

Chicago State University Faculty Senate
Minutes of Meeting of Tuesday, April 5, 2016

The meeting was called to order at 12:35 p.m.

Attendance: Justin Akugieze, Phillip Beverly (Presiding), Bob Bionaz, Judy Birgen, Patrice Boyles, Emmett Bradbury, Sarah Buck, Miguel Fernandez, Rosalind Fielder, Monique Germain, Kathleen Haefliger, Tonya Hall, Janet Halpin (Recording), Aref Hervani, Soo Kang, Ann Kuzdale, Crystal Laura, Bryon Martin, Paul Musial, Mohammad Newaz, Vincent Osaghae, Tatjana Petrova, Brenda Pruitt-Annisette, Jason Raynovich, Alesia Richardson, Virginia Shen, Yashika Watkins, Elizabeth Wittbrodt, Chyrese Wolf

Guests: Dr. Bernie Rowan, Academic Affairs; Dean Rich Darga LIS; Assoc. Dean Vennie Lyons, COB; Dr. Joanne Labonte, Sociology; Assoc. Dean Aida Abraha, CAS

Approval of Previous Minutes

Motion to approve the previous minutes by Senator Kathleen Haefliger seconded by Senator Bob Bionaz

Correction at the bottom of page 4 related to members of Academic Program Elimination Review Committee at the bottom of page 4. Remove "There are three prior members still within their terms."

Motion to approve the corrected minutes
yes 23 no 1 abstain 1
Motion carried.

Senator Speeches

Senator Janet Halpin: During the past couple of weeks I worked on a proposal to redesign an academic program: streamlining the degree options, making connections to other disciplines, and highlighting the program's importance to the University. My Chair and I spent part of another day going over the report: proof-reading, spell-checking, and tightening up grammar, punctuation and word usage. We had some arguments, and both of us won a few. Finally, we looked at the size and style of font, and whether to underline, bold, or italicize. We ensured that the sub-headings matched perfectly with the template supplied, and that the information in the tables and appendices was correct and presented in a consistent straightforward way.

My Chair apologized to me for tiny little things he found that needed to be fixed, like the underline that remained under the colon at the end of a heading; like the s at the end of a word that should be in bold like the rest of the word. No apology was necessary. This is scholarly practice. There was a sense of pride in working with a colleague who also wanted things to be just right.

At the same time, the Provost's Office sent out the stupid 'keys email', where noun verb agreement was optional; and where they couldn't figure out the difference between they're, there, and their, so used a random selection, perhaps hoping they would be correct at least

once. Because of that it became reasonable to wonder if they got anything right, including the dates which certainly looked wrong, wrong, wrong, but who knows?

Documents like that stupid 'keys email' make us all look stupid. The Provost owes an apology to the University for showing us in such a poor light in these desperate times.

Senator Chyrese Wolf: First, I think the "Fund Our Futures" rally [April 1], while overshadowed by the CTU, was well done. But, people marching through the streets screaming for more money is not going to accomplish our goal. I think if we continue in this vein we could lose an opportunity to have a voice in educational policy in Illinois.

Instead of going downtown, I went to church. My church consists mostly of white conservatives. They want to know how we can demand more money for education when millions are being dumped into education already. They don't want higher taxes and they want to know where Illinois will get the money given that the state is broke. Whether these views are valid or not is a moot point. The issue is we need to find a way to appeal to these people.

So, perhaps we take a more academic approach and host a legislative summit where we invite legislators to support white papers, policy documents that are research driven to demonstrate the cost benefit of urban education. Perhaps faculty from UPI institutions can come together to write policy statements. I'm sure there are many subtopics that people can rally behind. We can then invite legislators to a summit and to support the white papers.

Visitors

Dr. Bernie Rowan attended for Provost Henderson who is not available. He indicated that Dr. Tonya Hall will make a report regarding HLC, as follows: A UASC steering committee report has been posted and should be accessible from Cougar Connect. There have been access problems so readers are asked to use alternate browsers like Firefox to find the material. Senators had several questions about the recent visit by a team from HLC.

