The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was called to order at 2:30pm on Thursday, April 11, 2019 in the Magnolia Room of the Morris University Center by President Sorin Nastasia.

Present: Sorin Nastasia, Jocelyn DeGroot-Brown, Marcus Agustin, Shadrack Msengi, Laurie Rice, Wai Cheah, Dan Segrist, Ed Navarre
Absent: None
Guests: Denise Cobb, Jessica Harris, Nancy Lutz (UPBC), Jennifer Rehg, Wendy Shaw

Announcements:
Announcements were reviewed as listed on the agenda.

Consideration of Minutes:
The minutes for the March 28, 2019 meeting were approved as corrected.

Unfinished Business:
There was no unfinished business.

New Business:
The need to update the operating papers for the Rules and Procedures Council was discussed. There is a question on whether to include non-tenure track faculty as they do not have any avenue to evaluate the Provost or the Chancellor, however the operating papers refer to voting members of the Faculty Senate. There was a discussion of parliamentary procedures as the Rules and Procedures Council and full Faculty Senate only have one meeting left. There was also a discussion of the definition of non-tenure track, the previous inclusion of clinical faculty, and potential options for evaluation. After discussion, only changes that are needed for clarity will be brought forth to the full Faculty Senate at this time.

Reports:
The UPBC met on April 5 to do the second round of Innovation Grant reviews.

The FDC met last week. There was positive feedback for the Continuous Improvement Conference, and there were 80-90 people in attendance. The FDC meeting minutes for March 21 were posted to SharePoint and are attached.

The Rules and Procedures Council finished the first draft of the Chancellor’s and Provost’s reports and routed them to the committee for comments. The final reports were submitted today. The Chancellor has confirmed that he has received the report, and he will provide a written response within 10 working days. A report was posted to SharePoint an is attached.
The Graduate Council met and reviewed policies to ensure they were in line with 1Q5 (Academic Misconduct). The Admissions Policy was revised to take in changes on how the School of Dentistry operates. Starbucks will be closing for the summer on May 13. There was also a discussion of the classification change and R2 requirements.

The President reported that he has had discussions with the Provost and Chancellor about the equity problems with the AGB report. The list of search committee members for the SIU President search was received, and it is a more balanced membership than initially presented. Laurie Rice will represent the Faculty Senate on the committee.

It was noted that new Council chairs will need to be approved at the May meeting. The Chair must be a continuing Senate member.

There were no other reports.

Guest Speakers:
Provost Denise Cobb asked for College of Arts and Sciences representatives to join as they brought forward changes to the promotion and tenure dossier that she felt were good. They are being presented as a potential option with a request for feedback.

Wendy Shaw and Jennifer Rehg shared a template that incorporates information from Digital Measures. Currently there is no way to pull data from it, and very little of the work faculty do on a yearly basis can be pulled into the promotion and tenure documents. The outline is designed with the intent to be simple and organized while maximizing the use of digital data and retaining flexibility. There are still attachments, but when possible it will pull data from Digital Measures. The final result produces the same information, but it is intended to be easier to digest. It does not force anyone to use Digital Measures, but as a large number of faculty are using it they will be able to enter it in one place instead of manually across documents. There was a discussion of how different departments use Digital Measures, and some schools have no intention of using it. People will be allowed to use either the old or the new format without penalty. Rehg also shared that she will be doing a Digital Measures workshop for anyone who is interested.

The Provost provided information on the allocation model report presented to the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor has been working hard to get a commitment on when we will see an actual formula and shared that he is hoping for an August result. The original timeline for the report was spring, but it was unclear on whether that was supposed to include the formula.

Board of Trustees Chair Gilbert visited campus last week and met with the Chancellor’s Council. He wants to be sure that in his role as Chair he is committed to the system. The Chancellor has done an effective job sharing what we need in a President and how to reshape the role. Chair Gilbert has requested a list of things that are currently in the role of President that could potentially be moved to the Chancellor.
The Provost will be going to the UPBC tomorrow to present spending requests. Some items are being taken forward to ensure that there is knowledge of what is going on even if those requests cannot be met at this time. There are also requests for departments that grew with the intention of helping the University but where the resources did not follow. Both faculty and staff issues will be presented.

