This event will focus on health related research. Partridge added that the Graduate Teaching Ad Hoc Committee has been formed and is moving forward.

5. **HLC Accreditation Committee – Ruth Ann Rehfeldt** reported that the HLC site visit will be in late February 2020 which gives us more time than originally thought. The time period for accreditation is 2010 onward. So our job is to evaluate if the University is meeting certain criteria. Drafts will be going out for Steering Committee reviews in March. We are working hard to track and capture what we can regarding the discussions about reorganization, changes in admissions, and changes in enrollment. The HCL committee had a very productive meeting with the Chancellor a couple weeks ago. The Chancellor encouraged members of the committee to send back feedback regarding things that do warrant attention. We need for the entire campus to be involved planning and also transparency in budgetary matters.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – Ahmad Fakhoury** read the Resolution for Civil Conduct in Shared Governance ([Attachment D](#)). K. Chwalisz opened the floor for discussion.

**S. Ojewuyi** stated that he has an observation about the handout provided before the meeting ([Attachment E](#)). Ojewuyi stated that the date on the handout was February 1, 2018 and asked why it was not made available to the entire Senate before it was sent across [to the Board of Trustees] so we [the Senate] could take a look at it. Ojewuyi added that there are a lot of details on here [the handout] and there has not been enough time to read it and respond constructively.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that the current discussion is about the resolution.

**S. Ojewuyi** replied by saying his question is related to what he is going to ask about the resolution. Ojewuyi asked what the motivation for writing this resolution was.

**A. Fakhoury** responded by saying with everything that is happening on campus, the resolution is positive effort to set up the tone in expectation of all the hard work that is going to be needed to proceed with what is happening.

**S. Ojewuyi** asked for specific examples of things happening on campus.

**G. Miller** responded by saying the goal is to keep the conversation on ideas, how do we move the institution forward. Miller added that in his own experiences, there is a lot of trust not only to be gained between faculty and administration, but also faculty to faculty. We are entering a territory where there is some pretty tricky terrain to navigate. Does this resolution create that opportunity where there is discourse that talks about ideas and focusses on that? That is a good question. Does this resolve or address that issue? Does that garner or help build trust amongst faculty? We have a really, really challenging road ahead. This is something we discussed in Executive Council. Does this resolution address that? That is a great question. I [Miller] don't know. It will actually be more than that to address the terrain ahead of us, but it is an attempt.

**S. Ojewuyi** commented that reading this seems to presume there is a conflict on the campus in terms of approach rather than a conversation. If this resolution is because of that presumption, it would actually bring more conflict. Ojewuyi stated that the resolution says "conflict resolution scholars agree that the first step in effective conflict management is negotiation with an open dialog between parties to address the conflict, characterized by trust and a cooperative problem-solving attitude". Ojewuyi said from his perspective, as one who has been active in that conversation, and the Chancellor knows this too, he feels that this has always been a cooperative problem-solving attitude.

**S. Ojewuyi** said let me restate, because I [Ojewuyi] was in Edwardsville on Wednesday, let me restate my personal investment which goes beyond the "considerances" of campus; I [Ojewuyi] am a faculty member here, I am on the faculty association, I am on the Diversity Council, but I am also a parent of an SIU student. This is the second child that has went to this school. The investment goes beyond one that is trying to pull down the University as this seems to suggest.

**S. Ojewuyi** stated that he would like to read from the notes of the President of the Association (not a typo, this is what was said) presentation on Wednesday; which I find quite troubling in terms of the language and intent. Since the only resolution passed by the Senate, the President of the Senate has made several presentations and interviews to newspapers, but there has not been one that has been in support of the resolution that was passed here [Senate]. The President of the Senate should be the voice of the Faculty Senate. The Senate President has called it a “dog and pony show”; that is referring to people who have made statements in opposition to the specifics of the reorganization. When I read this (handout from February 1, 2018) it is like a cover and an attempt to divide the faculty. That is why I [Ojewuyi] am asking why this was not shared with us before sending it to the Chancellor; it is part of the democratic process. It says right here “problems and concerns in civil and professional manner”. I [Ojewuyi] don’t think the President of the Senate has presented itself in a civil and professional manner because I am privy to some of the statements that she has made on our [Faculty Senate] behalf. I have actually gone to her personally and asked her when making a presentation to make it clear if you are speaking for yourself or for the Senate. Unfortunately, I cannot give you the specific language, but I am very, very reluctant to support this.