Dr. Rowan reported that the formal response of the team will come in May. HLC did note informally that the CSU community seems very engaged, and that activities toward to survival are apparent. Teach-out plans were developed, and the HLC team members continue to request documentation. We should stand by for formal communication.

Q. What if the awaited response from HLC is overtaken by events at State of Illinois regarding the budget impasse? Ans. The HLC visit was brought down on us by Board of Trustees' declaration of financial exigency. However, getting an appropriation [or major donation] to continue operations would not necessarily mean that they would cease to monitor us.

Q. At the recent town hall meeting someone asked about our plans to move forward. If we get all, if we get some, or if we get no money. Is there a plan in place accounting for those exigencies? Ans. Dr. Rowan is not able to say anything regarding the plan. Has not seen three plans based on different progressions of scenarios. Is not part of the Management Action Team but will take the question back to them.

Announcements

Faculty Senate Meeting, May 3, 2016
Board of Trustees Meeting, May 6, 2016
Honors Convocation, April 21, 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
Commencement, Thursday, April 28, 2016, 12:30 p.m.

A new volunteer is needed for the IT Steering Committee. Q: What is the charge of the committee? Ans: That will be discussed at April 12, at 10 a.m. Senator Rosalind Fielder volunteered to serve.

Reports

Academic and Student Affairs: Senator Sarah Buck reported that Dr. Elizabeth Arnott-Hill of Academic Affairs sent the proposed Curriculum Calendar. This is an effort to smooth the progress of curriculum actions through the various committees by strategic scheduling of standing committee meetings. The calendar and plan are good ideas as long as there is flexibility for departments to have their own committee meetings. If this is included in the plan, Academic and Student Affairs supports it.

Building and Grounds: Senator Jacobs not present to give a report

Library: Senator Soo Kang reported that the academic library is currently operating with 50% of usual staff. The academic library has implemented reduced hours. The academic library is currently open to the community, but will move to University-only access. The library committee is investigating Open Access for class instruction. This system provides open access to textbook for classes, rather than students' needing to purchase individual textbooks. It is not free, but it is significantly less expensive than paying for individual textbooks. The University could use it as a recruitment tool. There will be more information at the next meeting if time allows. The committee needs participation from across the university to build awareness and support. Some open access elements already exist.

Social Committee: Senator Tonya Hall introduced the survey being conducted regarding the first activity of the Committee: the dinner at the beginning of the Spring 2016 semester. Senator Pruitt-Annisette lead the survey process by distributing surveys. All members present were asked to complete them and they were collected by Social Committee members.

University Budget Committee: Senator Chyrese Wolf reported that the University Budget Committee was scheduled to have hearings on requests for AY18, and Committee Chair Dr. Edmundo Garcia was working with Vice Presidents to collect all required documents just as the financial exigency was declared. The committee was told to cancel the hearings. When the HLC reviewers met with the University Budget Committee, the reviewers wondered why we were told to stop our hearings. One week later, the committee was told to resume 'our hearing'. The goal is to finish the hearings by April 30. Vice Presidents know about the process and the deadlines,

and a few hearings have taken place. Each unit presents their requests and defends their requests. Once complete the UBC will then meet to review requests and make recommendations. The hearings are open, so the university community may attend. UBC not looking back at 2017. Fluid, historical documents from previous budgets available.

Page 3 of 5

Academic Program Elimination Review Committee (APERC): Chair of the committee Senator Jason Raynovich shared information about the committee. They received a charge on March 11, 2016 to consider programs for elimination, as listed in the IBHE report. The committee will meet weekly in April, and every two weeks in May. They have received contact information from all programs, and have deadlines in place.

Q. What is the constitution of committee? Are there possible conflicts of interest? Who is representing programs in the College of Education on the committee? Ans. Senator Raynovich indicated that he is on committee, and his program, Music, is up for review. Is there a conflict of interest? Raynovich plans to recuse himself for votes on Music.