An update on enrollment was provided, and the current conservative estimate is a number around 13,000. There was far better enrollment in the MBA program than expected, and it gave a nice bump going into spring. It has had a spillover effect as hoped, and an increase in the flex program is expected. There have been ongoing discussions with community colleges in the state about how SIUE can better partner with them for transfer, especially in the Nursing program. SIUE has advisors on site at SWIC and LCCC, but some other schools have now offered office space.

There was a discussion about recent and upcoming searches. There will soon be a new Dean of Pharmacy and School of Education, Health & Human Behavior. Associate Provost interviews have been completed, and a report is expected this week. The East St. Louis Center will also be having a search for a new permanent director.

The changes to the Carnegie designation were discussed as were possible steps forward. Open forums will be scheduled to have in-person conversations. It is a new category so there is no reference for moving into it, however there is research on transitioning from a comprehensive to a more research-focused path.

Public Comment:
There was no public comment.

Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 4:44pm.

Submitted by Anne Hunter, University Governance
I. CALL TO ORDER

II. GUEST SPEAKERS
   a. Provost Denise Cobb and Assistant Provost Jessica Harris, with their guests Dr. Wendy Shaw and Dr. Jennifer Rehg - revised Promotion & Tenure Dossier Structure (3:30 p.m.)

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. Faculty Senate meetings, Spring 2019, guest speakers:
      i. May 2 - full Faculty Senate meeting (2:30 p.m., Mississippi Illinois Rooms in Morris University Center): Lakesha Butler, Black Faculty and Staff Association President
   b. Faculty Senate Executive Committee meetings, Spring 2019, guest speakers:
      i. April 25 - Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting (2:30 p.m., Magnolia Room in Morris University Center): Associate Chancellor for Institutional Diversity and Inclusion Venessa Brown; Jonathan Bean (rescheduled, tentative pending health update)
      ii. May 9 – Chancellor Randy Pembrook
   c. BOT meetings:
      i. May 16 – SIUC
      ii. July 18 – Springfield
   d. Important events:
      i. Faculty and Staff Appreciation Day – Meridian Ballroom, MUC, April 17
      ii. Staff Senate Scholarship Banquet (Faculty Senate members encouraged to attend if they can) - Meridian Ballroom, MUC, April 18
      iii. Discussion with John Charles, SIU Executive Director for Governmental and Public Affairs, on legislative work regarding higher education, health care, and pensions – Maple/Dogwood Room, MUC, April 24

IV. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES
   a. March 28, 2019

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Amending the R&P operating papers

VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL CHAIRS
   a. UPBC – Nancy Lutz
   b. Faculty Development Council – Shadrack Msengi
   c. Curriculum Council – Laurie Rice
   d. Rules & Procedures Council – Wai Cheah
e. Welfare Council – Dan Seegrist
f. Graduate Council – Ed Navarre
g. Past-President – Marcus Agustin
h. President-Elect – Jocelyn DeGroot
i. President – Sorin Nastasia

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The next FSEC meeting will be Thursday, April 25, 2019 at 2:30 p.m. in the Magnolia Room, Morris University Center
Faculty Development Council Meeting
Location: Center for Faculty Development and Innovation
Love-joy Library
March 21, 2019 @ 3:30 pm
UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1. **EUE Proposal Review update**— All proposals are due on March 28. Proposals will be assigned to a panel of six committee members to review. Committee members were urged to independently use the rubric when reviewing the assigned proposal and take notes that will be used during the panel (subgroup) discussion at the April 18 FDC meeting.

2. **Continuous Improvement Conference update**: It was reported that 89 attendees have signed for the conference. Individuals are encouraged to sign.

