

# Illinois Wesleyan University

## General Faculty Meeting

### Minutes: April 18, 2005

- I. President Wilson called the meeting to order at 4:13 PM
- II. The minutes from April 4, 2005 were approved.
- III. Curriculum Council Consent Agenda
  - a. Approved
- IV. Faculty Question: How should IWU engage in Strategic Curricular Planning in an ongoing, regular way?
  - a. Wes Chapman introduced the faculty question. As per the accompanying CC-CUPP workgroup report, citing ideas/issues 1) a-f and 2) a-g. General discussion followed.
  - b. An argument was put forth for option 2e.
    - i. For: making the point that continuity is there in some of the representatives.
    - ii. Against: no department chairs or academic administration are represented.
    - iii. Would dept. chairs be included? All of them? Division directors?
  - c. A place needs to be made to include interdisciplinary programs
  - d. Would the faculty governance web site help with the issue of continuity? (creating a paper trail, a memory database)
  - e. Department chairs and program leaders should be included. They are needed and important—perhaps ad hoc, called in as needed.
  - f. How do people envision department chairs engaging with this committee?
  - g. What is the campus model of what a department chair is? There is a lot of diversity on campus with this role.
  - h. What is the expected output of this committee? Why does it need to be a permanent committee? Couldn't it be a temporary committee?
  - i. The more frequent division meeting could work as workgroup for this strategic curricular planning committee.
  - j. Perhaps it should be a smaller committee once there is a five-year plan.
  - k. Front load a major planning committee and then a smaller continuous committee, which could carry on with the work.
  - l. Does this model include student representatives?
  - m. What would this committee be doing differently than the SPBC? Isn't this one of the spokes?
  - n. Would this committee flesh out (define) that spoke and report to the SPBC?
  - o. How big is 1) a-e? Is this a "north central" again, but now all the time?
  - p. Would looking at recommending approval of tenure lines (which CUPP does now) be taken over by this committee?

- q. A summer study group researched what other universities do, and concluded that all universities struggle with this issue of strategic curricular resource planning. We will need to invent our own solution.
- r. What would happen to CC? Bylaws call for CC to do this. So why has CC not done this? What is stopping them? Therefore we do not need to create another committee for one that should be doing this.
- s. CC is busy all the time in CD and AS and not strategic issues. A sub committee of CC would be just as busy trying to set up all the mini meetings required with all the groups on campus.
- t. Perhaps we need a broader group to deal with the strategic component of this.
- u. Constitution supports that this is CC's job. Proceeding with this idea would require a change in the constitution.
- v. A programmatic review required a set of stakeholders that includes faculty but includes many others as well.
- w. An argument was made that this is not totally CC's role. Faculty are divided on who needs to review this and CUPP is charged with faculty allocation of tenure lines. Usurping a committee's role is not necessarily what we are discussing.

V. Committee reports and Motions

- a. Nominating Committee
  - i. Kris Vogel called for nominations from the floor. None were made. Prof. Vogel thanked the members of the committee for all their hard work this year – applause.
  - ii. Ballots were distributed and subsequently collected.
- b. CUPP
  - i. Wes thanked CUPP members for their work over the past year, as well as those who were with CUPP during the first part of the year—Applause.
  - ii. Please send your nominations for Mellon Center Director.
  - iii. Wes was thanked for running CUPP as well -- applause
- c. Curriculum Council
  - i. Joan Friedman thanked the members of CC for their hard work this past year, ex officio members, and Jenny Hand – applause
- d. Promotion and Tenure Committee
  - i. George Rundblad thanked an unbelievably hard working committee – applause.
- e. Faculty Development Committee
  - i. David Vayo thanked the members of FDC for their hard work and wisdom as well as Jenny Hand and ex officio member.
- f. Hearing Committee
  - i. David Marvin brought the written report to attention along with the motion. *The Faculty shall continue for an additional one-year period the Trial Structure for Resolving Complaints Informally, as originally adopted in March of 2002, and amended April 7, 2003*

*and continued by vote of the faculty on March 1, 2004, and require that the Hearing Committee bring to the Faculty all necessary constitutional and Faculty Handbook changes by March 2006.*