**A. Fakhoury** asked if Ojewuyi has anything against the wording of this particular resolution.

**S. Ojewuyi** replied by saying the intent is questionable. In previous presentations, the President has expressed suspicions of the Faculty Association; some of us are not members of the union, some of us are, it is not a crime to be a member of the Faculty Association. The Faculty Association as stated here (in the Principles of Agreement) as one of the major constituencies on the campus. So when I [Ojewuyi] approached the Senate President, she said to me that resolution that was brought here by Jonathan [Bean] and I was sponsored by the Faculty union. I felt that that was an insult. In general there has been a consensus about wanting change on campus, but there are details that are of consequence to our work environment and our work security; so we continue to speak against those things. The language of the Senate President makes it very suspicious for me.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that she would like to have an opportunity to reply to these accusations and recognized S. Talapatra to speak.

**S. Talapatra** stated that he wonders what is meant by civil conduct in shared governance and if this is in response to something that he is not remembering.

**A. Fakhoury** replied by saying that this resolution is not in response to anything that has happened; there was nothing discussed in Executive Council about this being a response to anything that has happened and it is definitely not something that has to do with the behavior of Senators. This is an attempt to set up a positive tone and helping people deal with the challenges that are coming and these are restating some general concepts.

Discussion followed with multiple people talking at one time. K. Chwalisz called for a Point of Order.

**S. Talapatra** asked for clarification of why the Senate needs this resolution.

**A. Fakhoury** stated that it is just going back to what the role of the Senate is during the reorganization period.

**S. Talapatra** stated that the Senate had a small role and it was to pass the previous resolution (opposing the elimination of departments). What is the meaning of this civil conduct resolution; it is just words; it doesn’t mean anything. This resolution is undermining what the Senate is doing.

**A. Fakhoury** asked how this resolution is undermining what the Senate doing. What we are trying to do here is to make sure the Senate has a role to play. It was said that the Senate had a small role to play and that was all we had to play. The thing is that we are trying to identify the role of the Senate. One role is to be what this resolution is saying.

**S. Talapatra** asked what does it mean when you say civil conduct in shared governance.

**A. Fakhoury** replied by saying it means people respecting each other and people respecting that they cannot be speaking for other people.

**S. Talapatra** responded by saying that means that somewhere you have foreseen that there is not civil conduct in shared governance.

**A. Fakhoury** stated that we are just reiterating.

**S. Talapatra** stated that he is trying to find out the value of this resolution.

**K. Chwalisz** responded by saying one of the reasons that a resolution like this is helpful is when this resolution was brought up and one of my colleagues took it as an opportunity to make a personal attack on me; which is evidence of the problem that we have.

Multiple people began speaking at once.

**K. Chwalisz** recognized J. MacLean to speak.

**J. MacLean** stated that he felt that part of the reason for this resolution was to remind everyone when we are discussing what is going on at the University, not to say anything that would be damaging to the University. The idea is that when we talk about pros and cons; when we talk about something you don't like or you are against; how we relate our opinion of that because they may have broader impacts; so consider your thoughts carefully.

**J. Bean** stated that he agrees with his colleague. I sat for the first time at an Executive Council meeting as co-chair of the UEPC and had a draft of this resolution in front of me and I really did not see what the reason was for. I had stated that I had only been on the Faculty Senate for only a year, however my experience of the conversations have been spirited; there was a spirited conversation of the resolution that passed 19 to 11 with no outbursts or "shenanigans" which this resolution is aimed to prevent. In that EC meeting, I was told that I was in fact part of the "shenanigans" by introducing the resolution in November which I had every right to do. I understand the point of view of those who thought the resolution should not have been sent to the Senate by the Executive Committee. But I still felt and Segun thought that there was a different point of view and it should have been brought to the Senate to be discussed. I felt that in the end we did have a conversation that I would say is characterized "as honesty and a sincere desire to achieve agreements". That agreement was to discuss that resolution and have a vote. And then to be accused that somehow bringing that forth was uncivil or out of order; I just think is untrue. I am not sure that this resolution will serve the purpose it is supposed to serve. If you have to say this, then you know, I really can't support it because it is being presented in a very disingenuous manner. If this was presented at any other Faculty Senate meeting at any other time, then sure, fine. Just because we speak out about this doesn't mean we are against SIU. I am very invested in this University; I had a daughter that graduated from here; perhaps those around the table have as well. I can't support this resolution at this time with the circumstances it is being presented with.

