

4-11-2018

Faculty Senate Minutes, April 11, 2018

Faculty Senate



EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Minutes

Session-13

3.00—5.00 pm April 11th, 2018 310A Student Center

Present: Quiel, Rahman, Bluhm, Curran, Trewn, Elton, Chou, Hayworth, Willis, Staunton, Neufeld, Bari, Francis, Millan, Barton, McVey, Pawlowski, Edwards, Carpenter, Moore, Banerji, McTague, Foster

Guests: M. Tew

- I. **Approval of the Agenda** - approved 3:00 pm
- II. **Approval of the Minutes** 03-28-2018 Approved 3:05 pm
- III. **Elections and Appointments** (Candidate Profile and Ballots will be provided) 3:10 pm
 - A. Faculty Senate Officers: VP, Secretary, membership Coordinator
 - A. VP nomination – Mahmud Rahman
 - B. Secretary –
 - 1. Jessica Elton nominated. Motion to approve by acclamation. Passed.
 - 2. Thanks to Minnie Bluhm for her service as senate secretary. She will be on sabbatical next year.
 - C. Membership coordinator nomination – Monica Millan
 - Accept by acclamation the uncontested positions. Passed. Offices begin September 1.
 - B. University Budget Council (UBC) – Motion to accept uncontested candidate. Second. Passed.
 - C. Senate Budget Committee (BRC)-Motion to approve all uncontested candidates. Second. Passed.
 - A. Mark ballots for CHHS position
 - B. Karen Putzu elected for the uncontested position
 - D. Senate Academic Issues Committee (AIC -Academic Affairs) – Motion to accept uncontested nominees. Second. Passed. Kevin Karpiak won contested spot.
 - E. Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Committee (IAAC)- Motion to accept uncontested nominees. Second. Passed.
- IV. **Discussions** 3:40 pm
 - A. Memorandum of Concern on Shared Governance: John Staunton
 - A. Requesting vote (and discussion) on this document based on minutes of last meeting. Some opposition to a vote today because this document is not what Senate saw at the last meeting. Document does say *draft*. Feedback (almost all senators have shared with constituents) will be used to shape final document. Point of order: Resolution moved and seconded. Discussion. Amendments. Vote.
 - B. **Motion:** To move the document (Staunton). Second (Moore). Motion **passed** with 3 abstentions.
 - C. Discussion: Feedback from departments. (within paragraph #1, each # represents the views of a department)
 - 1. Take the strongest position possible. 2. More than half of respondents support vote of no confidence. 3. Change it to include administration as a whole. Add language to make our input system more clear. Make input system visible. 4. Against vote of no

confidence but support sending memorandum. Therefore, the expectation is that Pres. Smith will show evidence that he is a, he is b, he is c. 5. And 6. Did not want vote of no confidence but did want strong language and document with specified changes and metrics. The culture of disrespect by administration toward faculty is a problem that needs changing. Must happen top down. 7. Tone down language but support concept. 8. What is purpose? Do not support vote of no confidence. 9. Is this towards President or administration at large. 10. List of outcomes should be developed. Direct toward administration at large and not just the president. 11. No support of no confidence. Want outcomes and to address whole administration and not just president. 12. Concerns about decisions being made and their impact on departments.

2. Several departments cited the Board of Regents as a problem, as well. There was general agreement with this.
3. Changing the document to address Administration and BoR may weaken consequences because BoR is immune.
4. Suggestion that Staunton add some recommendations to this document.
5. This document as it stands is an indictment against the President. Action – to return to core values of the University. Minimal action step – therefore, we call for him to concretely commit himself to...
 - i. State what this means. Give examples of expectations.
 - ii. Senate is complicit if it doesn't address this.
6. Suggestion to name specific administrators and outline measurable expectations and consequences.
7. Suggest it goes to President, Provost and CFO.
8. Can we have more than one document? Yes.
9. Perception that we can be proactive rather than reactive. From a budget perspective, this is reactive. Should include Mike Valdez. Going back to core values is a good one to frame our expectations of leadership. These are primarily budget issues and will get worse over the summer without faculty input.
10. We don't have an input system. We need to build one together. Here's what we need in the meantime: Immediately have a discussion about the cuts that are coming. Faculty want to be at the table.
11. Call to return to core values, and immediate engagement with senate around budget cuts in keeping with this spirit.
12. Q: What's going on at UBC if not these discussions? A: Admins have questions about who UBC reports to. (BoR, actually.) Committee is being restructured. Chair (currently and administrator) brings agenda. Spirit of BRC is to provide input, but this is disingenuous when BRC was in the dark about the cuts. Move to co-chairs – one faculty, one administration.
13. Some unconvinced that it's a system failure as we have so much evidence that administrators repeatedly deny input. We have been asking for input for some time and have not been getting the opportunity.
14. Is there anything we can commit to doing now with a more comprehensive document over time? How will we approach this?
15. Short term – focus on what's on this document, many of which are about the budget. Get it out right away. We need to do it now given the track record of our administration to make decisions during summer when faculty are away. Do something more comprehensive over time.

16. Proposed changes to the document under discussion:
 -Title document a “Statement of Concern”
 -At end of document, clearly state what the Senate is calling on the President to do:
 a. The Faculty Senate thus calls for President Smith to commit concretely to the university’s core values: (enumerated in the document)
 b. The Faculty Senate of Eastern Michigan University calls for President Smith to engage the Senate directly before any new budget decisions, honoring both the spirit and practice of shared governance
17. All in favor of advancing this document as modified above:
 Vote: Yes 21, No 0, Abstentions 10

- B. BOR Academic Affairs meeting on 4-20-2018: Models of Shared Governance
 C. Outsourcing and Shared Governance—Mahmud Rahman
 D. Senate Housekeeping Matters: Budget, Charter
- V. **Committee Reports** (End of the year briefings) – suspend reports in the interest of time spent in discussion of item IV A 4:20 pm
- A. Budget and Resources: Rob Carpenter
 B. University Wide Committees: Deb Willis
 C. Academic Issues Committee: Dave Powloski
 D. Graduate Council: Francis Perry
 E. Institutional Issues: Daryl Barton –
 A. Fish Lake – brief update – chance to see this property
 F. Student Affairs: Peggy Trewn
 G. Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Committee: Zach Moore
- VI. **Provost Minutes:** Rhonda Longworth No report 4:35 pm
- VII. **Announcements:** Ray Quiel, Faculty Senate President 4:45 pm
- Intra University Senate Summit held on 04-07-2018 at UM Campus – successful and informative
 - EMU President scheduled for 10-10-2018 Senate Session
 - Last session of the senate: May 16th
- VIII. **New Business**
- A. Rahman introduces **motion** – Most decisions are made at the president’s council. Motion addresses this. Distributed paper copies. Review and discuss next meeting. Any discussion? Not much; Senate is ready to vote. Motion to vote on proposal. Second. **Passed unanimously.**
- IX. **Adjourn** 5:00 pm