3. **Teaching Excellence Award (TEA) Update** – Lindsay Ross-Stewart brought up three issues to the committee:
   a) That the CAS nomination numbers for Teaching Distinction Award (TDA) and Teaching Excellence Award (TEA) is unclear. An email had been sent the CAS dean asking if the school preferred that all their four nominees to be on the same category. The operating paper (OP) showed that “CAS can nominate up to 4 people while it does not specify how many of those would be receiving the Teaching Award for tenure and tenure track and the Distinction Award for non-tenure track. However the instruction in the binder does specify that each category requires two nominees for a total of four. The Dean of the CAS has been asked to advice as to what would work better for them. Should they decide that the four nominees be in the same category vs the operating paper, the OP would be forwarded to the FDC for further discussion.

   b) A suggestion was made that two Meridian Scholars and a student from Student Senate be selected as representatives to the TEA committee, which would provide opportunity for more students’ participation. During the next meeting, the FDC will discuss ways to accommodate this suggestion in the TEA operating paper.

   c) **Eligibility for the TEA**: It was shared that teaching excellence Awards have been granted to 7 individuals. During the review the TAC committee discovered that there were individuals who had applied for the award while they were on sabbatical, which was against one of the operating paper requirements. The TEA committee OP item IV section 4a states for the candidate to be nominated for the award (he or she) must have a minimum of three years as full time tenure/tenure track teaching experience at SIUE.
      - A **motion was made**: make a *special exception* for the Faculty Teaching Excellence Award. This exception would allow consideration for faculty applicants, who have a taught at the University for considerable years (more than 3), but do not meet the tenure-tenure track eligibility
requirement, put forth in the Teaching Excellence Awards Committee (See Operating Papers [Item IV, Section a.4.]

- Vote Result. 8 – motion denied, 0- motion accepted
- Motion discussed and denied based on the following premises:
  - That it is a nominee's responsibility to read the operating papers and make sure they are eligible.
  - That the operating papers should be followed to make sure all people are treated equally and appropriately.

4. **Comment from Public:** No comment from the public

5. Meeting adjourned at 4:20pm
Rules & Procedures Council (RPC) Report

Chair: Wai Hsien Cheah

4/11/2019

The evaluation sub-committee of RPC has completed the first draft of the Chancellor’s and Provost’s annual evaluation report respectively. The documents are currently being reviewed by the membership of RPC. The Chancellor and Provost will be receiving their respective report on Friday (April 12), and they will each be given a total of 10 days to provide a written response. Thanks.
Inquiry about Chancellor’s and Provost’s annual evaluation

Cheah, Wai

Thu 3/7, 12:53 PM
Pettibone, Jonathan;
Shelley, Jared;
Nastasia, Sorin;
Lutz, Nancy;
Navarro, Edward;
Segrist, Dan;
+9 more
Jonathan,

Well said! It will be up to the next FSEC to take this issue up. Wai.

Wai Hsien Cheah, Ph.D.
Professor &
Undergraduate Program Director
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Pettibone, Jonathan

Thu 3/7, 10:34 AM

Hi Again. Thanks, Wai, for chasing this down with Tom. Tom thanks for your extensive knowledge on policies. And to Jared that’s exactly why we re-wrote article V a few years ago.

The bigger issue here, which I hope will be addressed, is how the senate and its councils rely too much upon personal experience and communications to conduct business. This was a problem when I was president, I made the same mistakes, and this e-mail exchange is a further example. When people leave the senate, too much knowledge leaves with them, stunting progress or even reverting it in some cases.

In this case, we spent a good amount of time debating a settled issue, because, frankly, none of us could remember why NTT were excluded from evaluations in the past. For myself, I remembered the procedure, but not the reasons. Having Steve Kerber on here would have likely helped catch this, but again, we can’t rely on individual knowledge to conduct our business.

For the good of the Senate, we need to do a much better job of documenting WHAT we do and WHY we do it, and in following legislative procedure. In only one or two (much less three!) transitions between a committee chair or officer position, so much knowledge can be lost, and progress halted. Hell, seems like many have even forgotten the relatively recent Article V rewrite at this point. 😊

When an issue like this comes up, someone needs to amend operating papers to account for it, so that we leave a paper trail for the next set of leaders. For evaluations, because of the lack of clarity of Article
I and the further dependence upon Article V, I would like to see Appendix 2 of the R & P operating papers amended to state the population of people who participate in the Senate’s evaluation of the provost and chancellor. I would recommend the following change to Item 1 in “Distribution of Instrument”

Original Text
1. A memorandum explaining the Senate evaluation process will be circulated to faculty early in Spring Semester. Faculty members will have the option of filling out the forms either online or on paper.