**G. Miller** stated that it may be the case that this is not necessary; being proactive might not be necessary. As it was discussed in Executive Council, let's bring this to the Senate and have this discussion. As Jon [Bean] pointed out, a no vote on this resolution does not mean that you want the University to crash and burn. I would support someone in saying that we don't need this; we don't need to be proactive in this manner. I don't want anyone to think that this is an attack because that is a concern as well.

Multiple people began speaking at once.

**K. Chwalisz** recognized D. Carlson.



**D. Carlson** stated that he has only been a part of the Senate for less than a year; this is a time when there is a lot of change and needed ideas coming forward. I have heard some animated comments, but most of it has been professional. It is emotional, probably sometimes too emotional, but appropriate. When I look at these things, I look at how things were intended and how things are received. I think this was likely intended in the best possible circumstances to put forward the things we believe in; there is nothing in here I don't believe; but then again, I don't think we need a resolution to point out what we don't believe because I am one that is receiving this as "finger-wagging" at open discussion among professional faculty.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that she would like to make one point because I feel that my fellow Senators are not aware of this. Related to the comment about "shenanigans" that Jon made; when we had that meeting in November, there actually was a little bit of "shenanigans".

**T. Grant** called for a point of order and said if K. Chwalisz is going to be part of the debate, she needs to let someone else lead; K. Chwalisz passed the gavel to A. Fakhoury.

**A. Fakhoury** recognized K. Chwalisz to speak.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that she absolutely agree that Jon and Segun had every right to bring a resolution to the floor and some of you may have heard that I may have invited that resolution because I attended a CCC meeting and I heard a case for departments. I share concerns about departments and I invited the resolution. As is our standard procedure, we discuss resolutions in the Executive Council and we decide whether they go on the agenda or not. Sometimes we send them back for more information for revision and sometimes we decide when it is the best time to put those on the agenda. We had a long discussion about this particular resolution, 45 minutes as a matter of fact, we decided that it was premature to put it on the agenda for the November meeting. We did so because we had not yet seen the second revision of the reorganization proposal and we knew that administration was not going to have representation for that November meeting. Those were two big reasons.

**K. Chwalisz** continued by saying I [Chwalisz] notified the CCC that we were going to hold on to that resolution for December. I suspect they were not happy with that because they wanted to be able to bring it to the BOT meeting in December. That resolution was presented and used at the December BOT meeting. They were told on Tuesday that the resolution would not be on the November agenda. The very next day, I [Chwalisz] got an email from Dave Johnson saying that he has asked a couple Senators to put it forth. On that same day, Amy [Ortiz] heard from Jon [Bean] that they wanted to put it on the agenda. This was before the agenda came out, so no one would have known that it wasn't on the agenda unless they had talked to the CCC. It was put on the agenda, we didn't try to block it although it was suggested that I [Chwalisz] was trying to block it. On the day of the meeting, there was a motion to move around the agenda. Those are the "shenanigans" that I [Chwalisz] am referring to.

**K Chwalisz** continued by saying that the resolution was moved ahead of the Executive Council report on the agenda by virtue of that motion. So you [the Senate] did not get to hear any of the discussions or deliberations that the Executive Council had already had regarding this resolution. I don't know that it would have affected the results, but none-the-less, it was information that was missing from that discussion. I think that is important and I think one of the things about shared governance in a civil fashion is that we don't need to change our procedures; we have those procedures in place; we don't need to do things with Robert's Rules in order to be heard. I [Chwalisz] want us all to be heard.

**T. Grant** stated that now he has been accused of these so-called "shenanigans" by moving around the order; you can't play games with Robert's rules, they're just the rules. What happened in that meeting is that I wanted to be part of the discussion because I had to pick up my kids, so I asked that the resolution be moved up and it got voted on by the majority of the Faculty Senate; If you are calling the Faculty Senate; I'm not going to address you personally; any claim that the Faculty Senate voting by majority vote is somehow "shenanigans" or any claim that a Senator proposing something to be put as due business is "shenanigans", really makes me question what this document means. Because now we are saying that following the operating papers and the rules that we have established for the Faculty Senate,

if it doesn't follow what someone thinks of an outcome, it is now "shenanigans". We did everything right and this is why I am against this.