Q. Are there contractual issues regarding makeup of committee, and would these influence the integrity of the decisions? Ans. Every academic program is up for review. If decisions are made based on economic factors, we need to look at all programs and their costs and benefits to the university. APERC not charged to evaluate all programs.

Q. Are the members of the committee discussing past practice, where they would convene only if a program was recommended for elimination by the Program Review Committee. Ans. Standard practice is that if the Program Review Committee votes to eliminate a program, it would go to APERC. Then Academic Affairs would review that committee's findings and make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees would make the final determination and decision. APERC has twice asked for confirmation that this is being done in a contractually-approved and appropriate way. APERC is awaiting a response to that question. Of the seventeen programs under consideration, all have been reviewed within the past four years. None of them was recommended for elimination.

Senator Bionaz confirmed that the information that goes to APERC is supposed to come from the annual program review process, although that is not specified in the contract. Also, if a program does not submit Program Review documentation, it goes automatically to APERC.

Q. Is Provost/Academic Affairs aware of past process? Does financial exigency change the process? Ans: The process of program elimination is significant and very labor-intensive. When the Economics major was eliminated there were five meetings, along with notification. The current process would require 5 X 17 sets of meetings and notification.

Q. Why does administration get to choose what criteria are used for this? The reconvening of APERC is not necessarily connected to the IBHE process. Is financial exigency being used as a pretext for eliminating programs? CAN the faculty on APERC make that determination Ans: APERC's role is strictly advisory, and will make recommendations, not decisions. Also, look at other universities' reports; they were very articulate about what was being done about low performing or low-enrolled programs. If they can successfully defend, they can keep programs.

This committee must do its job of taking the process seriously. It was reported that Deans were not notified in advance of APERC being reestablished. They should have been notified in

advance by Academic Affairs.

Language of the contract suggests several criteria which administration must supply to APERC. Vacant positions are to be filled by academic deans. Slate of members was not following

Page 4 of 5

procedures . UPI faculty voted to review the election process, and it was approved at that meeting.

EXCOM: Dr. Beverly reported that questions are arising over the advisory committee's role with respect to the Management Action Committee. Has made many recommendations, but unaware if any have been taken up. Have had two joint meetings, but they continue to make decisions based only on their own criteria. We provide insight, but there is no evidence that it is being used. We have asked for the plan, but have concluded in the absence of a plan, that there is no plan. We do not believe that a plan exists. Mr. Lucey attended meeting and provided a contingency plan; however, it was all financial in terms of what the budget would look like, not a real plan. No one here has any previous experience in working in a financial exigency. Advisory committee is doing due diligence, but is not being heeded.

Q: Where can we save up to \$11.4million? Ans: It is a difficult and opaque situation. There is no specificity of how cuts would be made across the university. If we eliminated every single lecturer position, we would save about \$3.8million. Several programs would be eliminated. This is a challenging time for us. We must be patient and ask questions.

Regarding the keys debacle, there is a change in the policy. We can assume we will get a request for people to make a list of their keys. Do not hand in keys until you are terminated. There will be a vigorous discussion if we get another request for keys.

The 150 Committee needs to start planning. CSU 150 will start on January 1, 2017 and will run through spring semester of 2018. It is an 18-month commitment.

University Curriculum Coordinating Committee: the bylaws require an election in Faculty Senate for new members to the committee.

Moved by Senator Virginia Shen, seconded by Senator Ann Kuzdale that Dr. Brenda Aghahowa be elected to serve on UCCC.

Yes 25 No 0 Abstain 0
Motion Carried.

Old Business

Draft of a letter to Governor Rauner was distributed. Please send suggestions very quickly. Ensure that the final version demonstrates and expresses solidarity and concerns for other Illinois public universities. Send comments and suggestions to pbeverly@csu.edu. Senators can share with faculty/departments, but clearly this is a DRAFT not to distribute widely.

New Business

No new business was introduced.

Senator Rosalind Fielder moved to adjourn.
Meeting was adjourned at 1:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
Janet Halpin, Professor of Geography