Modified Text

1. A memorandum explaining the Senate evaluation process will be circulated to university faculty, full-time Clinical Professors, full-time Clinical Associate Professors, and full-time Clinical Assistant Professors who are eligible to vote on senate membership early in Spring Semester. They will have the option of filling out the forms either online or on paper.

This reflects our current practice and leaves a paper trail for the next person and includes the exceptions to Faculty in Article I of the constitution. Honestly, you may need to continue to look for places to append the clinical language wherever “faculty” appear in documents. We did try to do that, but this is one we clearly missed. Feel free to take this and run with it, or edit it to improve it. I hate “They” in there, but I also hate repeating the faculty and clinical line again.

If you want to explore including some NTT in the evaluation- start the process now, involve administration, bring it to the floor of senate for discussion, and propose a language change to the R & P operating papers to account for it BEFORE you put it into practice. I know this is a pain in the ass, but it's a pain in the ass for a reason- slow governmental change and consistency are generally to the benefit of a democracy.

Sorry to take up so much of your time today!

Jon

Sheley, Jared

Thu 3/7, 8:30 AM

Hi all,

Just a caution for distinction between instructors vs. clinical faculty when using the term "non-tenure track". I, for example, as clinical faculty, am considered non-tenure track, am not covered by the NTIFA or CBA, and serve in faculty senate, have been included in previous Chancellor / Provost evaluations, etc. It appears from wording in emails below that clinical faculty are appropriately continuing to be included since they have voice in faculty senate, but always get a little nervous with blanket terms of tenure-track vs. non-tenure track.
Jared

Jared Sheley, Pharm.D., BCPS
Clinical Assistant Professor, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville School of Pharmacy
Clinical Pharmacy Specialist- Internal Medicine, HSHS St. Elizabeth's Hospital, O'Fallon, IL
joshle@siue.edu
Campus: (618) 650-5952
Hospital: (618) 234-2120 x17890

Wed 3/6, 4:12 PM
Dear all,

Please see Dr. Tom Jordan’s email below. Per the Rules and Procedures Council’s Operating Paper (Appendix 2), as pointed out by Dr. Jordan, only faculty who are qualified to vote in the election of senators in the various units will get to review the performance of the Chancellor and Provost.

With these all said, the RPC will conduct its annual evaluation of the Chancellor and Provost WITHOUT the NTT folks this year. Thanks. Wai.

Wai Hsien Cheah, Ph.D.
Professor &
Undergraduate Program Director
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

From: Jordan, Thomas
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 3:39 PM
To: Bacus, Mark; Cheah, Wai
Subject: Re: Inquiry about Chancellor's and Provost's annual evaluation

Dr. Cheah,

I'm sorry to jump in here, but I think there might be a misunderstanding.

I'm assuming you are referring to the Faculty Senate’s review of the Chancellor and Provost, as opposed to the reviews of those same administrators conducted under the auspices of University Policy 2B2 (CHAPA Policy).

In the Rules and Procedures Operating Papers, it specifies that “The Rules and Procedures Council shall insure that only those qualified to vote in election of Senators take part in the evaluations.” As such, I do not believe that part-time lecturers nor full-time instructors are eligible to vote for Senators. I think your pool is tenure-line Faculty and full-time Clinical faculty.

Let’s talk through this a bit more...
Best,

Tom

Dr. Tom Jordan
Coordinator for Policy
Office of the Provost
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
618-650-3678
thjorda@siue.edu
SIUE PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIER
Jane Doe
Department(s) and Percent Assignment: Deptxx (51%), Deptyy (49%)
Current Rank: Associate Professor Date of Current Rank: 1 July 2013
Record Presented: Fall 2012 through Summer 2018
INFORMATION FROM DIGITAL MEASURES (DM)

PART I: EVALUATIONS, and RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Current Evaluations and Recommendations regarding the Dossier Presented

1. Cover page (with signatures) ATTACHMENT (or a Digital Signatures page)?

2. Assessment and Evaluation by the Dean ATTACHMENT

3. Assessment and Evaluation by the College/School Committee ATTACHMENT

4. Assessment and Evaluation by the Department Chair(s) (if the unit(s) has a chair)
ATTACHMENT
   In the case of split appointments assessments by both Chairs / Directors should be included.