**S. Ojewuyi** stated that his other speech was impassioned because he just trying to explain and not make anyone uncomfortable. I [Ojewuyi] am a minority and I am very sensitive to the language used in composition, especially when they are personal, and also when they are presented in a public forum. When I [Ojewuyi] met with Kathie [Chwalisz] after the BOT meeting, I told her that I wanted to initiate this conversation so it can be personal between us. I told her I felt very uncomfortable with her presentation and was not sure that she should be presenting that as a Senate President when we had passed that resolution. That was the first thing. The second BOT meeting which was last week, this is what I was searching for (on phone) because it was really disturbing; this is what Kathie said and that is why it seems I'm attacking her personally; I'm not; I'm just sure who was speaking; the President of the Senate or Kathie. This is what she said. She said "those working on great things are not the ones writing letters" "the unions are organizing a mob mentality" I [Ojewuyi] feel like one of the mob. "The faculty opposition and the CCC are potentially going to scuttle and sink SIU" She [Chwalisz] ended it by asking the board "not to listen to an angry mob" That is name calling. That is not constructive composition. That is the context that I think gave birth to this resolution.

**K. Chwalisz** asked S. Ojewuyi where he was reading those comments from.

**S. Ojewuyi** said "from my phone."

**K. Chwalisz** stated that those were her personal public remarks. I gave written copies to the Board members because they cut my time down to two minutes, so I'm not sure where you received that.

**S. Ojewuyi** stated "those were your personal remarks."

**K. Chwalisz** replied "those were my personal remarks."

**J. Bean** stated that there were quotes in the Southern Illinoisan.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that he [Ojewuyi] is reading my whole remarks and added that she is not sure where that would have come from.

**W. Zea** commented that if there has been uncivil behavior here, it has been on the part of the President and she owes us an apology.

**J. Bean** stated that he understand the Executive Councils reasons for not putting forth the resolution in November. Bean added that he called Kathie on the phone and explained that he was putting forth the resolution and they spoke for over an hour. We did not agree, but it was a civil discussion. It is completely untruthful that I [Bean] carry water for what was originally an FA or CCC resolution is completely untrue. During that hour long conversation, I [Bean] strongly urged you Kathie to name a parliamentarian because there were concerns that things were not being held in an orderly fashion and to follow Robert's Rules of Order. To your credit, you did, you learned more about Robert's Rules. This is the first time, probably in a very long time, that the Senate has tried to scrupulously follow Robert's Rules, and I credit you for that and I hope that we do that in the future. What happened in November was completely in order, it just didn't follow the script that you had in your mind with the way that the meeting should have unfolded.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that she appreciates having the opportunity to address the Senate; I frankly am embarrassed; even though I have not been making my public comments as a representative of the Senate, you saw today what I submitted to the Board on behalf of the Senate; I have actually been swept up in the things we haven't been able to put our finger on as far as what exactly what has been going on on campus; I honestly have experienced a mob mentality in my own interactions; how many were present at the December BOT meeting and experienced the disrespectful comments with clapping and cheering with some of those disrespectful comments; is that inaccurate; I experienced that meeting as quite

painful; some of the things I heard and saw were quite uncomfortable. As I was quoted from my remarks from the most recent BOT meeting, my soul ached for a couple days after the December BOT meeting because of the vibe of that room and the experience of that process. And it did feel to me like a bit of a mob mentality, a bit of an angry mob. It shouldn't matter and I apologize.

**A. Fakhoury** stated that the intent of the Executive Council was not to point fingers at anybody and the idea was to have a positive vibe. It is very obvious to me that that was not the intent of this resolution. There is a lot of divisiveness, so that being said, I am going to withdraw this resolution.

**T. Grant** stated that things are so tense on this campus and things might get misconstrued. This resolution was not going to address those issues. I don't want to be misconstrued as negative. We are trying so hard to make this institution thrive and be successful and we may have different perspectives on that, but we are really, really trying hard and we are really worn out.

**K. Chwalisz** stated that she would like to personally apologize to T. Grant for reading his motion as "shenanigans".

**UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION POLCY COMMITTEE –Sandra Collins, Chair** read the following resolutions:

Resolution to Recommend the Proposed Program Reviewers for University Honors Program ([Attachment F](#)). No discussion. Resolution passed unanimously by voice vote.