Motion carried unanimously

ii. David then thanked the members of the hearing committee for their hard work. -- applause

VI. Administrative Reports

a. Richard Wilson, President

- i. Pres. Wilson recognized each of the committees that reported today, each of which got serious work done this year. This shows that we take faculty governance seriously at IWU.
- ii. April Schultz was thanked along with all members of the inauguration committee – applause. Those three days “ [were] IWU at it’s best.”
- iii. There is a new endowed professorship in place: The Issac Funk Professorship, (a resurrection of the first one created at IWU in the 1860's) The Funk Foundation has agreed to refund that professorship
  1. by rebuilding the endowment that makes funding perpetual
  2. in the meantime they will fund the professorship on a year-to-year basis until the endowment can take over.

How do we award this professorship? We will work through this in the fall. And we continue to work on other endowed professorships – applause

iv. A reminder of commencement on May 1.

v. Strategic Planning: An open discussion

1. Are there any comments on the goals themselves?  
Remember this list is not the final list of goals
2. The future of SPBC. Will be creating a workgroup for each of the goal statements. Each group as broad as possible. This summer will allow SPBC the create charge letters along with other issues. In order to use next year productively.
3. The hope is that in each of the goals there will be at least an outline of a strategy to present to the board by late fall.

***For each of these workgroups are they expected to set and define specific goals that we can measure and attain? How do we measure our progress?***

What we want to hope for is a list of things we need to have done in order to graduate the kind of students we envision. We need to set strategies and then identify the means to implement them. I want to know from the faculty, where are we going? What are we trying to do?

“We can’t make progress if our advising system is not better” so what should it be like?

Gateway– if we need to move forward and fix it, it should show up on this list.

***How are these groups going to interact with established committees that deal with those specific areas?***

I would hope that those committees are conferred with so that we do not waste time repeating a process that has already been done. These committees / workgroups should also be included in the new “spoke” workgroup.

***Is there any room for additional growth for the IWU physical plant – extra building?***

It could come within the strategic plan framework under financial resources or teaching and learning as well.

vi. Diversity Initiatives.

1. The chart was brought up again and reviewed so that clarity of the chart's meaning could be made. This is an attempt to solve the need without marginalizing the person in the role of Associate Dean for Diversity, who will assume a leadership role for the campus.
  - a. ***How hard is it going to be to report to two different people for this person?*** This person will—in general— work for the provost. The President’s role is one of accountability. He/she wants to be able to report to the faculty (and everyone else) what is going on in the university and where we are headed as a campus. Also, he/she needs someone who will help the university make progress in this area. This person would sit on cabinet.
  - b. ***What about international programs? What is included?*** All of them. A multi-cultural agenda is part of this whole picture. If there are pieces that do not belong we will work together to find out what pieces those are.
2. We are not to the point of implementing this. There are budget issues and the BoT will be presented with this next month. SPBC will want to be part of this and where does May Term fit?
  - a. General comments about the cost (faculty lines) for this proposal – but what is it worth? We finally have a chance of making our goal happen/work. That this could really work.
- b. Janet McNew, Provost and Dean of the Faculty
  - i. No report.
- c. Roger Schnaitter, Associate Provost
  - i. No report
- d. Tom Griffiths, Associate Dean of the Faculty

- i. No report
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
  - a. None
- VIII. Old Business
  - a. Election web site: where are we with that? Nominating Committee has it as a carry over item for next year.
- IX. Announcements
  - a. Those faculty who contributed money to a student in need, several years ago, update: This student is now going on the graduate study at Harvard. – applause
  - b. Is the Methodist center &/ Sheen coming down this summer? Maybe. The May BoT meeting will include a proposal from the architects for the Methodist center. Sheen is more problematic. There is not enough in the budget to actually do the job, so this project will be delayed.
  - c. A Staff Council: expected to be appointed this summer for technical administrative and physical plant staff. This will provide a mechanism to communicate with these people.
- X. A good year, thank you all – applause

Adjourned at 5:26 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Jean M. Kerr, Secretary for the day