5. Assessment and Evaluation by the Department/Unit Faculty ATTACHMENT
   In the case of split appointments, assessments by the faculty of both departments and/or units should be included.

B. Other Evaluations and Recommendations During the Period Under Review

1. Midpoint Evaluation (Dean, College/School Committee, Chair, and Departmental Committee (tenure applications only) ATTACHMENTS

2. Other Evaluations and Recommendations Regarding Progress Toward Promotion/Tenure (if part of the process in the unit) ATTACHMENTS

3. ‘Annual’ Calendar Year Evaluations (as required by the Faculty Performance and Salary Increase Plan) ATTACHMENTS

PART II: GENERAL DOCUMENTS

1. Departmental criteria and standards in the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
ATTACHMENT

2. College/School criteria and standards in the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
ATTACHMENT
PART III: CANDIDATES RECORD

A. General

1. Current curriculum vitae ATTACHMENT (but can be generated within DM in a standard format)

2. Discussion of accomplishments in Teaching (including discussion of student and peer evaluations, curriculum development, professional development, recognition and awards, etc), Scholarship, Service, and plans and potential for continuing contributions. ATTACHMENT

B. Teaching

1. List of scheduled courses taught during review period from DM

2. Directed student learning (theses, senior assignment etc) from DM

3. Teaching observation reports by peers and chair ATTACHMENTS

4. Student evaluations ATTACHMENTS

5. Other supporting documents relating to teaching (optional) OPTIONAL ATTACHMENTS

C. Scholarly and creative activity.

1. List of scholarly peer-reviewed products (books, journal articles, proceedings, etc) from DM (Intellectual Contributions section); includes attached copies already in DM

2. List of scholarly non-peer-reviewed products (books, journal articles, proceedings, etc) from DM (Intellectual Contributions section); includes attached copies already in DM

3. List of scholarly peer-reviewed artistic and professional performances and exhibits (exhibits, performances, musical compositions, etc) from DM (Artistic and Professional Performances and Exhibits section); includes attached copies already in DM

4. List of scholarly non-peer-reviewed artistic and professional performances and exhibits (exhibits, performances, musical compositions, etc) from DM (Artistic and Professional Performances and Exhibits section); includes attached copies already in DM

5. List of funded competitive grants, contracts, fellowships, sponsored research, copyrights, and patents from DM (Contracts, Fellowships, Grants and Sponsored Research section and the Intellectual Property section); includes attached copies already in DM

6. List of funded non-competitive grants, contracts, fellowships, sponsored research, copyrights, and patents from DM (Contracts, Fellowships, Grants and Sponsored Research section and the Intellectual Property section); includes attached copies already in DM

7. List of scholarly peer-reviewed presentations (oral presentations, panels, posters, readings, etc) from DM (Presentations section); includes attached copies already in DM
8. List of scholarly non-peer-reviewed presentations (oral presentations, panels, posters, readings, etc.) from DM (Presentations section); includes attached copies already in DM

9. Letters of evaluation by external scholars ATTACHMENTS

10. Other supporting documents relating to Scholarship (optional) OPTIONAL ATTACHMENTS (Note that copies of publications etc. are inserted by DM in previous sections)

D. Service.

1. Departmental service activities from DM (Department Service section); includes attached copies of supporting documents already in DM

2. College/School service activities from DM (College/School Service section); includes attached copies of supporting documents already in DM

3. University service activities from DM (University Service section); includes attached copies of supporting documents already in DM

4. Professional service activities from DM (Professional Service section); includes attached copies of supporting documents already in DM

5. Public/community service activities from DM (Public/Community Service section); includes attached copies of supporting documents already in DM

6. Other supporting documents relating to service (optional) OPTIONAL ATTACHMENTS

D. Continuing Contributions.

1. Research Currently in Progress from DM (Research currently in Progress section). Note that continuing contributions in general are discussed as part of the faculty narrative.