Resolution to Recommend Approval of the RME to Eliminate the Certificate in Histotechnology in the School of Medicine ([Attachment G](#)). No discussion. Resolution passed by voice vote with one opposed and zero abstentions.

**S. Collins** commented that J. Bean is now the co-chair of the UEPC due to her teaching schedule.

**S. Collins** stated that she and J. Bean are working with the Graduate Council on how to move forward with RMEs related to the reorganization. Collins noted a procedural document from 2003 regarding program elimination. J. Bean added that there are extra steps to be taken for program elimination. It includes the addition of a panel composed of three; a faculty member from the program being eliminated, an administrative leader of the college, and somebody from the Faculty Senate such as the UEPC. This panel gathers information and reports to the UEPC.

**L. Chevalier** asked for a copy of the procedural document so she could update her records.

**S. Collins** asked D. Dilalla if UEPC is to assume when it gets to UEPC it will have all the votes on the form.

**D. Dilalla** replied not necessarily.

**S. Collins** stated that it says somewhere in Article 9 that it is supposed to go to the FA as well; will we have that report when it comes to UEPC?

**D. Dilalla** stated that is correct. It is his understanding that the report from the association must be provided before the final action of the Council or the Senate.

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

**BUDGET COMMITTEE – Derek Fisher, Chair** read the Resolution Calling on the Legislature and the Governor to Provide Stable Funding for Higher Education. ([Attachment H](#)) Brief discussion followed. Resolution passed unanimously by voice vote.

**GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – Jim MacLean, Chair**

No report

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES – Cherie Watson, Chair**

No report

**OLD BUSINESS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

Dave Johnson (FA President) was present to answer questions about the Article 9 process, steps departments have to take, what the contract allows and doesn't allow. Johnson stated that he wanted to make a brief comment about the previous discussions and said that this is hard because it is political and it is a public conversation; that doesn't mean that it has to be uncivil. It is a different kind of conversation that we have that is different than the more or less private, not secret, conversations that we normally have. Johnson said that is where we are. Johnson asked if there were any questions about Article 9 that he could answer.

**J. Bean** asked about the "clock" and when the FS thinks the clock stops.

**D. Johnson** replied by saying that we do have a disagreement with the administration about the clock and that's not a bad thing. The Chancellor has been very clear from the beginning that he is open to input. The problem we have is that many of these schools have been utterly transformed. In our [FA] view, when you change the makeup of the affected faculty; what you are essentially doing is making a proposal for a new school; therefore you ought to draw up a new proposal and start the clock; the clock doesn't have to go the whole 90 days; people can vote to speed things up; but what we are seeing right now is that there are a number of instances where units have been added in the last couple weeks; there are school where they haven't been part of the meetings because they haven't been part of the group yet; it is our [FA] view that the clearest way to understand when these proposals have been transformed so much that it is essentially a new proposal.

**G. Miller** stated that he is in a unit that voted out of the 90 day process; we thought of it as a department vote; does that pull the other units in that direction; what does that do to the clock as well.

**D. Johnson** replied by saying it is one for all and all for one. Everyone has to vote the same way for the vote to take effect. Johnson said it is his understanding, in the College of Education, that everyone other than C and I voted to extend and C and I didn't vote to extend, so therefore, no extension; there is no extension when some units want out and some units don't.

**D. Johnson** asked if anyone had questions about departments and if they are going or staying.

**J. Bean** asked if the FA is advising the faculty with the process of alternative proposals.

**D. Johnson** responded by saying he has gotten questions from people about those proposals and about the Chancellor's proposals, so sure, but I do think it is important to know there are a lot of proposals out there. We [FA] will try to answer questions during the process as we have done as we have done with the Chancellor's proposals.

No other new business.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**K. Chwalisz** announced the Faculty Senate spring elections will start on Monday, February 19, 2018 with the nomination process. J. MacLean noted that new Senators are being elected to fill the upcoming vacancies under our current structure and operating paper; a year from now when the structure changes we will make revisions as necessary.

**K. Chwalisz** announced that this is the time of year to let Senators know about the upcoming Executive Officers election; if anyone is interested in being a Faculty Senate Executive Officer, let current Executive Officers know.

**K. Zivkovich** stated that she would like to end the meeting on a light-hearted note; during the Westminster Dog Show, when the Saluki was brought out, they announced that it is Southern Illinois University's mascot; we got some free PR.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Respectfully submitted,  
Grant Miller, Secretary  
GM: ao